



MAINTENANCE OF ACCREDITATION HANDBOOK



<http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/process/process-toc.asp>

AACSB International Maintenance of Accreditation Handbook

PREFACE

To document and facilitate the accreditation process, AACSB International developed a series of three handbooks. The following *Maintenance of Accreditation Handbook* should be read in conjunction with the other two handbooks: the *PreAccreditation Handbook* and the *Initial Accreditation Handbook*.

The *Maintenance of Accreditation Handbook* is designed to provide assistance and essential information to applicant institutions and Peer Review Teams. It describes the philosophy, procedures, and guidelines for the maintenance of accreditation process, as well as the duties and responsibilities of Peer Review Team members in conducting a thorough and complete maintenance of accreditation review.

Where possible, applicants and Peer Review Team reviewers should follow the instructions prescribed by the handbook. At the same time, some degree of reviewer flexibility may be necessary to ensure that the process (1) brings value to the applicant, (2) maintains the integrity of AACSB International accreditation, and (3) provides the type and level of learning experiences that mark effective accreditation processes. In situations where applicants or reviewers must improvise to accomplish the purposes of the review, documentation of reasons and results of deviations must be provided to the appropriate accreditation committee by the Peer Review Team.

The appendices to this handbook provide further detail on policies, processes, and procedures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Maintenance of Accreditation Terminology	2
Maintenance Review Application	6
Exclusion of Programs	7
Comparison Groups	7
Materials for the Team	10
Accreditation Statistical Reports.....	10
Fifth Year Maintenance Report.....	11
Annual Maintenance Reports.....	12
The Visit	13
Visit Schedule	13
Maintenance Review Visit Report	14
Consultative Report	15
Sixth Year Review	15
Continuing Review	15
Review of Team Recommendation	17
Accreditation Committee	17
Board of Directors.....	18
Applicant.....	18
Maintenance of Accreditation Timeline	19
Example and Templates	20
Template 1: Cover Letter	20
Template 2: Maintenance Review Application.....	21
Example: Visit Schedule.....	24
Template 3: Maintenance Review Visit Report.....	25
Template 4: Consultative Report	28
Template 5: Sixth Year Review Team Report.....	29
Template 6: Continuing Review Team Report	31
Table I: Summary of Faculty Sufficiency (Using Student Credit Hours).....	33
Table I: Summary of Faculty Sufficiency (Using Contact Hours)	34
Table I: Summary of Faculty Sufficiency (Using Courses).....	35
Table II: Summary of Faculty Qualification, Intellectual Contributions and Professional Responsibilities	36
Table IIA: Calculations Relative to Deployment of Qualified Faculty	37
Accreditation Guidelines	38
Roles and Responsibilities	38
Conflict of Interest Guidelines	40
Disclosure of Accreditation Guidelines	41

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Accreditation Guidelines (Continued)	38
Code of Conduct	42
Responsibilities of Institutions with AACSB International Accreditation	43
Complaint Procedures	44
Appeal Procedures	45

INTRODUCTION

The AACSB International Board of Directors adopted the maintenance of accreditation procedures described in this handbook in January 2003. **The maintenance of accreditation process pertains only to institutions already accredited**; all initial accreditation reviews follow the standard-by-standard review process.

This document provides guidance for the maintenance of accreditation applicant and for Peer Review Team reviewers. It describes the process, and it states the expectations for these reviews. Where possible, the applicant and reviewers should follow these directions. However, reviewers should remain somewhat flexible in conducting reviews to achieve the conceptual aims that (1) bring value to the applicant and (2) maintain the integrity of AACSB International accreditation. **Where the applicant or the reviewers find they must improvise to accomplish the purposes of the review, documentation of any deviations must be provided.**

The maintenance of accreditation process minimizes the reporting burden on accredited institutions and adds value through the accreditation process. The approach emphasizes continuous improvement. The process creates an ongoing “maintenance of accreditation” signaling that once an institution has achieved accreditation, a process of continuous improvement maintains the accreditation status.

Maintenance of accreditation is not a standard-by-standard review. However, that does not mean that reviewers will be insensitive to issues of educational quality. By focusing the review on educational improvement, strategic management, and fulfillment of mission, the members of Peer Review Teams will be particularly attuned to educational quality issues and problems that may be revealed in the process.

The applicant and the reviewers provide evaluations of the process. Changes in the procedures are made each year to incorporate opportunities for continuous improvement learned from the participants in the previous year.

MAINTENANCE OF ACCREDITATION TERMINOLOGY

Accounting Accreditation Committee (AAC)

Appoints Peer Review Teams to assist the applicants in the initial and maintenance of accreditation processes, and reviews initial accounting accreditation and accounting maintenance of accreditation recommendations.

Accreditation

Recognition by AACSB International that an institution commits to fulfill its mission, and continues to sustain and improve educational quality of its undergraduate, master's, and doctoral degree programs according to the standards of AACSB International as interpreted by its Peer Review Team(s), accreditation committees, and the Board of Directors.

Accreditation Coordinating Committee (ACC)

Makes decisions on all requirements as described in the eligibility procedures A-F in the accreditation standards.

Accreditation Council

Members who have achieved AACSB International accreditation.

Accreditation Quality Committee (AQC)

Reviews the accreditation standards and processes for continuous improvement changes.

Accreditation Statistical Reports

Reports provided to the applicant and Peer Review Team members for use as background information in the accreditation review.

Accreditation Recommendations

Peer Review Team recommendation can be extension of accreditation or sixth year review. Sixth Year Review Team recommendation can be extension of accreditation or continuing review. Continuing Review Team recommendation can be extension of accreditation or suspension. The appropriate accreditation committee must review all team recommendations for concurrence. Immediate suspension of accreditation can result for cause at any time. Recommendations and concurrence for extension of accreditation and suspension of accreditation must be considered for ratification by the Board of Directors.

Annual Maintenance Reports

The set of progress reports specifying action items identified in the strategic management plan along with an explanation of new programs or objectives and supporting resources.

Applicant

The department, school, or administrative unit that is responsible for the degree programs under review. AACSB International accreditation is achieved and awarded to the member institution for all degree programs in business or accounting that it offers (except specifically excluded programs).

Aspirant Groups

A list of schools that provides developmental goals for the applicant, represents management education programs or features that the applicant hopes to emulate, and places the vision and strategy of the applicant in context. The list may be of any number.

Business School Questionnaire (BSQ)

Request for annual data from AACSB International to all accreditation council members. Some of these data are included in the accreditation statistical reports.

Comparable Peers

A list of schools considered similar in mission and assumed to be appropriate for performance comparison. A minimum of six comparable schools must be provided.

Comparison Groups

Schools considered by the applicant to be similar in mission and appropriate for performance comparison as either peers, aspirants, or competitors.

Competitive Groups

A list of schools so directly competitive that conflict of interest considerations exclude their personnel from the review process of the applicant. The list may be of any number. Only those schools should be included where the direct competition for students, faculty, or resources is so compelling that the appearance of a conflict of interest is present.

Consultative Report

Report included in the Maintenance Review Visit Report. The report consists of consultative advice that is not relevant to the maintenance of accreditation.

Continuing Review

Additional review for up to two years beyond the sixth year review.

Continuing Review Team

Mutually agreed upon team consisting of one member from the Sixth Year or Peer Review Team and one from (or appointed by) the relevant accreditation committee. The Continuing Review Team evaluates progress and resolution of specific standards-related quality items identified by the Sixth Year Review Visit Report.

Degree Programs

Undergraduate, master's, doctoral, and other comparable degrees awarded by an institution.

Effective Practices

Exceptional practices that demonstrate leadership and high quality continuous improvement in management or accounting education, noted by the team in its team visit report.

Exclusion of Program(s)

Programs excluded from the accreditation review as described in the eligibility sections of the accreditation standards.

Executive Summary

Applicant provides background information of up to five pages in length, including a list of self-proposed effective practices.

Fifth Year Maintenance Report

Report includes materials to inform the Peer Review Team before and during the fifth year maintenance review.

Initial Accreditation Committee (IAC)

Appoints a Peer Review Team to assist the applicant in the initial accreditation process, and reviews the initial accreditation recommendation.

Institution

The member organization of AACSB International. Usually a larger academic organization than the business school or accounting unit being reviewed.

Maintenance of Accreditation Committee (MAC)

Appoints a Peer Review Team to assist the applicant in the maintenance of accreditation process, and reviews the maintenance of accreditation recommendation.

Maintenance of Accreditation Review

Replaces the reaffirmation of accreditation process. This process is not a standard-by-standard review. It is an ongoing review which emphasizes continuous improvement to maintain the accreditation status. Accreditation is extended for six years with a review in the fifth year.

Maintenance Review Application

The set of documents required for participation in the maintenance of accreditation process.

Maintenance Review Visit Report

The report written by the Peer Review Team for the applicant and for review by the appropriate accreditation committee.

Peer Review Team

Mutually agreed upon team, normally chosen from the submitted Comparable Peer or Aspirant Groups that performs the accreditation review and makes a recommendation to the appropriate accreditation committee.

PreAccreditation Committee (PAC)

Reviews the Eligibility applications for both business and accounting and assigns a mentor to assist the applicant in the PreAccreditation process.

Scope of Accreditation

The degree programs that are included in the accreditation review.

Sixth Year Review

Additional review conducted in the sixth year on those standards-related issues specifically identified as problematic in the maintenance of accreditation review.

Sixth Year Review Team

Mutually agreed upon team consisting of one member from the Peer Review Team and one from (or appointed by) the appropriate accreditation committee. The team evaluates resolution of specific standards-related quality issues.

Strategic Management Plan

The systematic planning and implementation for the prioritized use of resources to accomplish the stated mission.

Suspension of Accreditation

Loss of membership in the Accreditation Council.

Withdrawal of Application by Applicant

Action available to applicant any time prior to consideration by the Board of Directors. In the case of an accredited school in the maintenance of accreditation process, withdrawal from the process is also withdrawal from the Accreditation Council.

MAINTENANCE REVIEW APPLICATION

What is Required:

The applicant submits each of the following items for business and a separate set for accounting, when applicable:

- Maintenance Review Application – The eligibility application requests details of the characteristics that determine institutional eligibility for accreditation such as scope, diversity, and ethical behavior (see Template 2).
- List of Degree Programs Offered
 - Catalogs (4 hard copies should be sent to the appropriate chair at AACSB International if electronic copies are not available)
- Request for Exclusion of Program(s) - The process for requesting exclusions is described in the *Eligibility Procedures and Standards for Business Accreditation, January 1, 2005*.
- List of Comparison Groups
 - Designate Comparable Peers (for consideration to serve on the Peer Review Team)
 - Designate Competitive Group (excluded from serving on the Peer Review Team)
 - Designate Aspirant Group (for consideration to serve on the Peer Review Team)Note that a school may be listed in one or all of the groups above.
- A cover letter, signed by the President/Chancellor, Provost, Dean, and Accounting Administrator (when applicable), must accompany these items. The letter, addressed to the appropriate accreditation committee chair, should include a statement requesting the maintenance of accreditation review and preferred visit dates. A sample cover letter is included in this handbook (see Template 1).

When to Submit:

The accreditation committee chair(s) will request the application items listed above. These items are due by July 1 two years prior to the scheduled year of visit; i.e., if the visit is a 2010-11 visit, the items are due by July 1, 2008. **The applicant requests exclusion of program(s) no later than TWO years prior to the scheduled visit.** The process for requesting exclusions is described in the *Eligibility Procedures and Standards for Business Accreditation, January 1, 2005*.

How to Submit:

The applicant submits the cover letter along with the required maintenance review application items, listed above, electronically to the appropriate accreditation committee chair (mac@aacsb.edu for business and aac@aacsb.edu for accounting). The electronic file(s) should be in Adobe PDF format or Microsoft Word DOC format.

What Happens Next:

The chair of the appropriate accreditation committee will submit to the Accreditation Coordinating Committee (ACC) the applicant's maintenance review application and the list of programs in conjunction with catalogs, Web sites, or other material describing the institution's offerings. Any requests for program exclusions will also be included. The ACC will review and inform the applicant of the degree programs that will be included in the review. The process for identifying the accreditation scope must be completed prior to scheduling the on-site review and normally no later than one year in advance of the Peer Review Team visit.

REQUEST FOR EXCLUSION OF PROGRAMS

What is Required:

The applicant submits the following items for business and a separate set for accounting, when applicable:

- Maintenance Review Application detailing eligibility requirements such as diversity and ethical behavior.
- Inclusive list of all business (and accounting) degree programs (those programs not listed and found by the Peer Review Team must be reviewed for inclusion by the Accreditation Coordinating Committee and can, in turn, delay the accreditation decision)
- List of degree programs requested for exclusion, including justification for the requested exclusion
- Statement from the chief academic officer verifying the above two lists

When to Submit:

The applicant may request exclusion for programs NO LATER THAN TWO YEARS prior to the scheduled visit date.

How to Submit:

The required items should be submitted electronically to the appropriate accreditation committee chair (mac@aacsb.edu for business and aac@aacsb.edu for accounting). The electronic files should be in Adobe PDF format or Microsoft Word DOC format.

What Happens Next:

The Accreditation Coordinating Committee will review the applicant's request for exclusion of programs. The ACC chair will inform the applicant of whether the request is granted or denied. The process for identifying the accreditation scope must be completed prior to scheduling the on-site review and normally, no later than one year in advance of the Peer Review Team visit.

LISTING OF COMPARISON GROUPS

Processes to support the maintenance of accreditation include the selection of comparison groups to form a relevant context for judgments, inform strategic planning activities, and assist in the selection of Peer Review Team members. Reviewers from comparable institutions are better prepared to make evaluative judgments about the applicant, to understand the applicant and its aspirations, and to offer suggestions for the applicant's improvement.

What is Required:

The applicant submits three comparison groups selected from members of the Accreditation Council. The applicant may select comparison groups on the basis of institutional or program comparisons. It is important to note that a school may be chosen in all three groups, as a peer, competitor, and aspirant based upon particulars of the school or programs it offers. Accounting programs may have a different set of comparison groups than the business programs and must be selected from those members of the Accreditation Council with accounting accreditation. Doctoral programs may have another set.

- ***Comparable Peers:*** A list of schools considered similar in mission and assumed appropriate for performance comparison. A minimum of six comparable schools must be provided. The

schools should be chosen carefully to match key characteristics of the applicant. In addition to mission, some features that might be salient when choosing comparison schools include student populations served, size, degree levels, and primary funding source.

- **Competitive Group:** A list of schools so directly competitive that conflict of interest considerations exclude their personnel from the review process. The competitive school list may be of any number. Only those schools should be included where the direct competition for students, faculty, or resources is so compelling that the appearance of a conflict of interest is present.
- **Aspirant Group:** A list of schools that provides a developmental goal for the applicant, represents management education programs or features that the applicant hopes to emulate, and places the vision and strategy of the applicant in context. The list of aspirant schools may be of any number.

Comparison groups do not imply categories or rankings of schools or members accredited by AACSB International. AACSB International will not publish or otherwise make available comparison group listings beyond the accreditation process. These lists are for the benefit of the applicant and the Peer Review Team in the accreditation review.

Although comparison groups include only AACSB International accredited schools of business or those with accounting accreditation when applicable, applicants are encouraged to look beyond academe for examples of best practices and potential Peer Review Team members. Processes for selecting Peer Review Team members will continue to value and support involvement from corporations and other appropriate persons.

The applicant should demonstrate in the review that it appropriately relates to the operational levels of the comparison school set. In some circumstances idiosyncratic features of the applicant may make some of the data non-comparable.

AACSB International will develop an on-line system to assist the applicant to identify potential comparison schools, officially select schools for each comparison group, and continuously maintain comparison group listings in an AACSB International database. Some information is currently available. The on-line service, www.aacsb.edu/knowledgeservices, offers advanced search functions that produce institution lists based on optionally selected criteria.

What Happens Next:

- **Peer Review Team:** The appropriate accreditation committee chair selects, and proposes to the applicant for acceptance, Peer Review Team members from the Comparable Peers and Aspirant Group. The proposed members are likely to be most well-prepared to make evaluative judgments about the applicant, to understand the applicant and its aspirations, and to offer suggestions for the applicant's improvement. Sometimes for scheduling or other reasons, reviewers who are not on the Comparison Group list may be proposed. When mutual agreement between the applicant and accreditation committee chair is reached, AACSB International invites the individuals to serve on the team.
- **Accreditation Statistical Reports:** Statistical reports will include data from the Comparison Groups who respond to the accreditation data questions in the annual *Business School Questionnaire*. AACSB International will distribute the reports to the applicant and Peer Review Team members. These reports will help form the context for judgment and

consultative elements of the review. The two reports will be the Comparable Peer Report and the Aspirant Group Report.

- Comparable Peer Report (includes data on the applicant and its comparable peers)
- Aspirant Group Report (does not include data on the applicant, competitive group, and its peers)

The data are used for **background information only and not for making accreditation decisions**. Feedback from the team that identifies those data elements most helpful in promoting useful discussions relating to the accreditation review will be used to further refine the *Accreditation Statistical Reports*.

MATERIALS FOR THE TEAM

What is Required:

AACSB International will provide the following materials to the applicant and the Peer Review Team members at least 60 days prior to the team visit:

- Accreditation Statistical Reports – (Only those members responding to the accreditation questions in the *Business School Questionnaire* will be included in the statistical reports.)
 - Comparable Peers (applicant data is included)
 - Aspirant Group (applicant data is not included)
- List of included and excluded programs as approved by the Accreditation Coordinating Committee (ACC) at least one year prior to the visit. Please note that any new degree programs started after the accreditation decision will be considered accredited until the next review. New degree programs will be reviewed during the next maintenance of accreditation review.

The Applicant will provide the following to each team member and to the applicable accreditation committee chair at least 60 days prior to the team visit:

- Fifth Year Maintenance Report
- Annual Maintenance Reports
- Policies for Faculty Management, including Non-Tenure Track Faculty - processes for recruitment, retention, and development for all faculty
- Executive Summary (up to five pages in length)
 - Background Information
 - Effective Practices that demonstrate leadership and high quality continuous improvement in management or accounting education

The Peer Review Team will provide the following to the applicant and the applicable accreditation committee chair within ten days of the visit:

- Maintenance Review Visit Report
- Consultative Report

When to Submit:

The applicant maintains the collection of Annual Maintenance Reports between visit reviews, along with the Fifth Year Maintenance Report and any updates. The most recent five-year collection, including all items listed above, should be distributed to reviewers at least 60 days prior to the team visit.

How to Submit:

The applicant should submit the required items electronically and in paper format to the Peer Review Team members and to the appropriate accreditation committee chair (mac@aacsb.edu for business and aac@aacsb.edu for accounting). The electronic files should be in Adobe PDF format or Microsoft Word format.

ACCREDITATION STATISTICAL REPORTS

All accreditation council members are required to complete both the Key Data and Accreditation Data sections of the annual *Business School Questionnaire* distributed by AACSB International

Knowledge Services. The statistical information collected is used for the *Accreditation Statistical Reports* which will be distributed to the applicant and to the Peer Review Team Members at least 60 days prior to the team visit. These reports will help form the context for judgment and consultative elements of the review. The information is used for **background information only and not for making accreditation decisions.**

FIFTH YEAR MAINTENANCE REPORT

There is no prescribed format for the Fifth Year Maintenance Report documentation. The applicant should provide its strategic management information in the format developed and utilized for its operations. A separate report for accounting programs is required when applying for accounting maintenance of accreditation. The documentation for the Fifth Year Maintenance Report (business and accounting) should include the following essential elements:

1. **Situational Analysis** (no more than five pages): A brief analysis that enables the Peer Review Team to understand the context within which the applicant operates. It should answer the following types of questions:
 - What historical, national, local, and other factors shape the applicant's mission and operations?
 - What are the applicant's relative advantages and disadvantages in reputation, resources, sponsors, and supporters?
 - What internal, environmental, or competitive forces challenge the applicant's future?
 - What opportunities exist for enhancing the applicant's degree offerings?
 - What degree programs are included in the accreditation review, and what is the number of graduates in the previous year for each program?
2. **Mission Statement:** A statement that includes all degree programs defined in the scope of accreditation.
3. **Strategic Management Planning Process** (no more than two pages): A description of the strategic management planning process of the applicant. Who is involved, and how do the various stakeholders influence the strategic management plan? How are resources strategically managed?
4. **Assessment Tools and Procedures:** A brief statement of learning goals for each degree program, along with a list of the assessment tools, procedures, and results used to demonstrate progress toward an achievement of the mission. What are the most recent outcomes from the assessments, and what is the impact on the program offerings relative to Assurance of Learning?
5. **Financial Strategies:** Description of the school's action items and financial plans to achieve the school's action items. This should include anticipated sources and timing of funding (see Standards 4 and 5 for definition and interpretation).
6. **New Degree Programs:** A list of degree programs introduced since the previous accreditation review. The following information is required for each new degree program:
 - A brief description of the employer or employment needs to be served by the program
 - A brief description of the intended student market
 - A description of the source(s) of faculty, technology, and facility support
 - A description of the learning goals, how the goals are measured, and results that demonstrate achievement.

Please note that any new degree programs started after the accreditation decision will be considered accredited until the next review. New degree programs will be reviewed during the next maintenance of accreditation review.

7. **Tables:** Include completed tables on faculty sufficiency and faculty qualifications (Table I, Table II and Table IIA) or an appropriate alternative to these tables.

To facilitate the maintenance of accreditation visit, additional materials or documentation may be requested by the Peer Review Team. If the purpose of the request is for a standard-by-standard review (audit) it is probably an inappropriate request. Please keep in mind the spirit of the review.

ANNUAL MAINTENANCE REPORTS

Annual Maintenance Reports are updates to the strategic management plan and provide information on the management of the planning process. The annual report consists of the following elements:

1. **Progress Update** (no more than five pages): A description of progress over the previous year on existing action items.
2. **Priority Update:** A description of updated action items for the immediate future. The relevance of these action items to the mission should be either obvious or explained.

THE VISIT

Maintenance of Accreditation focuses on strategic management. The Peer Review Team contributes an external perspective on the applicant's action items, accomplishments, and progress toward achieving its mission. The applicant should be prepared to respond to questions, such as:

- Are the objectives in the vision and mission statements realistic for the applicant?
- Does the applicant have a realistic vision and mission relative to its financial, intellectual capital, human capital, and physical capital resources?
- What has the applicant accomplished relevant to its plan?
- What are the next action items in the pursuit of the mission?
- Is the applicant taking the necessary steps to see that its programs remain current and relevant?
- Does the applicant have processes to ensure continuous improvement?
- Do the applicant's accomplishments demonstrate effectiveness of its planning and implementation of its action items?

For institutions with both business and accounting accreditation, a single Peer Review Team is appointed with representatives having both general review responsibility and an assigned emphasis in either business or accounting. The visit is coordinated so that representatives of both business and accounting accreditation are part of the same visit. During the visit, it is anticipated that some of the discussions will include leaders of the business program, leaders of the accounting program, reviewers of the business programs, and reviewers of the accounting program. Some parts of the visit may separate the business and accounting reviewers and leaders for discussions that emphasize specific concerns for the separate programs. Reviewers will prepare separate reports and recommendations for the appropriate accreditation committee.

VISIT SCHEDULE

The Peer Review Team Chair works with the administrative head of the business school to determine the schedule for the visit (see Example 1). When accounting accreditation is included, the Accounting Review Chair works with the accounting administrator to schedule sessions specific to the accounting review.

The visit should include certain individuals and groups. Because of differences in administrative structures, the groups and titles may differ from the following:

- Administrative officers of the business school/accounting program, e.g., deans/chairs
- Strategic management committee
- Department chairs and academic program directors
- Promotion and tenure committee
- Senior faculty representatives, junior faculty representatives, clinical faculty representatives, part-time and adjunct faculty representatives
- Student service directors, e.g., graduate admissions, academic support and advising, career services and placement
- Chief executive and chief academic officers of the institution, e.g., president, chancellor, academic vice president, provost, etc.
- Student representatives

The meeting of the Peer Review Team with the chief executive and chief academic officers should be one of the final meetings of the visit. During this meeting the team should present the recommendation (Section II of the Maintenance Review Visit Report) and discuss any effective practices (Section III) the team may highlight.

MAINTENANCE REVIEW VISIT REPORT

Within ten days following the visit, the Team provides the *Maintenance Review Visit Report* (See Template 3) to the applicant and copies the appropriate accreditation committee chair. The report should include the following three sections:

I. Definition of Scope

- A. *Descriptive Information*: Brief description of the school or accounting unit including its size and institutional setting (no more than one-half page)
- B. *Degree Programs*: List of all degree programs included in the accreditation review and the number of graduates in the previous year for each program
- C. *Comparison Groups*: Comparable peers, competitive group, and aspirant group
- D. *Maintenance Review Visit Schedule*: List of persons and activities followed during the visit
- E. *Visit Dates and Team Members*: On-site review dates and names of the full team
- F. *Materials Reviewed*: List of all the materials provided by the applicant and reviewed by the Peer Review Team to make its accreditation recommendation

II. Team Recommendation

- A. *Accreditation Recommendation (one of the following two)*:
 - Extend accreditation for an additional six years with a maintenance of accreditation review visit to occur in year five
 - Sixth Year Review visit to take place in the following year to examine the specific accreditation standards-related problems cited in the Maintenance Review Visit Report, along with the respective reporting expectation and the expectations for accomplishments.

When the Peer Review Team encounters issues or practices that raise concerns about educational quality, they must determine whether the issue relates directly to an AACSB International accreditation standard. An institution's accreditation can only be questioned on the basis of issues relative to the standards. The report should cite such problems with specific reference to the appropriate AACSB International accreditation standards. These issues will form the focus of a visit in the following year. During the

sixth year review, the accredited status of the applicant does not change until the review and decision process has been completed.

- B. *Team Recommendation Review Schedule*: Date that the appropriate accreditation committee will meet to review the team recommendation

III. Effective Practices

List up to five exceptionally effective practices that demonstrate leadership and high quality continuous improvement in management or accounting education, particularly relative to the set of comparison groups.

CONSULTATIVE REPORT

This report is to be completed by the Peer Review Team and included in the Maintenance Review Visit Report (see Template 4). The report consists of consultative advice that is **not** relevant to the maintenance of accreditation. That is, any issues raised should be unrelated to standards, or problems related to standards should not be sufficiently material to threaten accreditation. The consultative report will be shared with the applicant and the appropriate accreditation committee.

SIXTH YEAR REVIEW

If, during the maintenance of accreditation review, the Peer Review Team finds standards-related quality items that require additional investigation, a focused review will occur in the following year. The Peer Review Team identifies the weakness or threat to educational quality in Section II of the Maintenance Review Visit Report and states the expectations for the sixth year review. The applicant distributes to the Sixth Year Review Team and appropriate accreditation committee its response to the specific concerns cited by the Peer Review Team.

What Happens Next:

The relevant accreditation committee selects, and proposes to the applicant for approval, the Sixth Year Review Team that normally includes one member from the Peer Review Team and one from (or appointed by) the accreditation committee. The Sixth Year Review Team reviews the response from the applicant and prepares a Sixth Year Review Team Report (see Template 5). An on-site review may or may not be required.

Successful completion of the review in the sixth year earns the institution a six-year extension of its accreditation with the original review year as the start year and the next scheduled maintenance review to take place in year five; i.e., the five-year review cycle remains constant. For example, if the applicant is reviewed in year 2005-06, the next review will be in year 2010-11 irrespective of whether a sixth year review is required. If successful completion is not achieved in the sixth year, the Sixth Year Review Team will recommend continuing review of maintenance of accreditation for up to two additional years.

CONTINUING REVIEW

During the continuing review period, the applicant must rectify the standards-related quality items from the Sixth Year Review Team Report before maintenance of accreditation can be extended. The applicant responds annually on the progress being made or achievements that satisfactorily address

the specific concerns and expectations. Each of these reports is submitted to the Continuing Review Team and the appropriate accreditation committee.

What Happens Next:

The relevant accreditation committee selects, and proposes to the applicant, the Continuing Review Team that normally includes one member from the Sixth Year or Peer Review Team and one from (or appointed by) the accreditation committee. The Continuing Review Team reviews the annual Continuing Review Report submitted by the applicant and confers with the appropriate accreditation committee to determine (1) if the concerns have been satisfactorily addressed, (2) how the Continuing Review Team and Committee can further assist the applicant, and (3) if an on-site review is needed. The Sixth Year Review Team may be asked to continue to serve as the Continuing Review Team. The team prepares a Continuing Review Team Report (see Template 6).

Successful completion of the continuing review earns the institution a six-year extension of its accreditation with the original review year as the start year and the next scheduled maintenance review to take place in year five; i.e., the five-year review cycle remains constant. For example, if the applicant is reviewed in year 2005-06, the next review will be in year 2010-11 irrespective of whether a sixth year review and continuing review period are required. The continuing review period can be up to two years in duration. If successful completion is not achieved by the end of the continuing review period, the Continuing Review Team will recommend suspension of accreditation.

REVIEW OF TEAM RECOMMENDATION

ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE

The role of the accreditation committee is to ensure consistent application of AACSB International accreditation standards and processes across Peer Review Teams. Within 10 days following the visit, the Peer Review Team forwards a copy of the team visit report and its recommendation to the appropriate accreditation committee: the Maintenance of Accreditation Committee (MAC) or the Accounting Accreditation Committee (AAC).

Two members of the committee will serve as a liaison and a reader between the visit team and the committee. The liaison's role is to lead discussions concerning the institution at accreditation meetings. Prior to the committee meetings, the liaison and reader thoroughly review the reports, recommendation and any responses from the institution. The liaison maintains contact with the team chair during the visit process. The reader serves as a back-up should the liaison not be available for the committee meetings. The liaison and reader may determine situations that require additional information exchange.

The appropriate accreditation committee, either MAC or AAC, will normally review the team visit report and any response from the applicant at its next scheduled meeting. The following are recommendations the committee will review:

Peer Review Team Recommendation

- Concur with the team recommendation
- Remand the team's recommendation
 - The committee may remand the recommendation to the team for information, clarification, or similar reconsideration when an apparent inconsistency is noted
 - A conference call is convened with the committee chair, liaison, reader, Peer Review Team members, and AACSB International staff
 - The members of the conference call clarify information and agreement is reached on the recommendation
 - The committee concurs with the recommendation or refers the case to a panel
 1. Panel consists of two members from the accreditation committee and two members from the Peer Review Team
 2. Panel must reach agreement on recommendation
 - ◆ Panel decision to extend accreditation or suspend accreditation is forwarded to the Board of Directors for ratification consideration
 - ◆ Panel decision for a sixth year review (when the panel consideration is between extending accreditation and a sixth year review) or continuing review (when the panel consideration is between extending accreditation and continuing review) becomes the decision

Sixth Year Review Team Recommendation

- Process is the same as noted above for Peer Review Team Recommendation
- Successful completion of the review in the sixth year earns the institution a six-year extension of its accreditation with the original review year as the start year and the next scheduled maintenance review to take place in year five; i.e., the five year review cycle

- remains constant. For example, if the applicant is reviewed in year 2005-06, the next review will be in year 2010-11 irrespective of whether a sixth year review is required.
- If successful completion is not achieved in the sixth year, the Sixth Year Review Team will recommend continuing review of maintenance of accreditation for up to two additional years.

Continuing Review Team Recommendation

- Process is the same as noted above for Peer Review Team Recommendation
- Successful completion of the continuing review earns the institution a six-year extension of its accreditation with the original review year as the start year and the next scheduled maintenance review to take place in year five; i.e., the five-year review cycle remains constant. For example, if the applicant is reviewed in year 2005-06, the next review will be in year 2010-11 irrespective of whether a sixth year review and continuing review is required.
- If successful completion is not achieved in the second year of continuing review, the Continuing Review Team will recommend suspension of accreditation.
 - Recommendation for suspension will initiate an invitation to the applicant to present its case for extension of accreditation at the next accreditation committee meeting.
 - When the institution is suspended, the member is removed from the Accreditation Council and the listing of accredited institutions.
 - Suspension requires Board of Directors ratification.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

- Ratifies recommendation for extension or suspension of accreditation.
- Remands the recommendation to the appropriate accreditation committee with specific conditions.

APPLICANT

- The institution may withdraw its application for maintenance of accreditation any time prior to consideration by the Board of Directors. In the case of an accredited school in the maintenance of accreditation process, withdrawal from the process is also a withdrawal from the Accreditation Council.
- As to a suspension decision, the institution may submit an appeal to the Chair of the Board of AACSB International. An Appeal Panel will be formed to hear the appeal and make a judgment. The decision of the Appeal Panel is final.
- When the institution is suspended, the member is removed from the Accreditation Council and the listing of accredited institutions.

MAINTENANCE OF ACCREDITATION TIMELINE

YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and Refine Strategic Management Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and Refine Strategic Management Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and Refine Strategic Management Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and Refine Strategic Management Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and Refine Strategic Management Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare Annual Maintenance Report for prior academic year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare Annual Maintenance Report for prior academic year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare Annual Maintenance Report for prior academic year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare Annual Maintenance Report for prior academic year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare Annual Maintenance Report for prior academic year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Key Data and Accreditation Data Sections of the <i>Business School Questionnaire</i> for prior academic year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Key Data and Accreditation Data Sections of the <i>Business School Questionnaire</i> for prior academic year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Key Data and Accreditation Data Sections of the <i>Business School Questionnaire</i> for prior academic year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Key Data and Accreditation Data Sections of the <i>Business School Questionnaire</i> for prior academic year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Key Data and Accreditation Data Sections of the <i>Business School Questionnaire</i> for prior academic year
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit Maintenance Review Application with signed cover letter requesting maintenance review and preferred visit dates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation Coordinating Committee rules on exclusions and the scope of the accreditation visit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit Fifth Year Maintenance Report and the five year collection of Annual Maintenance Reports
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit List of Degree Programs including Catalogs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with AACSB to select Peer Review Team from peer and aspirant groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit Polices for Faculty Management, including Non-Tenure Track Faculty
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit request for exclusion of degree programs including justification for the request 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with AACSB to set the visit date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit Executive Summary including effective practices
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit List of Comparison Groups (Peer, Competitive, and Aspirant) <p><i>Previous four items to be submitted together.</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation Statistical Reports will be distributed to applicant and team members by AACSB International
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with Peer Review Team to prepare the Visit Schedule
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer Review Team Visit

EXAMPLES AND TEMPLATES

TEMPLATE 1: Cover Letter

(Cover letter for the application of business; a separate cover letter is required for the application of accounting)

Date

(Name of Chair)
(Appropriate Accreditation Committee)
AACSB International
777 South Harbour Island Boulevard, Suite 750
Tampa, Florida 33602
USA

Dear Chair (insert name):

On behalf of (Name of Institution), we are applying for a maintenance of accreditation review for the (undergraduate, master's, and doctoral) degree programs in business (or accounting) that we offer. We request a visit in (fall and year, or, winter and year).

Attached is

1. The list of the degree programs that we offer
2. (if applicable) Our request for exclusion of specific programs, along with our rationale for exclusion
3. The list of our Comparison Groups, including Comparable Peers, Competitive Group, and Aspirant Group

Thank you, (Name of Chair). We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

(signatures of: Chief Executive Officer, Chief Academic Officer, Dean(s), Accounting Administrator (if letter is for Accounting Accreditation))

encl:

TEMPLATE 2: Maintenance Review Application (Business Example)

Please send the requested information to the Maintenance of Accreditation Committee (MAC). The MAC will forward the information to the Accreditation Coordinating Committee (ACC) to rule on Eligibility Requirements for AACSB International Accreditation. (Please see *Eligibility Procedures and Standards for Business Accreditation, January 1, 2005* at <http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/business/AACSBSTANDARDS-Jan05-Final.pdf>) Please request the Accounting Maintenance Review Application when filing for accounting accreditation.

Name of Institution			
Name of Business Unit			
Mailing Address			Campus Box or Mail Code
City	State/Providence/Region	Postal Code	Country
Telephone Number (include country/city code or area code)	Fax Number (include country/city code or area code)		E-Mail Address
Name/Title of Business Unit Head			
Name/Title of Chief Executive Officer/President/Chancellor			
Name/Title of Provost/Academic Vice President			

- 1. Consistent with your mission and within your cultural context, describe how diversity in your business programs is demonstrated (see *Eligibility Procedures and Standards for Business Accreditation, January 1, 2005, Eligibility Procedures D*).**

- 2. Describe the established expectations of the institution or the business programs of the institution for ethical behavior by administrators, faculty, and students (see *Eligibility Procedures and Standards for Business Accreditation, January 1, 2005, Eligibility Procedures E*).**

3. List all business degree programs at all levels and in all locations offered through the business unit and non-business unit (see *Eligibility Procedures and Standards for Business Accreditation, January 1, 2005, Eligibility Procedures C and F*).

Note: Include catalogs, Web sites, or other material describing the degree programs.

Footnote those degree programs requested for exclusion and include justification for the requested exclusion. *Please complete the Request for Program Exclusion on the following page for each degree program footnoted in the table.*

Degree Programs	Location	Level: Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	Date program was established	# of courses required for degree completion	Program Length (# of academic terms)	Length of each academic term (# of weeks)	# of instructional hours for each course	# students graduated in		
								2002	2003	2004

Request for Program Exclusion

A separate copy of this form is required for each degree program for which exclusion from the AACSB International accreditation review is requested. Please complete every required section of the form (marked with an *), and as many of the optional sections as apply.

* Name of Institution:

* Name and Title of Person Completing Form

*Full Title and Descriptive Information for Program for which Exclusion is being Requested

Bases for exclusion:

To be excluded a program must satisfy the conditions of the first three categories below. Justification from additional categories may assist the Accreditation Coordinating Committee in its review of your request. Provide a brief, clear description of how the program satisfies all of the relevant categories. Descriptions of the category expectations can be found in the *Eligibility Procedures and Standards for Business Accreditation* of AACSB International (pages 4-7).

1. Independence -
2. Distinctiveness –
3. Autonomy –
4. Subject to non-business accreditation –
5. Specialized field –
6. Separate location –
7. Participate, but not named -

EXAMPLE: Visit Schedule

Prior to Visit:

Team Chair should prepare Section I of the Visit Report prior to arriving on-site and share it prior to the visit with the other team members. *Note: Section I.F of the Visit Report, Materials Reviewed, may need to be edited during the visit.*

Establishing a Visit Schedule - General Guidelines:

The team should tailor the schedule to address the specific needs of the accredited member applicant. In the absence of some specific need, focus the visit on the following three areas:

1. The strategic management process and how it produces the annual updates to the Maintenance Report.
2. Faculty management and development as seen through the eyes of the three classes of faculty (tenured senior faculty, probationary junior faculty, and non-tenure and part-time faculty).
3. Assurance of learning processes that the school has developed to use embedded measurements of achievement of learning objectives. This should include discussions with students.

Specific Guidelines:

Instead of all team members participating in each meeting during the Visit, some concurrent meetings may be scheduled. The team up may split up to cover more areas within the time given.

Allow time for the team to work alone and write the report.

Sunday , 5:00 p.m.	Peer Review Team meeting to discuss unresolved issues and review schedule.
6:30 p.m.	Dinner with the dean, associate dean, assistant deans, chair, etc.
Monday , 7:30 a.m.	Breakfast with selected group.
8:30 a.m.-9:30 a.m.	Meeting with the academic department chairs of finance, risk management, accounting and information systems, real estate, operations and information management, marketing, and management and human resources.
9:30 a.m.	Meeting with the Strategic Management Committees. Split team up to meet.
10:15 a.m.	BREAK
10:30 a.m.-12:00 p.m.	Meeting with various Committees and directors of programs. Split team up.
12:00 p.m.	Lunch with selected senior faculty.
1:00 p.m.	Meeting with selected junior faculty.
1:45 p.m.	Meeting with selected participating and supporting faculty.
2:30 p.m.	BREAK
2:45 p.m.-4:00 p.m.	Meeting with student representatives from undergraduate, MBA, MS, and doctoral programs/administrators, others. Split team up to meet.
4:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.	Team Meeting
5:00 p.m.-6:00 p.m.	Team Report Writing
6:00 p.m.-7:00 p.m.	Business Community Reception
7:00 p.m.-9:00 p.m.	Team Dinner - Alone
Tuesday , 8:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m.	Team meeting and breakfast; sharing of drafts of report sections; finalize recommendations and report writing.
10:30 a.m.	Meeting with dean to review findings and recommendations.
11:15 a.m.	Meeting with the chief executive and chief academic officers to review findings and recommendations.

TEMPLATE 3: Maintenance Review Visit Report

INSTITUTION
SCHOOL
(UNIT)

MAINTENANCE REVIEW VISIT REPORT

I. Definition of Scope

- A. Brief description of the school or accounting unit, including its size and the institutional setting:
- B. List of degree programs included in the review and the number of program graduates in the most recent year:

Name of Degree Program	Graduates

C. List of Comparison Groups

- 1. Comparable Peers:
- 2. Competitive Group:
- 3. Aspirant Group:

D. Maintenance Review Visit Schedule: List the persons and activities included in the on-site review

E. Visit Dates and Team Members: State on-site review dates and full team

F. Materials Reviewed: List of all materials provided by the applicant and reviewed by the Peer Review Team

II. Team Recommendation

The team recommendation reflects the opinion of the Peer Review Team only. It will be reviewed for concurrence or remanded to the team by the appropriate accreditation committee. The role of the accreditation committee is to ensure consistent application of the AACSB International accreditation standards and processes across peer review teams.

A. Based on the team recommendation, include only one of the following paragraphs:

Extend Accreditation Maintenance: The recommendation of the Peer Review Team is that the accreditation of the (undergraduate, master's, and doctoral) degree programs in business (and/or accounting) offered by (Name of Institution) be extended for an additional six years with a Maintenance Review to occur in year five. Concurrence by the accreditation committee and ratification by the Board of Directors are required prior to the confirmation of the accreditation decision. Following ratification by the Board of Directors, the applicant will be notified. The applicant must wait for this official notification before making any public announcement. AACSB International provides a list of applicants achieving accreditation to its members and the public. ***Please include a description of how overall high quality is achieved in relation to accreditation standards as a whole, not individually.***

Sixth Year Review: The recommendation of the Peer Review Team is that the maintenance of accreditation review of the (undergraduate, master's, and doctoral) degree programs in business (and/or accounting) offered by (Name of Institution) be continued for an additional year. The educational quality issues relating to the accreditation standards and expectations for resolution are listed below. Concurrence by the accreditation committee is required prior to official notification. During the sixth year review, the accredited status of the applicant does not change. ***The following table should be included with the Sixth Year Review recommendation.***

Standard	Reporting expectation	Accomplishment expectation

For each listed standard, provide a brief description of the findings leading to the concerns and any suggestions for improvement.

B. Subsequent Review of Team Recommendation

The accreditation committee will review this report, and any response from the applicant, at its next scheduled meeting (normally, provided that the report is received at least three weeks in advance of the meeting). The committee will meet [AACSB International will provide these dates at the beginning of each year].

The Board of Directors will consider for ratification the team recommendations (maintenance of accreditation and suspension of accreditation) that have concurrence from the appropriate accreditation committee, as soon as possible after the accreditation committee concurrence.

III. Effective Practices: List up to five exceptionally effective practices that demonstrate leadership and high quality continuous improvement in management or accounting education, particularly relative to the set of comparison groups.

TEMPLATE 4: Consultative Report

INSTITUTION

MAINTENANCE OF ACCREDITATION VISIT CONSULTATIVE REPORT

Date of Review:

Peer Review Team Members:

The following items are offered in the spirit of consultative suggestions for improvement. They are **not** related to AACSB International accreditation standards or the accreditation recommendation.

TEMPLATE 5: Sixth Year Review Team Report

INSTITUTION
SCHOOL
(UNIT)

SIXTH YEAR REVIEW TEAM REPORT

I. Team Recommendation

The team recommendation reflects the opinion of the Sixth Year Review Team only. It will be reviewed for concurrence or remanded to the team by the appropriate accreditation committee. The role of the accreditation committee is to ensure consistent application of the AACSB International accreditation standards and processes across Peer Review Teams.

A. Based on the team recommendation, include only one of the following paragraphs:

Extend Accreditation Maintenance: The recommendation of the Sixth Year Review Team is that the accreditation of the (undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral) degree programs in business (and/or accounting) offered by (Name of Institution) be extended for an additional six years with the original academic review year as the start year and the next scheduled maintenance review to take place in year five; i.e., the five year review cycle remains constant. Concurrence by the accreditation committee and ratification by the Board of Directors are required prior to the confirmation of the accreditation decision. Following ratification by the Board of Directors, the applicant will be notified. The applicant must wait for this official notification before making any public announcement. AACSB International provides a list of applicants achieving accreditation to its members and the public. ***Please include a description of how each educational quality issue relating to the accreditation standards was satisfactorily resolved.***

Standard	Reporting expectation	Accomplishment expectation	Resolution

Continuing Review: The recommendation of the Sixth Year Review Team is that the maintenance of accreditation review of the (undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral) degree programs in business (and/or accounting) offered by (Name of Institution) be continued for up to two additional years. The educational quality issues relating to the accreditation standards and expectations for resolution are listed below. Concurrence by the accreditation committee is required prior to official notification. **Continuing review does not require ratification by the Board of Directors because continuing review does not change the accredited status of the member.** Members participating in these on-going reviews are not announced or communicated by AACSB International to its members or the public.

The following table should be included with the Continuing Review recommendation.

Standard	Reporting expectation	Accomplishment expectation

For each listed standard, provide a brief description of the findings leading to the concerns and any suggestions for improvement.

B. Subsequent Review of Team Recommendation

The accreditation committee normally will review this report, and any response from the applicant, at its next scheduled meeting. The committee will meet [AACSB International will provide these dates at the beginning of each year].

The Board of Directors will consider for ratification the team recommendations (maintenance of accreditation or suspension of accreditation) that have concurrence from the appropriate accreditation committee, as soon as possible after the accreditation committee concurrence.

- II. (Optional) Effective Practices: Updated description of up to five exceptionally effective practices that demonstrate leadership and high quality continuous improvement in management or accounting education, particularly relative to the set of comparison groups.

TEMPLATE 6: Continuing Review Team Report

INSTITUTION
SCHOOL
(UNIT)

CONTINUING REVIEW TEAM REPORT

I. Team Recommendation

The team recommendation reflects the opinion of the Continuing Review Team only. It will be reviewed for concurrence or remanded to the team by the appropriate accreditation committee. The role of the accreditation committee is to ensure consistent application of the AACSB International accreditation standards and processes across Peer Review Teams.

A. Based on the team recommendation, include only one of the following paragraphs:

Extend Accreditation Maintenance: The recommendation of the Continuing Review Team is that the accreditation of the (undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral) degree programs in business (and/or accounting) offered by (Name of Institution) be extended for an additional six years with the original academic review year as the start year and the next scheduled maintenance review to take place in year five; i.e., the five year review cycle remains constant. Concurrence by the accreditation committee and ratification by the Board of Directors are required prior to the confirmation of the accreditation decision. Following ratification by the Board of Directors, the applicant will be notified. The applicant must wait for this official notification before making any public announcement. AACSB International provides a list of applicants achieving accreditation to its members and the public. ***Please include a description of how each educational quality issue relating to the accreditation standards was satisfactorily resolved.***

Standard	Reporting expectation	Accomplishment expectation	Resolution

Suspension: The recommendation of the Continuing Review Team is that the accreditation of the (undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral) degree programs in business (and/or accounting) offered by (Name of Institution) be suspended. The educational quality issues that have **not been satisfactorily addressed**, as related to the accreditation standards, are listed below.

Standard	Reporting expectation	Accomplishment expectation

B. Subsequent Review of Team Recommendation

The accreditation committee will review this report, and any response from the applicant, at its next scheduled meeting. The Committee will meet [AACSB International will provide these dates at the beginning of each year].

The Board of Directors will consider for ratification the team recommendations (maintenance of accreditation or suspension of accreditation) that have concurrence from the appropriate accreditation committee, as close to possible after the accreditation committee concurrence.

- II. (Optional) Effective Practices: Updated description of up to five exceptionally effective practices that demonstrate leadership and high quality continuous improvement in management or accounting education, particularly relative to the set of comparison groups.

**TABLE I (first example using student credit hours)
SUMMARY OF FACULTY SUFFICIENCY IN DISCIPLINE AND SCHOOL
(Re: Standard 9 – Using Student Credit Hours)**

Name ¹	Participating or Supporting (P or S)	Amount of teaching if P (blank if S) ²	Amount of teaching if S (blank if P) ²	
Accounting				
James Whitecloud	P	912 sch		
Terri Bunsen	S		432 sch	
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL ACCOUNTING		P_A	S_A	$P_A / (P_A + S_A)$ must be > 60%
Finance				
Karla Checkov	P	636 sch		
Hester Brighton	P	444 sch		
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL FINANCE		P_F	S_F	$P_F / (P_F + S_F)$ must be > 60%
“ “ “ “				
Operations Research				
Jean-Louis Pascal	S		210 sch	
Brett Ferstberg	P	942 sch		
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH		P_O	S_O	$P_O / (P_O + S_O)$ must be > 60%
OVERALL TOTAL FOR SCHOOL		P_T	S_T	$P_T / (P_T + S_T)$ 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 of 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, contact hours, individual courses, modules or other designation that is appropriately indicative of 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.

TABLE I (second example using contact hours)
SUMMARY OF FACULTY SUFFICIENCY IN DISCIPLINE AND SCHOOL
(Re: Standard 9 – Using Contact Hours)

Name ¹	Participating or Supporting (P or S)	Amount of teaching if P (blank if S) ²	Amount of teaching if S (blank if P) ²	
Accounting				
Jackie Emanon	P	3600 ch		
Yugi Ferrell	S		765 ch	
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL ACCOUNTING		P_A	S_A	$P_A / (P_A + S_A)$ must be > 60%
Finance				
Ben Dibbel	P	3420 ch		
Paco Estaves	P	1800 ch		
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL FINANCE		P_F	S_F	$P_F / (P_F + S_F)$ must be > 60%
“ “ “ “				
Operations Research				
Avril Printemps	S		5085 ch	
Trent Gordon	P	2385 ch		
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH		P_O	S_O	$P_O / (P_O + S_O)$ must be > 60%
OVERALL TOTAL FOR SCHOOL		P_T	S_T	$P_T / (P_T + S_T)$ 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 of 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, contact hours, individual courses, modules or other designation that is appropriately indicative of 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, “contact hours” (ch) is used as the metric.

TABLE I (third example using courses)
SUMMARY OF FACULTY SUFFICIENCY IN DISCIPLINE AND SCHOOL
(Re: Standard 9 – Using Courses)

Name ¹	Participating or Supporting (P or S)	Amount of teaching if P (blank if S) ²	Amount of teaching if S (blank if P) ²	
Accounting				
Erik Satire	P	3 co		
Marie Alphonse	S		2 co	
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL ACCOUNTING		P_A	S_A	$P_A / (P_A + S_A)$ must be > 60%
Finance				
Diana Festschrift	P	3 co		
William Brownstone	P	3 co		
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL FINANCE		P_F	S_F	$P_F / (P_F + S_F)$ must be > 60%
“ “ “ “				
Operations Research				
Astrid Fibster	S		1 co	
Jerome Neustein	P	3 co		
“ “ “ “				
TOTAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH		P_O	S_O	$P_O / (P_O + S_O)$ must be > 60%
OVERALL TOTAL FOR SCHOOL		P_T	S_T	$P_T / (P_T + S_T)$ 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 of 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, contact hours, individual courses, modules or other designation that is appropriately indicative of 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, “courses” (co) is used as the metric.

TABLE II: SUMMARY OF FACULTY QUALIFICATION, INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES (Re: Standards 2, 9, & 10)¹

Name ²	Highest Earned Degree & Year	Date of First Appointment to School	Percent of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission ³	Acad Qual ⁴	Prof Qual ⁴	Other ⁴	Number of Contributions during the last five years						Normal Professional Responsibilities ⁶
							Learning & Pedagogical Scholarship ⁵		Discipline-Based Scholarship ⁵		Contributions to Practice ⁵		
							PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC	

- 1 Information in this table, supplemented by information in individual faculty members' vitae, is useful in making judgments relative to:
 - Standard 2: The pattern of types of intellectual contributions will indicate whether intellectual contributions support the mission of the school.
 - Standard 9: The listed faculty qualifications will assist the judgment of whether "Students in all programs, majors, areas of emphasis, and locations have the opportunity to receive instruction from appropriately qualified faculty."
 - Standard 10: The table as a whole will assist the judgment of whether "The faculty has, and maintains, intellectual qualification and current expertise to accomplish the mission...."
- 2 Faculty should be listed alphabetically by discipline. 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.
- 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, professionally qualified, both academically and professionally qualified, 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 definitions for academically and/or professionally qualified.
- 5 The number of intellectual contributions should be listed in these columns. The peer reviewed journal columns marked "PRJ" should enumerate all of those intellectual contributions that have appeared in journal article form reviewed by academic and practitioner colleagues. The other intellectual contributions columns marked "OIC" should enumerate all other intellectual contributions regardless of the form of the contributions, including (but not limited to) research monographs, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, textbooks, proceedings from scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic or professional meetings, publicly available research working papers, papers presented at faculty research seminars, publications in trade journals, in-house journals, book reviews, written cases with instructional materials, instructional software, and other publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new curricula or courses. Intellectual contributions must be publicly available, i.e., proprietary and confidential research and consulting reports do not qualify as intellectual contributions.
- 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.

**TABLE IIA. CALCULATIONS RELATIVE TO DEPLOYMENT OF QUALIFIED FACULTY
(Re: Standard 10)¹**

NAME	QUALIFICATION (ACADEMIC-AQ, PROFESSIONAL-PQ OTHER-O) (FROM TABLE II)	AQ FACULTY- % OF TIME DEVOTED TO MISSION (FROM TABLE II)	PQ FACULTY- % OF TIME DEVOTED TO MISSION (FROM TABLE II)	OTHER ² FACULTY- % OF TIME DEVOTED TO MISSION (FROM TABLE II)	QUALIFICATION RATIOS PER STD 10
Accounting					
James Whitehead	AQ	100			
Terri Brunsen	PQ		100		
John Smith	O			50	
TOTAL ACCOUNTING		AQ _A	PQ _A	O _A	$AQ_A/(PQ_A+AQ_A+O_A) \geq 50\%$ $(AQ_A+PQ_A)/(AQ_A+PQ_A+O_A) \geq 90\%$
<i>(Repeat for each academic program, major, area of emphasis, and location)</i>					
TOTAL FOR SCHOOL		AQ _T	PQ _T	O _T	$AQ_T/(AQ_T+PQ_T+O_T) \geq 50\%$ $(AQ_T+PQ_T)/(AQ_T+PQ_T+O_T) \geq 90\%$

NOTES: Table IIA addresses the ratios described in Standard 10 regarding deployment of academically and professionally qualified faculty. It should be developed for the Peer Review Team to confirm that qualified faculty resources are distributed across each academic program, major, area of emphasis, and location (Standard 9). The objective thresholds increase for graduate programs. Standard 10 ratios are not intended to be static metrics but are intended to set minimums thresholds for deployment of qualified faculty consistent with mission. A mission that includes graduate programs should result in higher levels of coverage than the minimums established in Standard 10.

1. The metric used is the “percent of time devoted to mission” as derived from Table II.
2. The “Other” category should be used for those individuals holding a faculty title but whose qualifications do not meet the definitions for academically or professionally qualified.

ACCREDITATION GUIDELINES

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

ACCREDITED MEMBER	CHAIR	MEMBER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review and Refine Strategic Management Plan and complete the Key Data and Accreditation Data Sections of the <i>Business School Questionnaire</i> each year ▪ Submit Maintenance Review Application with signed cover letter requesting maintenance review and preferred visit dates by July 1 two years prior to the scheduled year of the maintenance visit ▪ Submit list of peer and aspirant schools from which members might be drawn to serve on the Peer Review Team ▪ Prepare annual maintenance reports and submit the five-year collection to the Peer Review Team and AACSB International <i>no later than 60 days</i> prior to the maintenance visit ▪ Contact Chair to discuss process, visit schedule, appointment requirements and confirmation of the appropriate information to be reviewed during the visit ▪ Assist the Peer Review Team during the visit so that its work can be thorough, expeditious and completed with minimum disruption to the institution ▪ Submit the Maintenance Review Visit Assessment Report to AACSB International 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure team performs as a cohesive unit and conducts peer review in a professional manner ▪ Maintain peer review focus on assessing quality and continuous improvement in relation to host school's mission ▪ Serve as a knowledgeable resource on the accreditation standards and peer review process ▪ Understand the institution's and academic unit's mission and objectives ▪ Review thoroughly the Fifth Year Maintenance Report and five-year collection of annual maintenance reports ▪ Review the accreditation data reports in consultation with both the accredited member and team members ▪ Plan a comprehensive visit in consultation with the host dean/accounting administrator ▪ Determine how the established processes ascertain attainment of the mission and assure quality programs and continuous development and improvement ▪ Provide consultation that encourages and challenges the institution ▪ Make accreditation recommendation consistent with team report ▪ Provide team report <i>within 10 days of the visit</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understand the academic unit's mission, objectives and its degree programs ▪ Be fully informed about the accreditation standards and peer review process ▪ Provide clarification to the school on the philosophy and intent of the accreditation standards and their interpretation ▪ Ascertain that the established structure and processes of the accredited member assure continuous development and improvement ▪ Make accreditation recommendation consistent with team report ▪ Assist in preparing the team report ▪ Provide consultation when requested ▪ Maintain appropriate confidentiality throughout and following the process

SIXTH YEAR/CONTINUING REVIEW TEAM	ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE LIAISON	ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain peer review focus on assessing quality and continuous improvement in relation to accredited member's mission ▪ Serve as knowledgeable resource on the accreditation standards and peer review process ▪ Understand thoroughly the mission and objectives of the institution, school and programs ▪ Determine the facts from which accreditation assessment is based ▪ Analyze the accredited member's achievement of each specific accreditation standard cited in the original Peer Review Team Report based on the team's recommendation of facts ▪ Make an accreditation recommendation ▪ Provide consultation when requested ▪ Maintain appropriate confidentiality throughout and following the process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Serve as principal point contact and communication between the Accreditation Committee and the team ▪ Correspond with the team Chair to gain understanding of team visit and recommendation ▪ Lead the Accreditation Committee discussion on the team's accreditation recommendation and report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Manage the peer review and accreditation process consistent with the policies and procedures established by the Accreditation Council and Board of Directors ▪ Appoint Peer Review Team Chair and members upon receipt of peer and aspirant groups from accredited member's application ▪ Review the Peer Review Team's visit report(s) and accreditation recommendation and concur or remand the recommendation for reconsideration ▪ Transmit accreditation recommendation(s) to the Board of Directors ▪ Conduct peer review process evaluation session

CONFLICT OF INTEREST GUIDELINES

Persons should not serve as site visitors nor participate in deliberations and votes for a program if:

- They are employed in the competitive proximity of the reviewed institution.
- They have been appointees of, employees of, or paid consultants to the reviewed institution within the past ten years.
- They have graduated from the reviewed institution within the past ten years.
- They are engaged with the reviewed institution in a relationship that creates the appearance of a conflict of interest.

DISCLOSURE OF ACCREDITATION GUIDELINES

In response to inquiries from the public, AACSB International will disclose only whether a member is accredited or not accredited. Information regarding a member's progress in the initial accreditation process, or issues of concern for an accredited member on review is not made public by AACSB International.

Accredited institutions are encouraged to make their accreditation known in accordance with the practices shown at <http://www.aacsb.edu/members/nameref.asp>. An institution may make public information about its accredited status or any portion of a visit team's report. If only a portion of the team report or notice from AACSB International is made public, the member must indicate that the full report is available. If the portion made public presents a biased or distorted impression, AACSB International may disclose information to correct the distortion or inaccuracy.

Misrepresentation

The AACSB International bylaws include the following statement: "A condition to membership by educational institutions in the corporation shall be the use of accurate descriptions of programs or degrees offered. In addition, members are responsible for the accuracy of any data and information requested by the corporation. Any reference to membership or accreditation, institutional or otherwise, which implies AACSB International accreditation in business administration or accounting by institutions which have not achieved accreditation for those programs or levels is prohibited."

Members should only state the status of their school regarding accreditation. Members that are not accredited may state that they are working to achieve accreditation if they are officially engaged in the accreditation process. They must have an accreditation plan that has been approved by the Initial Accreditation Committee or the Accounting Accreditation Committee. They may not state or imply that they will achieve accreditation within a designated time period. Members that are not accredited should not state that their curriculum or other features conform to AACSB International accreditation standards.

A member school that is not accredited by AACSB International should not state its membership affiliation in proximity or in conjunction with statements of other accreditations. For example, a member should not state: "University "X" is accredited by the ABC association and is a member of AACSB International."

CODE OF CONDUCT

Mutual respect is expected in all dealings between members of the AACSB International Peer Review Team and representatives of the institution being reviewed. If team members or representatives of the institution, collectively or individually, encounter situations that might constitute unethical or compromising behavior, the incident should be reported to a member of the AACSB International accreditation staff.

Acceptance of participation in an accreditation review assignment implies agreement to conduct one's self throughout the review, including the visit, according to the highest standards of professional and moral integrity. The appearance of conflict of interest should be avoided in all circumstances.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF INSTITUTIONS WITH AACSB INTERNATIONAL ACCREDITATION

1. Maintain educational achievements appropriate to AACSB International accreditation standards and to the member's strategic mission.
 - Prepare annual reports (1)
 - Provide annual accreditation-related data (1)
 - Provide appropriate reports for five-year reviews (1)
 - Ensure that program quality is maintained and that all programs have continuous improvement efforts (1)
 - Ensure that programs promote and operate with integrity (3)
2. Represent AACSB International accreditation [accurately].
 - Maintain accurate institutional publicity regarding accreditation (2)
 - Make accurate representations regarding accreditation to students and prospective students (2)
 - Promote AACSB International accreditation in catalogs, web sites, and promotional materials (3)
3. Participate in the AACSB International accreditation review process.
 - Provide representatives to participate in peer review of other institutions (3)
 - Assist in the continuous improvement of AACSB International accreditation (3)
4. Represent degree and non-degree programs accurately, realistically and with integrity in all communications.
 - Identify educational learning goals realistically (1)
 - Describe the success of graduates accurately (3)
 - Develop and follow consistent practices that ensure integrity in the representation of information about programs and the institution (2)
 - Report program data and information accurately to external parties (3)

(1) This expectation is monitored through the accreditation review process.

(2) This expectation is a condition of membership.

(3) This expectation is presented for guidance.

COMPLAINT PROCEDURES

AACSB International is concerned with sustained quality and continual improvement of collegiate education for business administration and accounting. AACSB International will receive and review allegations filed by third parties (e.g., students, faculty members) who claim conduct by the member school contrary to AACSB International accreditation standards. Complaints should be submitted by email to AACSB International in care of the appropriate committee:

- For Maintenance of Accreditation: mac@aacsb.edu
- For Accounting Accreditation: aac@aacsb.edu

All complaints should (1) identify the specific accreditation standard(s) relevant to the complaint, (2) provide documentation that supports the complaint, and (3) identify the relationship of the complainant to the member school.

The Chief Accreditation Officer of AACSB International will ascertain whether the complaint satisfies these three requirements. When the requirements are met, s/he will forward the complaint to the Initial Accreditation Committee (IAC), Maintenance of Accreditation Committee (MAC), or the Accounting Accreditation Committee (AAC) as appropriate. The Chief Accreditation Officer will also forward a copy of the complaint and supporting materials to the member school.

For schools engaged in the initial accreditation process, special emphasis will be focused on the standards that the complaint alleges are not met. The member school will be asked to report on those standards in light of the allegations of the complaint. The Peer Review Team will pay particular attention to those standards in the context of the evidence presented in the complaint, in the school's Self-Evaluation Report, and in the school's response to the complaint. The Peer Review Team will report on its findings regarding the complaint and the involved standards as a part of the Visit Report.

For accredited schools, at the next scheduled maintenance review, special emphasis will be focused on the standards that the complaint alleges are not met. The member school will be asked to report on those standards in light of the allegations of the complaint. The Peer Review Team will pay particular attention to those standards in the context of the evidence presented in the complaint and the school's response, and the team will make a report on its findings regarding the complaint and the involved standards.

If, on receipt of the complaint, the Chief Accreditation Officer and the chair of the relevant committee believe the issue significantly jeopardizes students' educational experiences at an accredited institution the relevant committee will proceed with an immediate investigation, rather than awaiting the next scheduled maintenance review.

APPEAL PROCEDURES

An institution may appeal the following negative decisions only: (1) denial of initial accreditation, or (2) suspension of accredited status. The status of the institution will remain unchanged pending the outcome of the appeal.

The procedures for an appeal are:

1. An institution's request for an appeal hearing must be submitted to the AACSB International Chair of the Board within thirty (30) days of notification of the negative decision. The basis of appeal must be clearly stated and relate directly to AACSB International accreditation standards or process.
2. Upon receipt of the request for appeal, and within thirty (30) days of receipt of the appeal request, the AACSB International Chair of the Board (or designee) shall promptly provide the appellant institution with the names of three Accreditation Council member representatives willing to serve on an appeal panel, from which the appellant promptly shall remove two names.
3. The appellant institution shall concurrently provide AACSB International with three names of Accreditation Council member representatives willing to serve on the appeal panel within thirty (30) days of delivery of the appeal request, from which two names shall be promptly removed by AACSB International.
4. Within twenty-one (21) days of confirmation of their joint appointment, the two members thus chosen shall select a third member willing to serve on the appeal panel from the Accreditation Council or a non-educational AACSB International member representative.
5. For accounting accreditation appeals, Accreditation Council representatives shall include accounting program directors or faculty members from schools possessing accounting accreditation.
6. The appeal panel shall not include any members of the Peer Review Team, accreditation committees, or Board of Directors who participated in the process leading to the decision under appeal. Appeal panel members should possess knowledge of the respective accounting or business accreditation process which is subject to the appeal.
7. The three appeal panel members shall choose one of its members to serve as chair. The appeal panel chair shall determine the date of the hearing and shall notify all parties at least thirty (30) days in advance of the hearing. The hearing shall be an open proceeding unless the appellant institution requests that it be closed. The hearing date shall be within six (6) months of notification of the negative decision and will take place at the AACSB International headquarters location..
8. AACSB International shall provide each panel member and all participating parties with copies of all correspondence, reports, and other materials relating to the decision being appealed, along with a copy of the request for appeal.
9. All costs and expenses incurred by AACSB International in providing for the hearing, expenses of the hearing panel, and all other expenses (exclusive of legal fees, if any) in connection with the appeal shall be borne by the appellant institution. This includes the meeting costs and travel costs of

the appeal panel and AACSB International's and the host institution's staff and representatives at the hearing. A deposit for estimated expenses is required to be submitted by the appellant institution within thirty (30) days of receipt of the appeal request. Additional expenses or refunds of deposits will be reimbursed immediately following the hearing.

10. Either party or the hearing panel may request a transcript of the hearing. The request for a transcript must be sent to the panel chair at least twenty (20) days before the date of the hearing. Costs of the transcript will be shared equally by the appellant institution and AACSB International. Any legal fees incurred by AACSB International shall be paid by the corporation.
11. The hearing shall be conducted in an informal manner with procedures determined by the panel. The appellant institution and AACSB International shall have the right to appear before the panel, to present evidence, to cross-examine witnesses, to be represented by counsel, and to present oral argument, all within the limitations prescribed by the panel chair. The hearing shall normally proceed in the following order (clarifying questions may be raised at any stage):
 - Appellant institution presents its case
 - AACSB International presents rebuttal
 - Rebuttal by appellant, if desired
 - Summation by AACSB International
 - Summation by appellant institution
12. In reviewing the decision, the hearing panel shall focus primarily on the conditions that existed at the appellant institution prior to and at the time of the decision, not on changes in conditions since the decision or the appellant institution's plans for change. The decision shall be sustained by the hearing panel unless the appellant institution shows by clear and convincing evidence that the decision being appealed is erroneous or unreasonable. For a procedural or process error by AACSB International to constitute grounds for reversal, the appellant institution must show that it has been substantially prejudiced by such error.
13. The appeal panel must either reverse or sustain the decision being appealed. If the appeal panel fails to reverse the decision by a majority vote, the decision is sustained.
14. The appeal panel decision shall be in writing and shall include a brief statement of the grounds for the decision. The decision shall be promptly submitted to the appellant institution and AACSB International within thirty (30) days of the hearing.
15. The decision of the appeal panel shall be final.
16. All parties to the appeal process (including members of the hearing panel) are expected to adhere to the time schedule stated in the steps of the Appeal Procedure. All parties should be notified immediately if the time schedule will be violated, and the reason for failure to keep the schedule should be made clear. Delinquency of more than fifteen (15) days on the part of the institution shall be grounds for the panel to declare the appeal withdrawn. Delinquency of more than fifteen (15) days on the part of AACSB International shall be grounds for the panel to declare the appeal upheld.