

31 January 2009

TO: The AACSB International Accreditation Council and Membership

FROM: Jerry E. Trapnell, Executive Vice President and Chief Accreditation Officer

RE: 2009 revisions to the standards and interpretive materials

This document outlines the following: (1) proposed changes to AACSB business accreditation standards approved by the AACSB Board of Directors for an AACSB Accreditation Council vote in April at the International Conference and Annual Meeting; (2) Accreditation Quality Committee approved changes in the interpretive materials supporting the standards; (3) De Minima and editorial changes; and (4) transitional guidance. Many of these changes will be also impact process documents related to pre-accreditation, initial accreditation, and maintenance reviews. All changes noted below are to be effective July 1, 2009 pending the April vote (see section on Transitional Guidance).

- I. **STANDARDS CHANGES:** The Accreditation Quality Committee (AQC) unanimously approved changes in selected standards. These changes were ratified by the Board of Directors to be put before the AACSB Accreditation Council for approval at the April 2009 Annual Business Meeting at the International Conference and Annual Meeting in accordance with AACSB By-Laws:

#### **Eligibility Criterion A:**

***Eligibility Criterion A: A collegiate institution seeking AACSB accreditation must be a member of AACSB International.***

#### **Standard 1:**

***Standard 1: The school publishes a mission statement or its equivalent that provides directions for making decisions. The mission statement derives from a process that includes the viewpoints of various stakeholders. The mission statement is appropriate to higher education for management and consonant with the mission of any institution of which the school is a part. The school periodically reviews and revises the mission statement as appropriate. The review process involves appropriate stakeholders. [MISSION STATEMENT]***

#### **Standard 2:**

***Standard 2: The mission incorporates a focus on the production of quality intellectual contributions that advance knowledge of business and management theory, practice, and/or learning/pedagogy. The school's portfolio of intellectual contributions is consistent with the mission and programs offered. [INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS]***

**Standard 10:**

***Standard 10: The faculty of the school has, and maintains expertise to accomplish the mission and to ensure this occurs, the school has clearly defined processes to evaluate individual faculty member's contributions to the school's mission. The school specifies for both academically qualified and professionally qualified faculty, the required initial qualifications of faculty (original academic preparation and/or professional experience) as well as requirements for maintaining faculty competence (intellectual contributions, professional development, or practice). [FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS]***

**Standard 15:** (change is underlined, italicized, and in bold print)

Standard 15: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, support staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, and the business community served by the school.

The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific course in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as:

- Communication abilities
- Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities
- Analytic skills
- Use of information technology
- **Dynamics of the global economy**
- Multicultural and diversity understanding
- Reflective thinking skills

Normally, the curriculum management process will result in undergraduate and master's level general management degree programs that will include learning experiences in such management-specific knowledge and skill areas as:

- Ethical and legal responsibilities in organizations including the impact of different cultural, regulatory, and legal traditions
- Financial theories, analysis, and reporting
- Creation of value through integrated production and distribution of goods, services, and information
- Group and individual dynamics in organizations
- Statistical data analysis and management science as they support decision-making processes throughout an organization.
- Information technologies as they influence the structure and processes of organizations and economies, and as they influence the roles and techniques of management
- Domestic and global environments of organizations.
- Other management-specific knowledge and abilities as identified by the school

[MANAGEMENT OF LEARNING]

***Standard 18:*** (change is underlined, italicized, and in bold print)

Standard 18: Master's level degree in general management (e.g., MBA) programs: Knowledge and skills. Participation in a master's level degree program presupposes the base of general knowledge and skills appropriate to an undergraduate degree. Learning at the master's level is developed in a more integrative, interdisciplinary fashion than undergraduate education.

The capacities developed through the knowledge and skills of general master's level program are:

- Capacity to lead in organizational situations.
- Capacity to apply knowledge in new and unfamiliar circumstances through conceptual understanding of relevant disciplines.
- Capacity to adapt and innovate to solve problems to cope with unforeseen events, and to manage in unpredictable environments.
- **Capacity to understand management issues from a global perspective.**

Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates master's level achievement of learning goals for key management-specific knowledge and skills in each master's level general management program. [MASTER'S LEVEL GENERAL MANAGEMENT LEARNING GOALS]

***Standard 19:*** (change is underlined, italicized, and in bold print)

Standard 19: Master's level degree in specialized programs: Knowledge and skills. Participation in a master's level program presupposes the base of general knowledge and skills appropriate to an undergraduate degree and is at a more advanced level.

The level of knowledge represented by students of a specialized master's level program is the:

- Application of knowledge even in new and unfamiliar circumstances
- Ability to adapt and innovate to solve problems.
- Capacity to critically analyze and question knowledge claims in the specified discipline.
- **Capacity to understand the specified discipline from a global perspective.**

Master's level students in specialized degree programs demonstrate knowledge of theories, models, and tools relevant to their specialty field. They are able to apply appropriate specialized theories, models, and tools to solve concrete business and managerial problems. Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates achievement of learning goals in each specialized master's degree program. [SPECIALIZED MASTER'S DEGREE LEARNING GOALS]

## II. INTERPRETIVE MATERIALS

AQC approved the following changes to the interpretive materials supporting the noted standards. Some of the changes are linked to the standards vote and some are not. However,

AQC agreed to wait for the standards vote and issue only one version effective 1 July 2009 incorporating all changes with a single effective date.

**Preamble:**

**Change 1:** The following language is approved to become the fourth paragraph of the **Preamble** to the business accreditation standards.

*A collegiate setting is an important context for AACSB accreditation reviews. A collegiate institution is one that supports an environment that fosters significant engagement of students, faculty, support staff, and the business community in the learning and scholarship process. Collegiate implies stability and a reasonable base level of human resources (administrative leadership, faculty members, and support staff) that can ensure the achievement of the school's mission. AACSB's expectations, as demonstrated throughout this document, is that faculty and support staff resources are sufficient, when joined with the administrative leadership, to carry out all functions (teaching, curricula development, course development, course delivery, research, academic service, advising, extracurricular activities, etc.) in support of quality management education programs through significant interaction with students and colleagues. Collegiate implies that there is sufficient infrastructure provided by the institution to support the administrative leadership, faculty members, support staff, and students toward successful achievement of all dimensions of the stated mission with particular focus on high quality degree programs and scholarly research. .*

**Change 2:** The following language will be added to the end of the fifth paragraph of the **Preamble**:

*Thus, the AACSB accreditation process is based on a mission-driven philosophy with a focus on overall high quality and continuous improvement. Accreditation decisions are derived through a peer review process that is based on the professional judgment of peers who participate in the accreditation process.*

**Change 3:** The following language (the underlined portion is new) is approved to become the final paragraph of the **Preamble**:

*In the practice of accreditation evaluation, Peer Review Teams must exercise flexibility and professional judgment. AACSB has a robust global strategy in regards to accreditation recognizing that high quality management education is occurring around the world in different ways. This requires AACSB to adapt its approaches to different cultural situations. Such a strategy implies that these standards are developed and implemented as true guidelines that may be interpreted and applied in different ways in different countries or regions of the world. These adaptive strategies are implemented to support high quality management education and scholarship wherever they occur, but this education must demonstrate alignment with the standards. Evaluations must be based on the quality of the learning experience and scholarly outcomes, not rigid interpretations of standards.*

**Eligibility Criterion A:**

**Change 1:** Subject to the approval to add a new Eligibility Criterion A as noted in Section I, the following interpretive language is approved to support the new Criterion A:

*INTERPRETATION: Membership should be established prior to or concurrent with the submission of the AACSB Pre-Accreditation Eligibility Application.*

### **Eligibility Criterion B (formerly “A”):**

**Change 1:** The following language is approved to be added at the last sentence to the interpretive materials supporting Eligibility Criterion B (formerly “A”):

*Alternatively, documentation should be provided demonstrating authenticity of the degrees granted in business. AACSB does not accredit institutions that solely award two-year post-secondary degrees (e.g. associate or foundation degrees.)*

### **Eligibility Criterion C (formerly “B”):**

**Change 1:** The following phrase is approved to be added at the end of the last sentence of the interpretive materials supporting Eligibility Criterion C (formerly “B”):

*...within the context of a collegiate institution as described in the Preamble to these standards.*

### **Eligibility Criterion D (formerly “C”):**

**Change 1:** The following language is approved to introduce the interpretive materials for Criterion D (formerly “C”) and concludes just prior to the heading **“DEFINING THE PROGRAMMATIC SCOPE OF ACCREDITATION:”**

*INTERPRETATION: In determining the “scope of accreditation” in regards to degree programs, the “institution” which is seeking to earn or maintain AACSB accreditation must be identified. Once the “institution” is defined, the scope of accreditation in regards to degree programs can be determined.*

*The institution is an organization through which business programs are authorized, resourced, and overseen. In some cases, business programs are offered through an academic unit (or units) that is part of a larger organization offering degree programs across many fields. In such cases, the business programs may be offered through a faculty, school, college, or department of business or management. Typically, such an academic unit is responsible and accountable to a senior academic officer and the entire organization has an administrative structure under the leadership of a chief executive officer (e.g., president, chancellor, rector, director general, etc.). In other cases, business degree programs are offered by an organization that in its entirety is the business academic unit and normally there are no programs offered outside of business and management fields, i.e., the academic unit and institution are one and the same. In between these two examples, AACSB recognizes there can be variations on the concept of an institution. In recognition of this, the first step in establishing the scope of accreditation is to reach agreement on the institution that is seeking to earn or maintain AACSB accreditation. Once the institution is identified and agree upon, the scope of AACSB’s accreditation review in regards to degree programs can be established. The following outlines this process and expectations.*

### **Identification of the Institution**

AACSB assume the total “organization” as depicted in a formal and comprehensive organizational chart is the relevant “institution” for accreditation purposes. However, the applicant academic unit can request a review by the Accreditation Coordinating Committee (ACC) to obtain a determination of the “institution” for accreditation purposes that may differ from a formal organizational structure. The burden of proof rests with the applicant academic unit seeking or maintaining AACSB accreditation. Based on the evidence provided regarding each of the guidelines outlined below, ACC will determine the “institution” for accreditation purposes.

If the applicant seeks an exception to the formal organizational chart, the following steps should be followed:

*Step 1. Does the applicant academic unit (faculty, school, college, department, etc.) depend on a larger organization for one of the following: authority to grant degrees in traditional business subjects; financial resources; human and physical resources; and/or management oversight? If the answer is no, the applicant is defined as the institution and it should proceed to address programmatic scope issues outlined in Step 3. If the answer is yes, and the business academic unit is part of or “connected” to a larger organization, the relationships should be described by addressing the questions in Step 2.*

*Step 2: Describe the extent of interdependence between the applicant academic unit and the larger organization from which it obtains the authority to grant degrees, resources, and/or managerial oversight. The description should address the following areas (Note: The questions under each area are not intended to be exhaustive):*

*Financial relationship: Does the larger organization approve the budget (operating and capital) of the business applicant academic unit? Does the organization have control over a large portion of the funds available to the academic unit? Does the applicant academic unit subsidize the organization? Are the physical and financial assets “owned” by the applicant academic unit or the organization?*

*Services: Does the organization provide services (e.g., library, academic services, residence life, parking, maintenance of grounds and facilities, human resource management policies and services, information technology infrastructure, etc.) necessary to sustain the activities of the applicant academic unit? Are the costs of those services charged back to the applicant academic unit?*

*Autonomy: Must the applicant academic unit adhere to most of the policies and procedures of the larger organization? Is the applicant academic unit’s strategic plan approved or otherwise constrained by the organization? Are key decisions of the applicant academic unit subject to approval by the organization? Describe any other significant attribute of the relationship. Does the larger organization appoint the head of the academic unit?*

*Brand dependence: Does the applicant academic unit rely heavily on the brand of the larger organization? Is the name of the larger organization important to the promotion and marketing of business program offered within the applicant academic unit? To what extent is the brand of the applicant academic unit differentiated from the organization’s brand (and other academic units and programs) in the marketplace? Is there a geographic separation that contributes to*

unique brand identity for the academic unit separate from the larger organization? If so, please describe.

*In light of the information on the above four factors, AACSB's Accreditation Coordinating Committee (ACC) will determine whether the academic unit may be taken as the "institution" to be accredited, or alternatively, whether the organization of which the academic unit is a part shall be the "institution" for accreditation purposes. The applicant must demonstrate that the level of independence is substantive. AACSB must be assured that there is clarity about what institution is seeking or holds AACSB accreditation and that external parties (prospective students, prospective faculty, employers, etc.) are not confused as to what is to be AACSB accredited and what is not.*

*Step 3: Based on the determination of the "institution," the final step is to determine the inclusion or exclusion of degree programs for purposes of an AACSB review. The institution may make a request to ACC to exclude certain degree programs. The determination of inclusion or exclusion of a program in the accreditation review will be made well in advance of the on-site visit of the accreditation review and should follow the process outlined in the next section.*

**Change 2:** AQC approved the following language to be placed in the document as a separate paragraph prior to the explanation of three dimensions on which program exclusions can be sought:

*AACSB recognizes national systems, local contexts, and regulatory environments in which the institution operates may result in possible variations in regards to what are traditional business subjects. AACSB will consider the definition of those boundaries in the local context in which the applicant school operates. Such variations should be explained and documented.*

**Change 3:** AQC approved the following changes to the second paragraph of the program exclusion dimension "**Branding/Distinctiveness**" (changes are underlined):

To be excludable, programs must be clearly distinguishable from included programs by title, by published descriptions, and in representations to potential students, faculty, and employers. The intent is to allow exclusion of programs that are separate from the included programs, but to avoid exclusion of programs when such exclusion would create confusion about which programs of the institution have achieved accreditation.

**Change 4:** AQC approved the removal of all examples from Eligibility Criterion D (formerly "C").

### **Standard 1:**

**Change 1:** AQC approved the inclusion of the following bulleted items from the former Standard 2 to be included in the "Basis for Judgment" in Standard 1:

- *The mission statement encourages learning that positively affect students' development as managers and professionals.*
- *The mission statement of the school supports the mission of any larger organization of which it is a part.*
- *The mission emphasizes the achievement of high quality in each degree program*

**Change 2:** AQC approved the inclusion of the following two bulleted items from the former Standard 2 to be included in the “Guidance for Documentation” for Standard 1:

- *Describe the appropriateness of the mission statement for students, and discuss how it positively affects their development as managers and professionals.*
- *Discuss the mission statement’s relation to the mission of any larger organization of which it is a part.*

**Change 3:** AQC approved the relocation of the following sections from former Standard 2 for inclusion in the interpretive materials for Standard 1 following the section entitled “Inclusion of Stakeholders in Creating the Mission Statement:”

### ***Appropriateness of the Mission Statement***

*To say that the mission statement is "appropriate to higher education for management" is an important aspect of this standard. Evaluation of a mission statement’s appropriateness involves professional judgment about both higher education and management education, and must be understood in the broader context of the school.*

### ***Professional Judgment in Mission Statement Creation***

*During the creation of the mission statement professional judgment about the appropriate level and content of higher education for management comes from the school's stakeholders. The stakeholders shape the mission statement to reflect their understanding of proper goals. Different stakeholders will have different relative advantages for this task. Administrators, members of the faculty, and other academics will, through their knowledge of other higher education institutions, have an understanding of learning and other intellectual outcome expectations suitable in higher education. Members of the business community (alumni, employers, and other interested business representatives) will bring knowledge about expectations for management education that fit with the demands graduates will face in their careers. These and other stakeholder groups will help to shape the mission through the variety of perspectives they contribute to the discussions and processes that establish the statement.*

### ***Professional Judgment in Accreditation Review***

*The peer review team’s judgment will focus on the appropriateness of the mission statement, the process for deriving the mission, and the extent to which the school is achieving high quality and continuous improvement inherent in the standards in accordance with the stated mission. Therefore, this standard requires the school’s mission to be open to scrutiny by the peer review team and appropriate accreditation committees.*

### ***General Mission Expectations***

*In general, appropriateness for higher education for management implies learning experiences and career preparation that goes well beyond skill training. It conveys an expectation of education about the context within which management careers develop, as well as capacities for direct applications of functional skills. Students should comprehend the "why" of business activity as well as the "how."*

*Of course, for many schools the mission statement will speak to much more than just the educational goals of the school. The mission statement may define the contribution of the school as it interacts with a specified business community. It may depict the school's role in*

*regional or national economic development. It may define the school's contributions to the larger academic community through the creation of scholars and scholarship. The mission statement should tell readers where the boundaries of the school lie – what it is, and what it is not. The mission statement should make clear how the world is different because the school exists and the expected outcomes in terms of degree programs, learning outcomes, intellectual contributions, and other mission activities adopted by the school.*

### **Consonance with Institutional Mission**

*Normally, the business school (see earlier definition of "school") will be a part of a larger institution. The mission statement of the school should be complementary to the mission of that larger organization. Generally, the Peer Review Team will detect consonance, or lack of consonance, of missions, not by an analysis of mission statements, but by noticing collaboration or competition in operational matters. Discussions with participants in the school and participants in the institution will disclose agreement in goals. If reviewers discover conflicts, it is important to assure that the school and institution are working to resolve such conflicts.*

### **Standard 2:**

**Change 1:** AQC approved the following bulleted items (bullets three and four) to be added to the "Basis for Judgment" for Standard 2:

#### **Basis for Judgment:**

- *The school has infrastructure and processes that facilitate and encourage the production of intellectual contributions.*
- *If the portfolio of intellectual contributions relies on the outputs of faculty members who have primary faculty appointments with other institutions, the school must provide documentation of how its relationship with the individual faculty member and the other institution contributes to the success of the school, supports its mission, and in particular, its portfolio of intellectual contributions.*

**Change 2:** AQC approved the following bulleted items (bullets two, three, four, and five) to be added to the "Guidance for Documentation:"

#### **Guidance for Documentation:**

- *Demonstrate the school's infrastructure, policies, and processes which support the production of intellectual contributions.*
- *Display the portfolio of intellectual contributions for individual faculty members, within each discipline, and for the business school as a whole by completing Table 2-1 which should be used to provide an overall 5-year summary of the school's intellectual contributions. Discuss how this aligns with the school's mission. Table 2-2 may be provided.*
- *Provide an analysis of the value of the school's intellectual contribution efforts and how the "substantial cross-section of faculty in each discipline" is achieved.*

**Change 3:** AQC approved the following language to follow the "Guidance for Documentation:"

*Research and scholarship in the form of intellectual contributions are essential for a business school to:*

- *Contribute to the advancement of knowledge of management theory, practice, and/or learning/pedagogy;*
- *Ensure intellectual vibrancy across and among faculty members contributing to the currency and relevancy of management education programs; and*
- *Ensure the business school contributes and is an integral part of an academic community of scholars across all disciplines within an institution and in a larger context.*

**Change 4:** AQC approved the addition of the following item as the final example in the list of possible examples of intellectual contributions:

- *Non-peer reviewed intellectual contributions for which the school can provide substantive support for quality*

**Change 5:** AQC approved formats for new tables, 2-1 and 2-2 (see next two pages), to be placed in Standard 2. Table 2-1 will be required and Table 2-2 is optional.

**Table 2-1: Five-Year Summary of Intellectual Contributions** (Note: Please add a footnote to this table summarizing the school’s policies guiding faculty in the production of intellectual contributions.)

	Portfolio of Intellectual Contributions									Summary of Types of ICs <sup>10</sup>		
	Peer Reviewed Journals <sup>1</sup>	Research Monographs <sup>2</sup>	Books <sup>3</sup>	Chapters <sup>4</sup>	Peer Reviewed Proceedings <sup>5</sup>	Peer Reviewed Paper Presentations <sup>6</sup>	Faculty Workshops <sup>7</sup>	Non-Peer Reviewed Journals <sup>8</sup>	Others <sup>9</sup>	Learning & Pedagogical Research	Contributions to Practice	Discipline-Based Research
<b>Faculty</b>												
List alphabetically by academic discipline as defined in the organizational structure that is used by the school identifying each faculty member												

1. Peer reviewed journal articles (learning and pedagogical research, contributions to practice, and/or discipline-based scholarship)
2. Research Monographs (teaching/pedagogical, practice/applied and /or discipline-based research)
3. Books (textbooks, professional/practice/trade, and/or scholarly)
4. Chapters in books (textbooks, professional/practice/trade, and/or scholarly)
5. Peer reviewed proceedings from teaching/pedagogical meetings, professional/practice meetings, and/or scholarly meetings
6. Peer reviewed paper presentations at teaching/pedagogical meetings, professional/practical meetings, and/or academic meetings
7. Faculty workshops (teaching/pedagogical, practice oriented, and/or discipline-based research seminar)
8. Non-peer reviewed journals (learning and pedagogical, contributions to practice, and/or discipline-based scholarship). School must provide substantive support for quality
9. Others (peer reviewed cases with instructional materials, instructional software, publicly available material describing the design and implementation of new curricula or courses, technical reports related to funded projects, publicly available research working papers, etc. please specify)
10. Summary of ICs should reflect total number of ICs in each category (learning and pedagogical research, contributions to practice, and/or discipline-based scholarship)



**Standard 3:**

**Change 1:** AQC approved the addition of the following language to the “Guidance for Documentation” relative to student populations served:

- *Describe how the student population the school intends to serve is consistent with the stated mission.*

**Standard 6:**

**Change 1:** AQC approved the addition of the following two bullets to the “Basis for Judgment” relative to how schools support students for success:

- *The school demonstrates how it prepares and supports students for success in the degree programs.*
- *Where admission policies are not under the control of the school, the school demonstrates how it prepares and supports students for success in the degree programs and how the process is consistent with the school’s mission.*

**Standard 9:**

**Change 1:** AQC approved the following bulleted items to be added to the “Basis for Judgment” for Standard 9:

**Basis for Judgment:**

- *Participating faculty do not have to be “full-time” faculty members.*
- *If the school deploys a faculty model that relies on different levels of support for classroom instruction (e.g., senior faculty teaching large classes supported by a cadre of “teaching assistants”) , the school must document how the model supports high quality academic programs and meets the student-faculty interaction principles of this standard.*
- *In cases where a substantial proportion of a business school’s faculty resources hold primary faculty appointments with other institutions, the school must provide documentation of how this faculty model supports mission achievement, overall high quality, and continuous improvement and is consistent with the spirit and intent of this standard.*
- *A school must provide documentation supporting its determination of faculty members as “participating” or “supporting” by adopting and implementing....(this is a modification of the first sentence to the last bullet, the remainder of the wording is unchanged)*

**Change 2:** AQC approved the following revisions to Bullets one and two for “Guidance for Documentation:”

*Guidance for Documentation:*

- *Describe the faculty complement available to fulfill the school’s mission and all instructional programs they staff in the most recently completed academic year.*
- *Demonstrate how faculty members and support staff fulfill the functions of curriculum development, course development, course delivery, academic assistance, academic advising, career advising, and other activities that support the school’s mission.*

**Change 3:** AQC approved the following paragraph to be inserted into the interpretive materials for Standard 9 following the “Guidance for Documentation” section:

*Faculty sufficiency is critical for the effective delivery of high quality management education programs supported by high quality student/faculty interactions. To demonstrate faculty sufficiency, a school should deploy faculty members who are engaged with the administrative leadership in carrying out all functions (teaching, curricula development, course development, course delivery, research, academic service, advising, extracurricular activities, etc.) necessary for high quality business programs through significant interactions with students and colleagues. The level of engagement is not dependent on a legal or contractual relationship, but by the extent to which faculty members are committed broadly and collegially to support the business school mission, academic programs, and students. To meet these expectations, the concepts of “participating” and “supporting” faculty and along with guiding principles for student/faculty interactions are introduced.*

**Change 4:** AQC approved the deletion of two of the three examples for Table 9-1 and to modify the remaining example of Table 9-1 to include footnote guidance on the use of various metrics to measure the teaching of participating and supporting faculty.

**TABLE 9-1:**

**SUMMARY OF FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY DISCIPLINE AND SCHOOL (Note: Please include a footnote to the table summarizing the school’s policies for determining participating and supporting faculty)<sup>3</sup>**

(RE: Standard 9 - Using Student Credit Hours as metric:  Name <sup>1</sup>	Participating or Supporting (P or S)	Amount of teaching if P (blank if S) <sup>2</sup>	Amount of teaching if S (blank if P) <sup>2</sup>	
<b>Accounting</b>				
James Whitecloud	P	912 sch		
Terri Bunsen	S		432 sch	
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL ACCOUNTING		P <sub>A</sub>	S <sub>A</sub>	P <sub>A</sub> / (P <sub>A</sub> + S <sub>A</sub> ) must be > 60%
<b>Finance</b>				
Karla Checkov	P	636 sch		
Hester Brighton	P	444 sch		
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL FINANCE		P <sub>F</sub>	S <sub>F</sub>	P <sub>F</sub> / (P <sub>F</sub> + S <sub>F</sub> ) must be > 60%
“ “ “ “				
<b>Operations Research</b>				
Jean-Louis Pascal	S		210 sch	
Brett Ferstberg	P	942 sch		
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH		P <sub>O</sub>	S <sub>O</sub>	P <sub>O</sub> / (P <sub>O</sub> + S <sub>O</sub> ) must be > 60%
OVERALL TOTAL FOR SCHOOL		P <sub>T</sub>	S <sub>T</sub>	P <sub>T</sub> / (P <sub>T</sub> + S <sub>T</sub> ) must be > 75%

1 Faculty should be listed by academic discipline as defined in the organizational structure that is used by the school. The organizational structure should be clear to the Peer Review Team.

2 The measure “amount of teaching” must reflect the operations of the school, and this metric must have the concurrence of the Peer Review Team, e.g. student credit hours (SCHs), European Credit Transfer Units (ECTUs), contact hours, individual courses, modules or other designation that is appropriately indicative of the amount of teaching contribution. Concurrence on the measurement process should be reached with the Peer Review Team early in the review process. In this example, “student credit hours” (sch) is used as the metric.

3 Tables that present the percentages relating to participating/supporting faculty and AQ/PQ faculty should be presented for the two most recently completed academic terms (semesters or quarters) at a minimum. The peer review team reserves the right to request the information for additional time periods.

## Standard 10:

**Change 1:** AQC approved the following changes or additions to the bulleted items for the “Basis for Judgment:”

**Basis for Judgment:** (changes are italicized and underlined)

- The aggregate, or total, faculty resources is the sum of full and partial *(based on a measure of percent-of-time devoted to the school’s mission)* assignments. For example, if a school has 12 full-time faculty members and seven faculty members who are only half-time assignments, the total faculty resources would equal 15.5.
- Qualified faculty resources are distributed across programs, disciplines, and locations consistent with the school’s mission. *Variations from the overall percentages may be justified at the program, discipline, and location level. The burden of proof is on the school to demonstrate the delivery of overall high quality in such cases.*
- *In cases where a substantial proportion of a business school’s faculty resources hold primary faculty appointments with other institutions, the school must provide documentation of how this faculty model supports mission achievement, overall high quality, and continuous improvement and is consistent with the spirit and intent of this standard.*
- *If the school deploys a faculty model that relies on different levels of support for classroom instruction (e.g., senior faculty teaching large classes supported by a cadre of “teaching assistants”), the school must document how the model supports high quality academic programs and supports mission achievement.*
- A school should develop appropriate criteria consistent with its mission for the classification of faculty as academically or professionally qualified. The interpretive material in the standard provides guidance only and each school should adapt this guidance to its particular situation and mission by developing and implementing criteria that indicate how the school is meeting the spirit and intent of the standard. Specific policies should be developed to provide criteria by which academically and professionally qualified status is granted and maintained. The criteria should address:
  - *The academic preparation and/or professional experience required to attain each status.*
  - *Consistent with the stated mission, the types of development activities that are required to maintain academic or professional qualifications on an ongoing, sustained basis.*
  - *The priority and value of different development activities reflecting the mission and strategic management processes.*
  - *Quality standards required for the various, specified development activities and how quality is assured.*
  - *The quantity and frequency of development activities and outcomes expected within the typical five-year AACSB review cycle to maintain each status.*

**Change 2:** AQC approved the following language to be included in the interpretive materials for Standard 10 to follow the “Basis for Documentation:”

*The delivery of high quality management education programs, scholarly activity and other mission components relies on the deployment of a cadre of qualified faculty members who demonstrate currency and relevance in their field or discipline. Faculty qualifications are a function of (1) original academic preparation and (2) subsequent, on-going development activities that maintain currency in the field of teaching and scholarship, supporting each faculty member’s contribution to the business school’s overall mission. Faculty members may be academically qualified, professionally qualified, or neither. Regardless of the category, all faculty members should demonstrate they are current in their field of teaching supported by appropriate, ongoing development activities and academic preparation.*

**Change 3:** AQC approved the following language to be added at the end of the paragraph describing Example 2 of academically qualified faculty:

*The greater the disparity between the field of academic preparation and the area of teaching, the greater the need for supplemental preparation in the form of professional development linked to the area of teaching.*

**Change 4:** AQC approved the following language to be added at the end of the paragraph describing Example 3 of academically qualified faculty:

*The greater the disparity between the field of academic preparation and the area of teaching, the greater the need for supplemental preparation in the form of professional development linked to the area of teaching.*

**Change 5:** AQC approved the following language to be added at the end of the paragraph describing Example 4 of academically qualified faculty:

*The burden of justification in these cases rests with the school under review.*

**Change 6:** AQC agreed to delete the following sentences from the last paragraph in the section entitled “Academically Qualified Faculty Members:”

*Since the intent of academic qualifications is to assure that faculty members have research competence in their primary field of teaching, the existence of a current research record in the teaching field may be accepted as prima facie evidence of academic qualifications, regardless of credentials. The burden of proof is on the school to provide appropriate documentation to support its position.*

**Change 7:** AQC approved the following bullet item to be added to the section entitled “Expectations of the Standard Regarding Qualifications:”

- *Classification as academically or professionally qualified will be lost if there is inadequate evidence of development activities within the past five years that demonstrate currency and relevancy in the field of teaching.*

**Change 8:** AQC approved modifications to Table 10-1 as shown below:

**TABLE 10-1: SUMMARY OF FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES, AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES  
(RE: Standard 10)<sup>1</sup>**

(Note: In a footnote to Table 10-1, summarize the school's criteria for determining academic and professional qualifications)

Name <sup>2</sup>	Highest Degree Earned and Year	Date of First Appointment to the School	Percent of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission <sup>3</sup>	Academically Qualified <sup>4</sup>	Professionally Qualified <sup>4</sup>	Other <sup>4</sup>	Five-Year Summary of Development Activities Supporting AQ or PQ Status <sup>5</sup>					
							Intellectual Contributions	Professional Experience	Consulting	Professional Development	Other Professional Activities	Normal Professional Responsibilities <sup>6</sup>

1The summary information presented in this table, supplemented by information in individual faculty members' vitae, is useful in making judgments relative to Standard 10. The table as a whole will assist the peer review team in judging whether "The faculty has, and maintains, intellectual qualification and current expertise to accomplish the mission...."

2 Faculty members should be listed alphabetically by discipline following the organizational structure of the business school. Administrators who hold faculty rank and directly support the school's mission should be included relative to their percent of time devoted to the mission including administrative duties. If a faculty member serves more than one discipline, list the individual only once under the primary discipline to which the individual is assigned and where his/her performance evaluation is conducted. Provide a footnote explaining the nature of the interdisciplinary responsibilities of the individual. Graduate students who have teaching responsibilities should be included in accordance with the guidance provided in Standard 10.

3 This column should show the percent of total time devoted to teaching, research, and/or other assignment represented by the faculty member's contribution to the school's overall mission during the period of evaluation (i.e., the year of the self-evaluation report or other filing with AACSB International). Reasons for less than 100% might include part-time employment, shared appointment with another academic unit, or other assignments that make the faculty member partially unavailable to the school.

4 Faculty members may be academically qualified (AQ), professionally qualified (PQ), AQ and PQ, or other. Indicate by placing "YES" in the appropriate column(s) or by leaving columns blank. Individual vitae should be provided to support this table. The "Other" category should be used for those individuals holding a faculty title but whose qualifications do not meet the criteria for academically and/or professionally qualified. A faculty member should be counted only once for use in Table 10-2 even if the individual is AQ and PQ.

5 The number of development activities should be noted in these columns. This summary information should be consistent with information presented in Table 2-1 as well as supported by faculty vitae.

6. Indicate the normal professional responsibilities the faculty member is expected to perform, e.g., (UG for undergraduate teaching; GR for graduate teaching; UG/GR for teaching at both levels; ADM for administration; RES for research; NCR for non-credit teaching; SER for service and outreach activities) A faculty member may have more than one category assigned.

NOTE: Tables presented in support of standards 9 and 10 should be presented for the two most recently completed academic terms (semesters or quarters) at a minimum. The peer review team has the right to request the information for additional time periods.

### Standard 13:

**Change 1:** AQC approved the addition of the following bullet to the “Guidance for Documentation:”

- *Document faculty development activities that support continuous improvement in instructional methods.*

### Introduction to Assurance of Learning Standards:

**Change 1:** Clarifying language is added to several examples of assessment processes and measures indicating that remediation of students who do not do well on a particular assessment tool is optional, but not required as part of AACSB’S outcomes assessment expectations.

### Standards 15, 18, 19, and 21:

**Change 1:** AQC approved the following bullet to be added to the “Guidance for Documentation” for each standard:

- *Show how the curriculum across the dimensions outlined in the standard demonstrates a global perspective.*

### III. DE MINIMA CHANGES

AQC approved the following de minima (minor editorial and clarifying additions, etc.) changes to the standards documents:

- To clarify the distinction between faculty and staff, the term “staff” is replaced with the term “support staff” throughout the document.
- The last sentence in Standard 9 is modified to read, “Students in all programs, disciplines, and locations have the opportunity to receive instruction from appropriately qualified faculty.”
- The first bullet in Standard 11 is modified to read, “Determining appropriate teaching assignments, intellectual expectations, and other components of the faculty member’s professional responsibilities to the school.”
- AQC approved staff’s recommendation to delete the section of the Standard that shows only the standards themselves without the interpretive materials.

### IV. TRANSITIONAL GUIDANCE

The Accreditation Quality Committee approved the following transitional guidance relative to the implementation of the above changes:

- All changes approved by the Accreditation Quality Committee will become effective 1 July 2009 subject to the vote of the Accreditation Council at the 2009 International Conference and Annual Meeting in April.
- For schools involved in the accreditation process filing reports, applications, or other documents that are due in the 2009-10 fiscal year (1 July 2009-30 June 2010), the following guidance is provided: (1) for reports, applications, or other documents due to AACSB between 1 July 2009 and 31 December 2009, schools may follow the 31 January 2008 standards and related process documents (early adoption of the revised standards to become effective 1 July 2009 is encouraged); (2) for reports, applications, or other documents due to AACSB beginning 1 January 2010 and after, the 1 July 2009 standards document and supporting process documents should be followed.

The Accreditation Quality Committee welcomes your feedback and appreciates the comments and recommendations received during the exposure draft period. AACSB staff will be working with the appropriate accreditation committees to update process documents reflecting the changes outlined in this document and these will be available through [www.aacsb.edu](http://www.aacsb.edu).