



Deploying Academically Qualified Faculty: An Interpretation of AACSB Standards



An AACSB White Paper issued by:

**AACSB International Accreditation
Coordinating Committee
AACSB International Accreditation
Quality Committee**

November 2006

Updated September 2010

DEPLOYING ACADEMICALLY QUALIFIED FACULTY: AN INTERPRETATION OF AACSB ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

Purpose

This document provides guidance consistent with the spirit and intent of AACSB Accreditation Standards on the use and deployment of “academically qualified” (AQ) faculty. It is based on experiences of peer review teams, feedback from accreditation committees, and significant discussions at AACSB Conferences and Seminars. This document should not be viewed as a change to the standards, but it is intended to facilitate additional dialogue on the deployment of AQ faculty consistent with the spirit and intent of the standards as adopted in 2003.

Background

The concept of AQ faculty was first introduced in the 1991 standards and has generated significant discussion. Current AACSB Accreditation Standards provide significant content related to AQ faculty; however, some additional perspectives on current issues and practices is in order to further the understanding of the role of AQ faculty and their importance to accredited business schools and accounting programs.

Philosophically, AACSB’s concept for faculty resources can be characterized as a “portfolio” approach. That is, depending on the mission of the business school or accounting program, faculty resources (AQ, Professionally Qualified (PQ), or Other) should be deployed in sufficient numbers and with appropriate qualifications to support “overall high quality” in all academic programs. The programs that are offered and faculty that are deployed should result from strategic decisions made within the business school. AACSB Accreditation Standards do not prescribe a “one size fits all” approach to faculty resources, but the standards do establish a minimum floor for AQ faculty resources which is discussed in the next section.

The preamble to current AACSB Accreditation Standards states that “academic quality is created by the educational standards implemented by individual faculty members in interactions with students.” The central tenet of the standards remains that all faculty, AQ, PQ and other, are necessary to support high quality academic programs, continuous improvement, and high quality graduates. These outcomes are delivered by faculty members that:

- are experts in the subject matter of their teaching and research fields;
- are experts in the educational process and the theory of learning; and
- are active scholars through their research and other development activities that support the maintenance of their intellectual capital in the teaching field.

This document builds on these principles, focusing on the concept of AQ faculty. It begins with a review of Standard 10, related standards, and interpretive materials on the deployment of AQ faculty. A framework to guide the development and maintenance of intellectual capital of AQ faculty is then presented. Next, the paper draws from the experiences of AACSB peer reviews, discussions from AACSB Conferences and Seminars, as well as other feedback to develop a specific set of key clarifications related to classifying and deploying AQ faculty. Finally, Appendix 1 provides responses to frequently asked questions about AQ faculty. This paper in combination with a companion paper entitled “Deploying Professionally Qualified Faculty: An Interpretation of AACSB Standards” is designed to advance discussions on the expectations of faculty as outlined in the AACSB Accreditation Standards and to assist schools in understanding expectations related to faculty deployment.

Current AACSB Accreditation Standards Related to AQ Faculty

Recognizing the diversity of missions of business schools and accounting programs, AACSB Accreditation standards provide guidance to assist schools in producing academic programs that demonstrate “overall high quality” and support an environment of “continuous improvement.” Two standards provide objective guidance on faculty issues—Standard 9 on faculty sufficiency, and Standard 10 on faculty qualifications. Both standards reinforce the central role of the faculty for the development of curricula, courses, and program delivery. Standard 10 focuses specifically on faculty qualifications (AQ and PQ) and will be the focus of the remainder of this document.

Standard 10 States:

The faculty, has, and maintains, intellectual qualifications and current expertise to accomplish the mission and to assure that this occurs, the school has a clearly defined process to evaluate individual faculty member’s contributions to the school’s mission...(AACSB, 2006)

The standards also recognize that faculty members designated AQ, PQ, or other can make appropriate contributions to the fulfillment of the school’s mission. The interpretive material places significant importance on the responsibility of **all** faculty members to maintain their intellectual capital to support the mission. The supporting material also states that obtaining and maintaining academic or professional qualifications is a function of both original academic preparation **and** subsequent activities that maintain or establish preparation for current teaching responsibilities.

Standard 10 outlines six “descriptions” of various forms of credentials and supporting experiences that would meet the expectations for AQ status. Table 1 summarizes the six descriptions and the expectation for each category in

accordance with Standard 10. When the individual faculty member's academic preparation is in a field different from the primary teaching field, the depth and intensity of the development activities that are necessary to gain AQ status as outlined in Table 1 should be greater.

In all cases, AQ faculty members are expected to maintain their intellectual capital in support of the mission of the business school and/or accounting program. Development activities may take several forms, but it is also important to recognize the role of AQ faculty in fulfilling the intellectual contributions expectations found in Business Standard 2 and Accounting Standards 31 and 35. Standard 2 states that the mission must include "the production of intellectual contributions that advance knowledge and practice of business and management." The interpretive materials go on to say that to meet this expectation, the faculty's "portfolio of intellectual contributions reflects the mission and includes contributions from a substantial cross-section of the faculty in each discipline." Given the academic preparation of AQ faculty, it is appropriate to assume that to meet this expectation as outlined in Standard 2 (and Accounting Standard 31 and 35), the AQ faculty is expected to provide the leadership in producing the intellectual contribution that support this aspect of the business school or accounting program's mission. However, this in no way should diminish the role PQ faculty members can play in producing intellectual contributions as well.

Standard 10 requires that "the academically qualified portion of the faculty...should not fall below 50 percent of the total faculty resources for schools with undergraduate programs only." The standard also acknowledges that the percentage of AQ faculty required varies based on a school's mission. The interpretive materials supporting Standard 10 states, "...the percentage of academically qualified faculty resources required for a school with graduate programs should exceed the percentage for schools with no graduate programs." Guidance in Standard 10 also requires that "total faculty resources that are academically qualified or professionally qualified must constitute at least 90 percent of the total faculty resources."

Consistent with the above requirements, business school and accounting programs can have up to 10 percent of its faculty resources classified as "other", neither AQ nor PQ. As a school's mission requires more graduate programs, the percentage of total faculty resources that are PQ faculty should decline with a corresponding increase in the deployment of AQ faculty. However, as noted later in this paper, the goal is not to have 100 percent of the faculty to be AQ recognizing there is an appropriate role for a faculty compliment that is PQ, but the level of deployment of PQ faculty will vary with mission and programs offered.

Standard 10 also requires that schools provide "information on academic and professional qualifications for each faculty member". In all cases, programs need clear criteria and additional guidelines to:

Table 1: Summary of Descriptions of Academically Qualified Faculty per AACSB Accreditation Standard 10

NO.	ACADEMIC DEGREE	RELATIONSHIP TO TEACHING FIELD	EXPECTATIONS FOR SUSTAINING AQ STATUS	LIMITATIONS ON DEPLOYMENT AS AQ FACULTY	RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER STANDARDS
1	Doctoral degree: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a business field, and • In area of primary teaching responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctorate <u>directly</u> relates to teaching field • Development activities <u>directly</u> relate to teaching field 	Development activities directly related to area of teaching to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual contributions • Participation in professional or academic meetings • Consulting • Other professional development activities 	None	Standard 2: AQ faculty must play a significant role in meeting expectation for intellectual contributions Standard 11: School must have appropriate policies for recruitment, hiring, deploying, mentoring, evaluating, and rewarding faculty consistent with its mission
2	Doctoral degree: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a business field, but • <u>NOT</u> in area of primary teaching responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctorate <u>indirectly</u> relates to teaching field • Development activities <u>directly</u> relate to teaching field 	Development activities that demonstrate active involvement in area of teaching to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual contributions • Participation in professional or academic meetings • Consulting • Other professional development activities 	None	Standard 2: AQ faculty must play a significant role in meeting expectation for intellectual contributions Standard 11: School must have appropriate policies for recruitment, hiring, deploying, mentoring, evaluating, and rewarding faculty consistent with its mission

NO.	ACADEMIC DEGREE	RELATIONSHIP TO TEACHING FIELD	EXPECTATIONS FOR SUSTAINING AQ STATUS	LIMITATIONS ON DEPLOYMENT AS AQ FACULTY	RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER STANDARDS
3	Doctoral degree: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside of business, but • Area of academic preparation incorporates teaching responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctorate outside of business field, but • Doctorate <u>directly</u> relates to teaching field • Development activities <u>directly</u> relate to teaching field 	Development activities that demonstrate active involvement in area of teaching to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual contributions • Participation in professional or academic meetings • Consulting • Other professional development activities 	None	Standard 2: AQ faculty must play a significant role in meeting expectation for intellectual contributions Standard 11: School must have appropriate policies for recruitment, hiring, deploying, mentoring, evaluating, and rewarding faculty consistent with its mission. An example would be a faculty member with a doctorate in industrial/organizational psychology who teaches organizational behavior.
4	Doctoral degree: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside of business, and • Primary teaching responsibilities <u>DO NOT</u> incorporate area of academic preparation 	<u>Not AQ without:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional coursework in teaching field, and/or • Development activities <u>directly</u> supporting the teaching field 	Development activities that demonstrate active involvement in area of teaching to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual contributions • Participation in professional or academic meetings • Consulting • Other professional development activities • Burden of proof is on the school to make its case 	None	Standard 2: AQ faculty must play a significant role in meeting expectation for intellectual contributions Standard 11: School must have appropriate policies for recruitment, hiring, deploying, mentoring, evaluating, and rewarding faculty consistent with its mission

NO.	ACADEMIC DEGREE	RELATIONSHIP TO TEACHING FIELD	EXPECTATIONS FOR SUSTAINING AQ STATUS	LIMITATIONS ON DEPLOYMENT AS AQ FACULTY	RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER STANDARDS
5	Specialized graduate degree in taxation	Graduate degree: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In taxation, or • Combination of graduate degree in law and accounting focused on taxation • Development activities <u>directly</u> support teaching field 	A specialized resource to support taxation programs. Development activities that demonstrate active involvement in area of teaching to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual contributions • Participation in professional meetings • Consulting • Other professional development activities 	Applies to taxation programs only	Standard 2: AQ faculty must play a significant role in meeting expectation for intellectual contributions Standard 11: School must have appropriate policies for recruitment, hiring, deploying, mentoring, evaluating, and rewarding faculty consistent with its mission
6a	<u>NO</u> research doctorate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial coursework in field of primary teaching responsibilities beyond masters degree in business doctoral program or currently enrolled in business doctoral program 	Graduate coursework in research doctoral program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Directly</u> linked to teaching field • Development activities <u>directly</u> relate to teaching field 	Development activities including current graduate coursework and other development activities in the area of teaching to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual contributions • Participation in professional meetings • Consulting • Other professional development activities 	Deployment is limited to 10% of Total faculty resources	Standard 2: AQ faculty must play a significant role in meeting expectation for intellectual contributions Standard 11: School must have appropriate policies for recruitment, hiring, deploying, mentoring, evaluating, and rewarding faculty consistent with its mission

NO.	ACADEMIC DEGREE	RELATIONSHIP TO TEACHING FIELD	EXPECTATIONS FOR SUSTAINING AQ STATUS	LIMITATIONS ON DEPLOYMENT AS AQ FACULTY	RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER STANDARDS
6b	<p>NO research doctorate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In “all but dissertation” stage or equivalent status in a research doctoral program or experience 	<p>Graduate coursework in research doctoral program and research program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Directly</u> relate to teaching field Development activities <u>directly</u> relate to teaching field 	<p>Development activities including current graduate coursework and other development activities in the area of teaching to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intellectual contributions Participation in professional meetings Consulting Other professional development activities 	<p>No limit on deployment but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status is granted for maximum of three years, and School must document timing and status 	<p>Standard 2: AQ faculty must play a significant role in meeting expectation for intellectual contributions Standard 11: School must have appropriate policies for recruitment, hiring, deploying, mentoring, evaluating, and rewarding faculty consistent with its mission</p>

- Determine AQ status at the time of hiring
- Determine performance expectations adequate to maintain AQ status

Schools may formally communicate expectations for AQ faculty through formal evaluation systems such as appointment, evaluation, tenure and promotion systems. However, schools may choose to have specific expectations related to accreditation that differ from expectations for appointment, evaluation, tenure and promotion. The key here is that the school must demonstrate that its criteria support the deployment of high quality faculty who support the mission of the business school or accounting program consistent with AACSB Accreditation Standards.

Evaluating and Documenting AQ Faculty Qualifications

Table 2 provides a comparison of AQ and PQ faculty in terms of intellectual capital development, intellectual capital maintenance and teaching preparation. For AQ status, a faculty member has typically devoted 2-5 years of focused, full-time or part-time learning at the doctoral level (often beyond a masters degree) to develop the appropriate intellectual capital to be an AQ faculty member. AACSB standard 10 outlines expectations regarding an AQ faculty member's responsibilities to maintain currency in his/her teaching field and poses the questions that schools must answer: "does the academic preparation and subsequent activities demonstrate currency and relevance in the field of teaching?"

Consistent with the philosophy noted in the previous paragraph, documentation of qualifications is critical. The 2006 revised interpretive materials supporting the Standards require schools to develop and implement appropriate criteria by which AQ and PQ status is granted and maintained. The criteria should be consistent with the school's mission and should address:

- The educational background, experience, and demonstrated work outcomes that are required to attain each status.
- The priority and value of different activity outcomes reflecting the mission and strategic management processes.
- Quality standards required of each activity and how quality is assured.
- The quantity and frequency of activities and outcomes expected within a typical AACSB review cycle to maintain each status.

TABLE 2: AQ AND PQ FACULTY PERSPECTIVES*

	Qualification	AQ	PQ
Intellectual Capital Development	Intellectual Contribution Sufficiency (Std. 2)	Intellectual Capital sufficient to conduct research and teach.	Intellectual Capital sufficient to teach and contribute to the school's mission which may include contributions to the research mission
	Academic Preparation (Std. 10)	Doctoral Degree, a highly specialized degree (accounting, marketing, etc.) and/or significant specialized coursework	Master's Degree in Teaching Area
	<i>And/or</i>		
	Professional Experience (Std.10)	Encouraged	Significant in duration and level of responsibility
Intellectual Capital Maintenance	On-going development to maintain status (Std. 10)	Intellectual contributions (Discipline-based scholarship, contributions to practice, and/or learning and pedagogical research) and/or other development activities	Continuous development activities that demonstrate maintenance of intellectual/professional capital which may include intellectual contributions
Teaching Preparation		Preparation for teaching responsibilities in higher education received from AACSB accredited institutions or other sources	Strongly encouraged

*Note: The concept of teaching should reflect the broad range of activities undertaken by a faculty member that includes classroom responsibilities, as well as activities such as career mentoring outside of the classroom, coordinating internships, student advising, directed study, etc.

The criteria should be periodically reviewed and subject to continuous improvement over time.

Clarification of AACSB's Position on AQ Faculty

In light of the discussion above and after consideration of experiences from AACSB reviews, feedback from accreditation committees, discussions from AACSB Conferences and Seminars, and other feedback on the use of AQ faculty, some summary perspectives for classifying and deploying AQ faculty are provided as follows:

- Both AQ and PQ faculty members are important contributors to the mission of AACSB schools and accounting programs.
- AQ faculty members must comprise at least 50 percent of total faculty resources for undergraduate-only programs. Normally, the percentage of total faculty resources that are AQ faculty should increase as graduate programs and other mission elements are included in the scope of the accreditation review.
- Normally, the academic preparation expected for AQ faculty members is a research doctorate (see Table 1 for descriptions of various options regarding academic preparation for AQ faculty) or the equivalent **and** sustained development activities to demonstrate currency in the faculty member's teaching field.
- A substantial cross-section of the faculty in each discipline, AQ and PQ, are expected to produce intellectual contributions in each discipline consistent with the mission; however, it is likely that AQ faculty will shoulder a significant level of the responsibility to produce intellectual contributions given the academic preparation for AQ positions. PQ faculty can make significant contributions to the research mission as well.
- The standards imply that a substantial cross-section of total faculty resources, AQ and PQ, must sustain their qualifications through intellectual contributions. This conclusion results from the intersection of Standard 2 and Standard 10 (and accounting standards 31 and 35). Some faculty members may maintain their intellectual capital through consulting and other professional development activities; however, the expectations of Standard 2 imply that a majority of the faculty resources should be qualified on the basis of their intellectual contributions.
- PQ status is not a default position for AQ faculty who fail to maintain their intellectual capital.
- AQ and PQ status may be lost if appropriate, continuous development activities are not undertaken. AQ and PQ status can be regained with an appropriate array of development activities.
- PQ faculty may undertake appropriate development activities to earn AQ status and vice versa.
- Faculty members may be PQ and AQ at the same time if they have the credentials and experience appropriate for each status. One does not substitute for the other.

- In limited cases, a faculty member may be AQ without a doctorate. This is addressed in the appendix.

These points form the basis for future dialogue on selection, deployment and development of AQ faculty.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This document expands discussion and clarification of AACSB standards that address deployment of AQ faculty. AACSB requirements for AQ faculty represent critical challenge that business schools must address in the accreditation process. Enhancing the discussions and understanding of AQ faculty is an important activity.

Appendix 1

Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Academically Qualified Faculty

This appendix provides a number of “frequently asked question” regarding the selection and deployment of AQ faculty. The questions and discussion presented reflect an interpretation based on experiences from AACSB Accreditation reviews, questions and discussions at accreditation conferences and seminars and observations of actual deployment of PQ and AQ faculty.

Is the optimum faculty mix 100% AQ and 0% PQ or other faculty?

No. Business schools with a significant discipline-based scholarship mission and graduate programs that train doctoral graduates for faculty positions at similar schools still benefit from deployment of some PQ faculty. Both AQ and PQ faculty have significant intellectual capital to contribute to the teaching and scholarship missions of business schools and accounting programs.

What mission factors influence the mix of AQ and PQ faculty?

The deployment of AQ faculty is directly linked to the school’s mission. There is no set formula to determine the appropriate AQ/PQ/Other faculty mix. Factors such as types of degree programs (undergraduate, graduate, executive, etc.), degree program size and scope (on-campus, off-campus, distance, traditional or non-traditional students etc.), and intellectual contribution mission focus can all impact the distribution.

Table 3 depicts how differences in selected mission characteristics might impact the proportion of a school’s faculty that should be AQ or PQ. Given the diversity of accredited business schools, it would be impossible to create a table that covered every possible mission combination. Instead, the uniqueness of missions and programs requires each school to determine and justify the mix of AQ/PQ/Other faculty that is appropriate to meet the spirit and intent of AACSB

Table 3: The Impact of Mission Characteristics on AQ-PQ Faculty Proportion: An Interpretation of the Intent of Standard 10		
Larger PQ Proportion	Moderate PQ Proportion	Smaller PQ Proportion
General Model of Degree Program Emphasis		
Undergraduate focused on professional preparation	Mix of undergraduate and graduate programs focus on professional preparation	Significant graduate program focus on preparing students for advanced degrees and academia
Impact of MBA/Masters		
No MBA/Masters Program	Medium to large MBA and/or Executive MBA Program with significant part-time student and practitioner focus	Large traditional student MBA/Specialized Masters Program
Impact of PhD Program		
No PhD Program	Small PhD Program placing students in teaching focused schools or industry	Large PhD program placing graduates in Research 1 schools
Impact of Executive Education Programs		
Significant faculty deployment to support executive programs	Moderate faculty deployment to support executive programs	No or only minimal faculty deployment to support executive programs
Impact of Scholarship Focus		
Scholarship focused on learning and pedagogical research or contributions to practice	Scholarship includes an equal priority on pedagogical & practice oriented research as well as disciplines based research	Scholarship focused on discipline based research

standards by insuring that “overall high quality” is delivered. Table 3 is a general guide to this process. AACSB Peer-Review Teams and Accreditation Committees must provide professional judgment in the accreditation review process to determine the appropriateness of an individual school’s determination.

Some variations and combinations in Table 2 could lead to a different mix of AQ/PQ faculty. For example, if the executive education program offered by a business school focuses on senior executives rather than middle managers, an argument could be made that such a focus would demand more AQ faculty who could provide more theoretical perspectives to senior executives while middle managers would benefit from a higher percentage of PQ faculty who could share real-life applications of management tools and concepts.

Another perspective on the mix of AQ and PQ faculty relates to the research mission. For a business school or accounting program with a mission that focuses on discipline-based research, the proportion of AQ faculty would be higher, such as what would be expected where doctoral degrees are offered. For a business school or accounting program where the research focus is “applied” or “contributions to practice” scholarship and activities emphasizing a strong connection to practice, the mix of AQ and PQ faculty may be more variable as long as the “substantial cross section” expectation is met. The same example could apply to a business school or accounting program whose mission emphasizes teaching. In such cases, where the output of intellectual contributions is expected to be in journals and other outlets that focus on “learning and pedagogical research,” the mix of AQ and PQ faculty may vary in such cases and still meet mission expectations and AACSB standards.

Each school must carefully evaluate its mission components and develop its faculty plan that best fits that mission.

Is there any consideration of relaxing AACSB standards regarding AQ/PQ faculty percentages?

The requirement that the AQ faculty must comprise at least 50% of total faculty resources has been consistently maintained in accreditation decisions relative to undergraduate-only programs. For any portfolio of degree programs, the burden of proof is on the business school or accounting program to make a case for its deployment of AQ/PQ faculty and how it meets the spirit and intent of AACSB Accreditation Standards to deliver “overall high quality.” A business school with graduate programs can make a case for the deployment of a higher percentage of PQ faculty members (and a corresponding lower percentage of AQ faculty) on the basis of quality. The burden of proof is on the school.

If the faculty member is AQ at the time of hiring, how long can this status be justified before the qualification is lost assuming no development activities are undertaken?

A new PhD is usually considered AQ for five years from the date the degree is granted without any additional development activities. The five years is derived from the AACSB Accreditation review cycles and has gained general acceptance. The same time period is appropriate for PQ faculty.

Can an AQ faculty member become PQ?

AACSB standards do not allow the "PQ" status to be a default status for AQ faculty members who fail to maintain their academic qualifications. In cases where an AQ faculty member has or attains the appropriate level of professional experience as that required to be PQ, they may be deemed PQ. Experience as a faculty member does not meet the test for PQ status unless part of that experience included extensive engagement with industry such as a consultant or a similar role of significant duration and level of responsibilities to warrant PQ status.

Can a PQ faculty member become AQ?

A PQ faculty member may gain AQ status with an appropriate level of educational experience consistent with earning a research doctorate in a field of business or a related one. That is, the faculty member would have to demonstrate the background consistent with what is expected of faculty members who hold academic qualifications as defined in the standard. Earning a doctorate is clearly an avenue to making this transition along with continuing development activities that sustain academic qualifications. A professionally oriented doctorate would not typically be sufficient. Again, the school must make its case that its faculty meets AQ expectations.

Can a PQ faculty member become academically qualified without a doctorate?

In some cases, a school may make a successful argument that a faculty member without a doctoral degree may be AQ. Such a case must be based on the faculty member having a sustained record of successful work consistent with what is expected for AQ faculty members. This record would probably include a sustained record of high quality research and publication in leading academic journals in the field, significant recognition and honors from the academic community, and academic engagement activities that would be consistent with an individual with academic credentials. Importantly, the activities that demonstrate AQ status should be consistent with the business school and accounting program mission. External recognition of the faculty member as a scholar would provide additional support for the AQ status. Publication in top

quality practitioner journals validates strong support for a faculty member's PQ qualifications but such publications typically will not provide support for their status as AQ.

What level and types of development activities are sufficient to sustain status as AQ? Do AQ faculty members have to produce intellectual contributions?

AACSB Standard 10 is clear on the following point:

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate activities that maintain the currency and relevancy of their instruction. Faculty members can maintain qualifications through a variety of efforts including the production of intellectual contributions, professional development, and current professional experience." (AACSB, 2006)

The interpretive materials note that the activities of a faculty member that sustain currency and maintain AQ or PQ status may change over his/her career. As noted above, the range is broad.

However, the intersection of Standard 2 is important in this context. Standard 2 states that intellectual contributions should be produced by a "substantial cross-section of the faculty in all disciplines consistent with the stated mission." Therefore, it is appropriate to expect that a substantial cross-section of the faculty (which could include AQ and PQ faculty) should be qualified on the basis of production of intellectual contributions consistent with the spirit and intent of standard 2.

Some AQ faculty may sustain qualifications by other activities including professional development programs, consulting, etc.; however, the majority of total faculty resources (this may include PQ faculty as well) are expected to be qualified on the basis of intellectual contributions. Therefore, in no case can faculty resources as a whole be considered AQ and meet the spirit of the standards on the basis of professional development and/or consulting activities alone. Logically, since the basic academic preparation for AQ status is normally a research doctorate, the AQ faculty is the most qualified to produce intellectual contributions.

The expectations of Standard 2 may also impact the responsibilities of PQ faculty members in regards to the activities that they must undertake to maintain their intellectual capital and currency. If schools deploy an increasingly larger percentage of PQ faculty that approaches the 40-50% range, it is likely that PQ faculty members will have to contribute intellectual contributions to satisfy the "substantial cross-section" expectation.

How should AQ status be documented for AACSB reviews?

AQ and PQ status are documented for AACSB Accreditation reviews with vitae on each faculty member regardless of the type of appointment (i.e., full-time, part-time, etc), title, or other characteristic. If a faculty member is supporting the mission of the business school or accounting program, an updated vitae is necessary to support the school's case for AQ or PQ status.

The information on individual faculty members is summarized in Table II and IIa in support of Standard 10 and 2 and the faculty vitae provide the detailed back up to these summary tables.

If AQ status is lost, how can it be regained?

AQ status may be lost if a faculty member does not continue to undertake appropriate development activities that sustain his/her intellectual capital and currency in the field of teaching. If AQ status is lost, a faculty member can undertake a development program to regain the status consistent with the expectations outlined in the school's criteria for maintaining AQ status. The burden of proof is on the school to document its case that a faculty member has successfully retooled and regained AQ status.

Standard 10 focuses attention on AQ, PQ, and Other faculty in "support of mission." Explain this concept and how can this be measured?

Standard 10 takes a broader look at total faculty resources than is found in Standard 9. Standard 9 focuses only on the teaching function in regards to the deployment of participating and supporting faculty. Standard 10 focuses on the deployment of qualified faculty in support of the entire business school or accounting program mission which includes the teaching function, but should also include other mission components including research and service/outreach. Therefore, the faculty documented for Standard 10 purposes will include faculty who may not have teaching responsibilities, but support the mission across the broadest range of roles and responsibilities. For example, the dean of the business school who does not teach should be reflected in the data for Standard 10 assuming he/she holds a faculty title as well. The same will apply to associate/assistant deans, department heads, and directors who do not teach but hold faculty title and contribute to the mission by their professional activities.

Standard 10 requires each faculty member to be reflected in terms of his/her "percent of time" devoted to the business school mission. For those faculty members including academic administrators who are full-time with the business school or accounting program, the percent of time devoted to mission is 100%. For part-time faculty or university-level administrators who may also serve the business school, a metric must be used consistently to reflect this percentage. A "full-time equivalent" status may be used if it is linked to a workload policy or

guidelines. Alternatively, a measure of percentage of hours per week devoted to mission may be used. Other metrics may be used as well. The metric should be selected and consistently used by the school in consultation with the peer review team.

Standard 10 discusses a “distribution” expectation for the deployment of qualified faculty, AQ and PQ, in each program, major, or area of emphasis and location. What does this mean?

The review process for achieving and maintaining AACSB International accreditation places high priority on the demonstration of “overall high quality” and a commitment to “continuous improvement” relative to the degree programs offered by the business school or accounting program as well in terms of support of the overall mission. Therefore, it is appropriate to expect that if a business school or accounting program offers a program, major, area of emphasis or programs in a variety of locations, these programmatic initiatives are consistent with mission. In each location, an appropriate compliment of faculty with appropriate AQ and PQ status should be deployed to support each of the degree programs. If such is not the case, “overall high quality” is in question. Therefore, business schools and accounting programs must pay attention to the deployment of qualified faculty across the spectrum of programs offered at all levels and at all locations. No program, major, area of emphasis, or location should be relegated to second-class status in regards to access to qualified faculty.

What type of teaching preparation is needed for AQ faculty? Does expertise in a topic area with no formal training in pedagogy qualify a person for AQ status?

AACSB Accreditation Standards do not specify that faculty members must have formal training in teaching pedagogy and techniques. Consistent with Standard 12, however, faculty members share the responsibility to “continuously improve instructional programs” and “innovate in instructional processes” (AACSB, 2006). Thus, faculty members must be prepared to meet these responsibilities.

Doctoral graduates from AACSB-accredited business schools should have teaching preparation as a requirement of the academic program as specified in Standard 21 (AACSB, 2006). Many faculty members in business schools or accounting programs hired before the current or prior standards were adopted, however, have little or no formal training in educational pedagogy, learning theory, and/or teaching techniques. In response, many universities have effectively implemented faculty development programs focused on teaching. This, however, remains a concern and business schools and accounting programs are encouraged to address the spirit and intent of Standard 12 with faculty development programs in teaching, learning theory, and pedagogical techniques.

Teaching preparation may also be a requirement of other accrediting or governmental organizations. The topic of teaching preparation deserves discussion within the context of expectations of faculty of accredited business schools.

Can a faculty member be AQ and PQ? If so, how is this individual counted?

Faculty members may be both AQ and PQ. In such cases, the faculty member would normally hold a doctorate and have an appropriate scholarly record consistent with the school's criteria for AQ status. At the same time, the faculty member may also have previous and/or current professional experience outside of the academic role that is of sufficient duration and level of responsibility to have PQ status. The experience and record of achievement must be consistent with each status and each must stand on its own supporting AQ or PQ status independent of the other experience. One does not substitute for the other. Additionally, a faculty member designated as AQ and PQ must continue an appropriate level of activities (intellectual contributions and contributions to practice) to maintain both qualifications.

If a faculty member is both AQ and PQ, the individual can only be counted once as AQ or PQ. Since AQ status is the most restrictive, it would seem that including the AQ status in any analysis of commitment to mission would be a first choice. But this is not required, and the individual may be listed as PQ by the business school or accounting program.

Does rank or title affect AQ status or academically qualified status?

Rank or title does not impact PQ or AQ status. Many schools use common terms as "assistant professor," "associate professor," or "professor," and many other titles are also found in business schools including "visiting scholar," "visiting professor," "lecturer," "instructor," and/or "clinical professor." These may have different meanings in different countries and/or regions of the world. Nevertheless, title and rank should have no affect on AQ or PQ status.

What must a school do to document how it defines AQ and PQ status in support of accreditation reviews?

In the January 2006 edition of the standards, explicit language is included in the interpretive materials for Standard 10 to require schools to develop and implement appropriate criteria for establishing and maintaining AQ and PQ status. Those criteria should be consistent with mission. AACSB staff will continue to identify best practices across all the standards and share these broadly at conferences, seminars, and other outlets. Standard 10 states the criteria for AQ/PQ status should address:

- The educational background, experience, and demonstrated work outcomes that are required to attain each status.
- The priority and value of different activity outcomes reflecting the mission and strategic management processes.
- Quality standards required of each activity and how quality is assured.
- The quantity and frequency of activities and outcomes expected within a typical AACSB review cycle to maintain each status.

Standardized presentations of the above information are most helpful to peer review team members in facilitating an efficient and effective review of supporting documentation such as faculty vitae.

What is the status of academic administrators (e.g., deans, associate deans, department chairs, etc.) in the context of AQ faculty members?

As was noted above, Standard 10 states the following:

Faculty members can maintain qualifications through a variety of efforts including the production of intellectual contributions, professional development, and current professional experience. The choice of activities to maintain currency and relevance may change at different times during a faculty member's career. (AACSB, 2006)

Therefore, it is appropriate that academic administrators can maintain their original status of AQ or PQ through appropriate development activities that may be more consistent with the current role in administration. It is up to the business school and/or accounting program, as they develop appropriate criteria to implement the spirit and intent of standard 10, to provide avenues for academic administrators to maintain AQ and/or PQ status. Without such avenues, the motivation to seek such positions is diminished significantly. Conversely, if avenues are identified for academic administrators to maintain qualifications, these individuals will have to demonstrate relevancy and currency as any other faculty member recognizing that the development activities may be somewhat different. Of course, many academic administrators continue to be active scholars, and, as such, are qualified on the same grounds as other faculty members will be on those grounds.

Clearly, an academic administrator may undertake many of the same developmental activities to sustain qualifications as other members of the faculty. As well, academic administrators may also participate in developmental activities that are purely administrative in focus and related to their leadership roles and responsibilities. Each business school or accounting program must decide if developmental activities that are administrative in focus meet the expectations for currency and relevance in support of the overall mission. In all cases, the developmental activities should be substantive and relevant to the role the individual plays in support of mission.

How should AQ faculty members who are sabbatical leaves be documented for AACSB review purposes?

Sabbatical leaves represent an important faculty development opportunity. AQ and PQ faculty members who are on sabbatical leaves during periods in which accreditation reports (e.g., Tables I, II, and IIa) on faculty must be filed should be identified since they are part of “total faculty resources.” Since faculty on sabbatical leaves do not normally teach, schools may include them or exclude them from Table I analyses for participating/supporting faculty and identify them as participating or supporting in accordance with their normal professional responsibilities in the business school or accounting program. For Table II and IIa purposes, faculty on sabbatical leave should be included in the analysis but clearly identified as on sabbatical leave either in a footnote or other materials that support the data included in the tables.

Must AACSB accredited business schools and accounting programs hire AQ faculty who have earned doctorates from other AACSB accredited programs?

AACSB standards do not restrict the hiring of AQ faculty to those individuals who have earned doctorates from AACSB-accredited institutions. The interpretive material supporting Standard 11 states:

The school should have an overall planning process regarding faculty resources. This process should include acquisition and allocation of faculty resources....” (AACSB, 2006)

An AACSB-accredited business school (and accounting programs) must have appropriate processes and policies to insure that the academic preparation and professional experience that a faculty candidate presents to the school is appropriate and verifiable. Secondly, the academic and professional credentials of the prospective faculty member must be appropriate for the professional responsibilities that will be assigned.

AACSB, through Standard 2, demands that accredited business schools and accounting programs commit to the advancement of knowledge in the fields of business and accounting in accordance with its mission. AQ faculty will normally take on major roles in research. Therefore, AQ faculty candidates must be evaluated in terms of their potential to be a teacher/scholar in terms of their ability to contribute appropriate intellectual contributions and be a successful classroom teacher. This burden is on the accredited business school or accounting program to document that it hires and develops faculty who can contribute to the full mission of the business school or accounting program including the production of intellectual contributions consistent with the mission of the school and the intent of Standard 2.

What is the implication for AACSB Accreditation for doctorates that are granted from programs with significantly different formats?

The program of study undertaken to earn a doctoral degree may be structured in a variety of formats around the world. The U.S. model of a doctoral program involving a 2-3 years of academic courses followed by the production of the dissertation is one model; however, there are programs where doctoral students largely go through an independent study period or pursue limited course work followed by a dissertation usually not working along side other students but individually with a faculty sponsor. In all cases, the work of the student is directed by one or more faculty mentors.

AACSB Accreditation does not require accredited business schools to hire faculty members who have earned doctorates from a specific type of program. What is expected is that an AACSB-accredited business school (and accounting programs) must have appropriate processes and policies to insure that the academic preparation and professional experience that a faculty candidate presents to the school is appropriate, verifiable, and prepare the faculty member for the responsibilities of an AQ teacher/scholar.

For AQ faculty who will normally take on major roles in teaching and research, it is very important that accredited business schools and accounting programs evaluate candidates' potential as teachers/scholars in terms of their ability to contribute appropriate intellectual contributions. For those AQ candidates that do not have doctorates from an AACSB-accredited business schools or accounting programs (or programs with equivalent accreditation), an appropriate benchmark for the background and preparation is that of a successful faculty member who earned the doctoral degree from an AACSB-accredited business school or accounting program (or an equivalent specialized accreditation). The burden of proof is on the accredited-business school or accounting program to document that its policies and procedures will lead to the recruitment, development, and deployment of appropriately qualified faculty resources.

What is the status of faculty members in the business school who teach traditional business communications classes?

First and foremost, all faculty members housed in the business school or accounting program, including faculty teaching business communications classes, should be accountable for normal, reoccurring faculty management and evaluation processes in accordance with the provisions of Standard 11. However, for Standard 9 and 10 purposes, business communication faculty **may** be excluded from these analyses to the extent they are teaching traditional business communications classes in writing and speaking. If these faculty members teach traditional business subjects (See footnote 2 under Eligibility Criteria C for a list of traditional business subjects), they would be included in

Standard 9 and 10 analyses to the extent of this teaching. Clear disclosure of the treatment of business communication faculty housed in the business school should be provided.

References:

AACSB, *Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation*, 2006.

Issued: November 2, 2006

Master Version 1