

Table 2: Summary of Proposed Changes to the Interpretive Materials Supporting Selected Standards (requires AQC approval only)

PROPOSED CHANGES	RATIONALE
<p>PREAMBLE: Three major paragraphs are added or revised to: (1) address the concept of “collegiate” as found in AACSB’s name within the context of accreditation expectations; (2) reinforce the importance of professional judgment in accreditation reviews focused on overall high quality and continuous improvement; and (3) reinforce the standards as broad guidelines that are adaptable on a global basis allowing for different interpretations and applications in different countries or regions of the world.</p>	<p>These additions reflect recommendations from the Strategic Directions Committee in regards to AACSB’s global strategy and the focus on the characteristics of “collegiate” business schools as a foundation for AACSB accreditation.</p>
<p>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA B (formerly “A”): Language is added to allow additional flexibility for schools to document their authority to grant degrees in business at the baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral level.</p>	<p>Based on AACSB’s experience in the international setting, “authority to grant degrees in business” can be derived from a number of sources some of which are not governmental. Some additional flexibility is deemed appropriate so as to not restrict institutional access to seek AACSB accreditation on a “form over substance” issue.</p>
<p>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA C (formerly “B”): Language is added to reflect the Preamble’s new material on “collegiate” as an important attribute of business schools seeking accreditation.</p>	<p>The additional language provides a clear link to the concept of “collegiate” as described in the Preamble and places the concept into the standards themselves.</p>
<p>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA D (formerly “C”): Language and processes are added to more clearly define the institution that is seeking AACSB accreditation. The language allows a business school to request a determination of the “institution” seeking accreditation. If the business school seeking accreditation wants an “institutional determination” that does not reflect a formal organizational chart, a process and documentation is outlined. Additional language is also added</p>	<p>Based on 5 years of experience, case law has clearly shown that the concept of what is an “institution” for accreditation purposes may, in some cases, not be clear. The new language maintains AACSB’s institutional accreditation focus, but allows business schools to seek a determination of the “institution” that is different from a formal organizational chart. Scope issues should also reflect national cultures and regulatory contexts. Sufficient case law has been developed</p>

<p>to allow scope decisions to reflect national cultural and regulatory contexts reflecting, that in some cases, scope of accreditation should not be defined in a U.S centric context. All examples of scope issues are deleted.</p>	<p>that the examples in the standard are no longer necessary and in some cases only confuse the issues of scope.</p>
<p>STANDARD 1: The interpretive material associated with the “mission appropriateness” section of Standard 2 (which is proposed to be blended with Standard 1) is now moved to support Standard 1. These materials include bulleted items under “Basis for Judgment” and “Guidance for Documentation.”</p>	<p>This change is concurrent with the consolidation of all mission related expectations into Standard 1 via the proposed change in Standard 1 consolidating the “mission appropriateness” material from Standard 2.</p>
<p>STANDARD 2: An introductory paragraph is added outlining the importance of research and scholarship for a business school. Bulleted items are added to the “Basis for Judgment” relative to expectations regarding the infrastructure supporting the production of intellectual contributions, the value of a school’s intellectual contributions, and expectations when the portfolio of intellectual contributions includes the work of visiting faculty who have primary appointments with other institutions. The “Guidance for Documentation” section has additional bullets directing schools to document their infrastructure, policies, and processes supporting the production of intellectual contributions. Tables 2-1 and 2-2 are introduced as optional means to summarize the 5-year summary of intellectual contributions and schools are asked to address the value of its intellectual contributions along with how the “substantial cross-section of faculty in each discipline” is achieved. The list of examples of intellectual contributions is expanded to recognize the possibility that non-peer reviewed work may be included as long as the school can provide substantive support for quality.</p>	<p>The revisions are consistent with the goal of making Standard 2 solely focused on intellectual contributions and their role in support of the mission of a business school seeking or holding AACSB accreditation. The change in Standard 2 and the interpretive changes reinforce the importance of high quality research and scholarship to business schools. These changes will also be reflected in the accounting standards as similar language is included supporting Standard 31.</p>
<p>STANDARD 3: Under the “Guidance for Documentation,” the school is asked to address how the student population the</p>	<p>The additional language adds clarity to the expectations.</p>

<p>school intends to serve is consistent with its mission.</p>	
<p>STANDARD 6: Under the “Basis for Judgment,” one bullet is added for schools to address how it supports and prepares students for success in degree programs. A second bullet addresses where the school does not control the admissions process, how it supports students for success as well as how the admission process is consistent with mission.</p>	<p>Case law reveals that schools have a wide range of admission processes, standards, and policies and, in some cases, admissions are not under the control of the institution or business school. In such cases, the school should document how it responds to ensure that students are provided the necessary support for success.</p>
<p>STANDARD 9: An introductory paragraph is added outlining the principles of faculty sufficiency and developing this concept in accordance with the statement on “collegiate” proposed for the Preamble. Under the “Basis for Judgment”, a bullet is added to state that “participating” faculty do not have to be full-time and that, normally, a faculty member cannot be participating at more than one institution. In the same section, two bullets are added regarding expectations when different faculty models are deployed to support teaching as well as when a school deploys a significant number of faculty who hold primary appointments with other institutions. Two of the three examples for Table 9-1 are deleted and different metrics are highlighted in the footnotes to the one example.</p>	<p>These changes reflect case law and experience with accreditation reviews which highlight different faculty models. These changes also apply to the accounting standards since Standard 9 is one of the business standards carried forward into the accounting standards document.</p>
<p>STANDARD 10: An introductory paragraph is added outlining the principles and importance of deploying a qualified faculty that sustains the currency and relevancy of its intellectual capacity through professional development activities. Under the “Basis for Judgment,” language is added to recognize variations in the deployment of qualified faculty across programs, disciplines, and locations and that in such cases, quality must be documented. Two bullets are added to address deployment of faculty who hold primary appointments with other institutions and for different levels of support for</p>	<p>Based on experience since 2003, different faculty models are often encountered. The standard does not preclude different approaches, but schools must document and make their case for quality when the faculty deployment model is unique. As important, Standard 10 is about qualifications which may be maintained with a variety of activities including intellectual contributions, professional development activities, professional experience, etc. The standard is clear on this, but the current Table 10-1 reinforces that only intellectual contributions are acceptable. This change in Standard 10 in</p>

<p>classroom instruction. Some minor changes are reflected in the attributes of criteria for determining academic or professional qualifications. Table 10-1 is modified to allow recognition of different activities to support academic and professional qualifications in accordance with language that is already in the standard. The clear linkage to Standard 2 in regards to intellectual contributions is removed but remains an option. For some of the categories of academically qualified faculty, language is added to clarify how an individual faculty without a research doctorate in the primary teaching field may be academically qualified.</p>	<p>no way weakens AACSB's focus on the importance of research and scholarship as schools have to demonstrate alignment with the expectations of Standard 2. These changes also apply to the accounting standards since Standard 10 is one of the business standards carried forward into the accounting standards document.</p>
<p>STANDARD 13: Under the 'Guidance for Documentation,' language is added requesting schools to document activities that support continuous improvement in teaching methods.</p>	<p>In the spirit of continuous improvement, classroom teaching should be an important area of focus.</p>
<p>INTRODUCTION TO ASSURANCE OF LEARNING STANDARDS-"EXAMPLES OF LEARNING GOALS AND MEASURES OF ACHIEVEMENT:" Clarifying language is added to several of the examples of assessment processes and measures indicating that remediation of students who do not do well on a particular assessment tool is optional, but not required as part of the outcomes assessment process.</p>	<p>This language is consistent with practice in the area of outcomes assessment.</p>
<p>STANARDS 15, 18, 19, and 21: Under "Guidance for Documentation" for each standard, schools are requested to address how the curriculum across the dimensions outlined in the respective standard demonstrates a global perspective.</p>	<p>This language is consistent with reinforcing the importance of global issues as an important component of all business curricula.</p>