

~~Adopted: April 8, 2013~~
~~Most Recent Update Date Last Revised: September 22, 2017~~

2013 Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation

Engagement ♦ Innovation ♦ Impact

**AACSB International – The Association
to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business**



Americas
777 S. Harbour Island Blvd
Suite 750
Tampa, FL 33602 USA
+1 813 769 6500

Asia Pacific
331 North Bridge Road
#10-04/05 Odeon Towers
Singapore 188720
+65 6592 5210

Europe, Middle East and
Africa
UP Building
Piet Heinkade 55
1019 GM Amsterdam, the
Netherlands
+31 20 509 1070

**Standards for Business Accreditation
Table of Contents**

Introduction to AACSB International Accreditation	1
Preamble: Engagement, Innovation, and Impact.....	2
Section 1: Eligibility Criteria for AACSB International Accreditation	5
Core Values and Guiding Principles	5
General Criteria.....	8
Section 2: Standards for Business Accreditation	15
Strategic Management and Innovation	15
Standard 1: Mission, Impact, Innovation.....	16
Standard 2: Intellectual Contributions, Impact, and Alignment with Mission.....	18
Standard 3: Financial Strategies and Allocation of Resources	24
Participants – Students, Faculty, and Professional Staff	26
Standard 4: Student Admissions, Progression, and Career Development	26
Standard 5: Faculty Sufficiency and Deployment	28
Standard 6: Faculty Management and Support	30
Standard 7: Professional Staff Sufficiency and Deployment.....	31
Learning and Teaching	32
Standard 8: Curricula Management and Assurance of Learning	32
Standard 9: Curriculum Content.....	34
Standard 10: Student-Faculty Interactions.....	37
Standard 11: Degree Program Educational Level, Structure, and Equivalence	37
Standard 12: Teaching Effectiveness	39
Academic and Professional Engagement	40
Standard 13: Student Academic and Professional Engagement	40
Standard 14: Executive Education	41
Standard 15: Faculty Qualifications and Engagement.....	42
Appendix I: Examples of Impact Metrics in Support of Documentation	53
Appendix II: A Collective Vision for Business Education: Utilizing the Framework within the Context of Strategic Planning & Accreditation Reviews.....	57
<u>Appendix III: Sample AACSB Tables.....</u>	<u>60</u>
<u>Appendix IV: Frequently Asked Questions.....</u>	<u>68</u>

INTRODUCTION TO AACSB INTERNATIONAL ACCREDITATION

AACSB International's vision is to transform business education for global prosperity. Business and business schools are a force for good, contributing to the world's economy and to society, and AACSB plays a significant role in making that benefit better known to all stakeholders – serving business schools, students, business and society.

AACSB's mission is to foster engagement, accelerate innovation, and amplify impact in business education. This mission is aligned with AACSB accreditation standards for business schools. AACSB strives to continuously improve engagement among business, faculty, institutions, and students, so that business education is aligned with business practice. To fulfill this goal, AACSB will encourage and accelerate innovation to continuously improve business education. As a result, business education will have a positive impact on business and society – and AACSB will amplify that impact. In achieving its mission and vision, AACSB will emphasize and model the following values: Quality, Inclusion & Diversity, a Global Mindset, Ethics, Social Responsibility, and Community.

AACSB was founded in 1916 and established its first standards for degree programs in business administration in 1919. AACSB adopted additional standards for undergraduate and graduate degree programs in accountancy in 1980 to address the special needs of the accounting profession. The association regularly reviews its accreditation standards and processes for opportunities to improve relevance, maintain currency, and increase value. This edition of the standards was adopted by the AACSB Accreditation Council in April 2013. The accreditation standards and processes are updated annually by the Business Accreditation Policy Committee (BAPC) and the AACSB Board of Directors.

A collegiate business school offering degrees in business administration, or accounting, may apply for an AACSB Accreditation review. As a first step, the business school must establish its membership and eligibility for accreditation. During the initial accreditation process, the school is evaluated on how well it achieves and aligns with AACSB's accreditation standards, through a process of self-evaluation and peer review. After earning AACSB accreditation, the business school undergoes periodic peer reviews of its strategic improvement to continue its accreditation.

AACSB is a non-profit association of business schools, accounting programs, corporations, and other organizations devoted to the promotion and improvement of higher education in business and accounting.

- AACSB supports and upholds the *Code of Good Practice for Accrediting Bodies* of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA), www.aspa-usa.org.

Copies of this publication are available at the AACSB website (www.aacsb.edu).

PREAMBLE: ENGAGEMENT, INNOVATION, AND IMPACT

The business environment is undergoing profound changes, spurred by powerful demographic shifts, global economic forces, and emerging technologies. At the same time, society is increasingly demanding that companies become more accountable for their actions, exhibit a greater sense of social responsibility, and embrace more sustainable practices. These trends send a strong signal that what business needs today is much different from what it needed yesterday or will need tomorrow.

Not surprisingly, the same factors impacting business are also changing higher education. In today's increasingly dynamic environment, business schools¹ must respond to the business world's changing needs by providing relevant knowledge and skills to the communities they serve. They must innovate and invest in intellectual capital; they must develop new programs, curricula, and courses. Moreover, declining public support for higher education has placed business schools under additional economic pressure, which has shifted the mix of teaching and learning models they employ and affected the future of faculty and professional staff.

In this context of constant change, standards and processes for accreditation must be designed not only to validate quality management education and impactful research, but also to provide leadership, encouragement, and support for change in business schools. The standards should also provide a platform for business schools to work together to advance quality management education worldwide through AACSB.

The fundamental purpose of AACSB accreditation is to encourage business schools to hold themselves accountable for improving business practice through scholarly education and impactful intellectual contributions. AACSB achieves this purpose by defining a set of criteria and standards, coordinating peer review and consultation, and recognizing high-quality business schools that meet the standards and participate in the process.

AACSB remains deeply committed to diversity in collegiate management education, recognizing that a wide variety of missions and strategies can lead to quality. One of the guiding principles of AACSB accreditation is the acceptance, and even encouragement, of diverse paths to achieving high quality in management education. Accreditation decisions are derived through a process that relies on the professional judgment of peers who conduct reviews that are guided by the business school mission. It is also vitally important that AACSB accreditation demands evidence of continuous quality improvement in three vital areas: engagement, innovation, and impact.

Engagement: AACSB acknowledges and values the diversity among its membership, but it also recognizes that all of its accredited members share a common purpose—the preparation of students for meaningful professional, societal, and personal lives. Effective business education and research can be achieved with different balances of academic and professional engagement. However, quality business education cannot be achieved when either academic or professional engagement is absent, or when they do not intersect in meaningful ways. Accreditation should encourage an appropriate intersection of academic and professional engagement that is consistent with quality in the context of a school's mission.

¹ The term business school is used to describe the entity that offers programs and is not meant to imply any particular organizational structure.

Innovation: Accreditation standards focus on the quality of education and supporting functions. The standards must set demanding but realistic thresholds, challenge business schools to innovate, and inspire educators to pursue continuous improvement in educational programs and other mission-based activities of the business school. Accreditation standards and associated processes should foster quality and consistency, but not at the expense of the creativity and experimentation necessary for innovation. Also, accreditation standards and processes should not impede experimentation or entrepreneurial pursuits; the standards must recognize that innovation involves both the potential for success and the risk of failure. Therefore, when assessing any success or failure, it is key to recognize the importance of experimentation and place a priority on strategic innovation. If innovations are well-developed, rational, and well-planned, negative outcomes should not inhibit a positive accreditation review. Negative outcomes are of concern only when they seriously and negatively affect the ability of the business school to continue to fulfill its mission.

Impact: In an environment of increasing accountability, it is important that AACSB accreditation focus on appropriate high-quality inputs (human, financial, physical, etc.) and the outcomes of those inputs within the context of the business school's mission and supporting strategies. That is, in the accreditation process, business schools must document how they are making a difference and having impact. This means that AACSB will continue to emphasize that business schools integrate assurance of learning into their curriculum management processes and produce intellectual contributions that make a positive impact on business theory, teaching, or practice. Impact also has a broader meaning in that the business school, through the articulation and execution of its mission, should make a difference in business and society as well as in the global community of business schools and management educators. Examples of how schools can assess and demonstrate impact are provided in the Appendix I.

The primary relationship in the accreditation process is between AACSB and the business school under review. Although many individuals and groups have a stake in the AACSB accreditation process, the association implements that process through a series of individual business school reviews. This approach provides a common reference point for quality and performance in management education for all AACSB members.

Having achieved AACSB accreditation, an institution commits to a process of continuous improvement review to demonstrate high quality and alignment with the spirit and intent of these accreditation standards. That process also includes a commitment to complete the following:

- Annual completion of the Business School Questionnaire and
- A periodic five-year review of strategic progress.

In choosing to participate in the AACSB accreditation process, business school deans, directors, and other administrators are expected to submit data in a timely manner and to assure that all data and information provided in the accreditation review process are accurate.

AACSB's initial accreditation process includes a review of the institution's self-evaluation report and a visit to the institution by a peer review team. Because an institution's mission is integral to the accreditation process, peer review teams must exercise judgment regarding the reasonableness of deviations from the standards.

AACSB recognizes that high-quality management education is achieved around the world in different ways, which requires the association to adapt its approaches to accreditation to different cultural situations. Accordingly, the association has developed and implemented these

standards as guidelines that may be interpreted and applied in different ways in different countries or regions of the world. AACSB implements these adaptive strategies to support high-quality management education and scholarship wherever it occurs, but schools still must demonstrate that their programs align with the standards. Evaluations must be based on the quality of the learning experience and scholarly outcomes, not rigid interpretations of standards.

AACSB INTERNATIONAL CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR BUSINESS ACCREDITATION

This document details eligibility criteria and standards for AACSB business accreditation, which have been developed and adopted by the AACSB Accreditation Council. Members of the council include leading business schools that share AACSB's values and are committed to advancing management education by participating in the AACSB global community of institutions.

SECTION 1 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR AACSB INTERNATIONAL ACCREDITATION

The eligibility criteria serve two purposes—accordingly, they are organized into two parts. First, the eligibility criteria specify a series of core values that AACSB believes are important. Schools must demonstrate a commitment to and alignment with these values in order to achieve and continue AACSB accreditation.

Second, these criteria provide a foundation for accreditation by defining the scope of review. They establish the basis for agreement about the entity to be considered and the way that entity is organized and supported in the context of business education. For this purpose, eligibility criteria also address certain basic characteristics that bear on the quality of business degree programs, research, and other activities. These characteristics must be present before an applicant is reviewed for initial accreditation or for that applicant to continue accreditation. An applicant for accreditation must be able to show that it has the structure and capacity to deliver and sustain high-quality business education and intellectual contributions. Unless it can do so transparently, it is not prepared to be evaluated against the standards.

For initial applicants, alignment with these eligibility criteria is viewed as the first step in the accreditation process. As such, the documentation a school provides in response to the criteria is a signal of its commitment to the underlying core values outlined in the criteria and its likelihood of achieving accreditation in a reasonable period. Eligibility criteria are thus the basis for the eligibility application.

Once a school achieves accreditation, members of the Accreditation Council continue to evaluate the school's adherence to the eligibility criteria and determine whether changes in its strategy could affect its ability to continue to fulfill its mission.

Part 1: Core Values and Guiding Principles

The following three criteria represent core values of AACSB. There is no uniform measure for deciding whether each criterion has been met. Rather, the school must demonstrate that it has an ongoing commitment to pursue the spirit and intent of each criterion consistent with its mission and context.

A. The school must encourage and support ethical behavior by students, faculty, administrators, and professional staff. [ETHICAL BEHAVIOR]

Basis for Judgment

- The school has appropriate systems, policies, and procedures that reflect the school's support for and importance of ethical behavior for students, faculty, administrators, and professional staff in their professional and personal actions.
- The systems, policies, and procedures must provide appropriate mechanisms for addressing breaches of ethical behavior.
- This criterion relates to the general procedures of a school. In no instance will AACSB become involved in the adjudication or review of individual cases of alleged misconduct, whether by administrators, faculty, professional staff, students, or the school.

Guidance for Documentation

- Provide published policies and procedures to support legal and ethical behaviors.
- Describe programs to educate participants about ethical policies and procedures.
- Describe systems for detecting and addressing breaches of ethical behaviors, such as honor codes and disciplinary systems to manage inappropriate behavior.

B. The school maintains a collegiate environment in which students, faculty, administrators, professional staff, and practitioners interact and collaborate in support of learning, scholarship, and community engagement. [COLLEGIATE ENVIRONMENT]

Basis for Judgment

- Collegiate environments are characterized by scholarship, scholarly approaches to business and management, and a focus on advanced learning. Schools must provide scholarly education at a level consistent with higher education in management.
- In collegiate environments, students, faculty, administrators, professional staff, and practitioners interact as an inclusive community. Schools must provide an environment supporting interaction and engagement among students, administrators, faculty, and practitioners.
- Collegiate environments are characterized by faculty involvement in governance and university service. Schools must have shared governance processes that include faculty input and engagement.

Guidance for Documentation

- Provide an overview of the degree programs offered and evidence that the quality of these programs is at a level consistent with higher education in management.
- Describe the environment in which students, faculty, administrators, professional staff, and practitioners interact; provide examples of activities that demonstrate the ways they interact; and show how the school supports such interactions.
- Discuss the shared governance process, indicating how faculty are engaged or how faculty otherwise inform decisions.
- Provide documents that characterize the culture and environment of the school, including statement of values, faculty and student handbooks, etc.

C. The school must demonstrate a commitment to address, engage, and respond to current and emerging corporate social responsibility issues (e.g., diversity, sustainable development, environmental sustainability, and globalization of economic activity across cultures) through its policies, procedures, curricula, research, and/or outreach activities. [COMMITMENT TO CORPORATE AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY]

Definition

- With an understanding of the context and environment in which each school operates, the concept of diversity encompasses interest, inclusion, acceptance and respect. It means understanding that each individual is unique, and recognizing and engaging with individual differences. These can be along the dimensions of gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, age, physical abilities, religious beliefs, political beliefs, or other ideologies. The values of diversity and inclusion foster the exploration of these differences in a safe and supportive environment, where community members move beyond tolerance to seeking and celebrating the rich dimensions of diversity and the contributions these differences make to innovative, engaged and impactful business education experiences.

Basis for Judgment

- Diversity in people and ideas enhances the educational experience in every business education program. At the same time, diversity is a culturally embedded concept rooted in historical and cultural traditions, legislative and regulatory concepts, economic conditions, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic conditions, and experiences.
- Diversity, sustainable development, environmental sustainability, globalization, and other emerging corporate and social responsibility issues are important and require proactive engagement between business schools and business students.
- The school fosters awareness, understanding, acceptance and respect of, diverse viewpoints among participants related to current and emerging corporate social responsibility issues.
- The school fosters sensitivity toward and greater understanding and acceptance of cultural differences and global perspectives. Graduates should be prepared to pursue business or management careers in a diverse global context. Students should be exposed to cultural practices different than their own.

Guidance for Documentation

- Describe how the school defines and supports the concept of diversity in ways appropriate to its culture, historical traditions, and legal and regulatory environment. Demonstrate that the school fosters sensitivity and flexibility toward cultural differences and global perspectives.
- Demonstrate that the school values a rich variety of viewpoints in its learning community by seeking and supporting diversity among its students and faculty in alignment with its mission.
- Define the populations the school serves and describe the school's role in fostering opportunity for underserved populations.
- Define the ways the school supports high-quality education by making appropriate effort to diversify the participants in the educational process and to guarantee that a wide variety of perspectives is included in all activities.
- Demonstrate that the school addresses current and emerging corporate social responsibility issues through its own activities, through collaborations with other units within its institution, and/or through partnerships with external constituencies

Part 2: General Criteria

D. An applicant for AACSB accreditation must be a well-defined, established entity and a member of AACSB International in good standing. The entity seeking AACSB accreditation may be an institution authorized to award bachelor's degrees or higher (in business) or under certain circumstances a business academic unit within a larger institution. [ACCREDITATION SCOPE AND AACSB MEMBERSHIP]

Definitions

- An institution is a legal entity authorized to award bachelor's degrees or higher.
- An academic unit operates within an institution offering bachelor's degrees or higher and may depend on the institution for authority to grant degrees and for financial, human, and physical resources.
- A business academic unit is an academic unit in which business education is the predominant focus across degree programs, research, and outreach activities. The business academic unit may seek accreditation as outlined in these eligibility criteria.
- Another (non-business) academic unit is an academic unit in which business education is not the predominant focus across degree programs, research, and outreach activities.

Basis for Judgment

- The entity applying for accreditation is agreed upon through AACSB processes and meets the spirit and intent of the conditions and expectations as outlined in these eligibility criteria. The entity must be approved well in advance (normally two years) of the onsite visit of the accreditation peer review team.
- Within the approved entity applying for accreditation, the programmatic scope of accreditation (i.e., degree programs and other programmatic activities to be included in the AACSB review process and subject to alignment with accreditation standards) is agreed upon through AACSB processes and meets the spirit and intent of the conditions and expectations outlined in these eligibility criteria. Program inclusions and exclusions are approved well in advance (normally two years) of the onsite visit of the accreditation peer review team.
- The entity applying for accreditation agrees to use the AACSB accreditation brand and related statements about accreditation in its electronic and printed communications in accordance with AACSB policies and guidelines.
- Normally, at the time of the initial accreditation visit, the school should have produced at least two years of graduates.

—Guidance for Documentation

- An applicant for AACSB accreditation must complete an AACSB Accreditation Eligibility Application, which identifies the applicant as either:
 - An institution that offers business education degree programs and related programmatic activities in one or more business academic units and other non-business academic units. In this case, all of the institution's business and management activities and related programmatic activities are included in the scope of the AACSB accreditation review. An institution is the default entity applying for accreditation.
 - A single business academic unit within an institution that offers business education degree programs and other related programmatic activities. In this case, the applicant may request that this unit be considered an independent business academic unit for accreditation purposes. If approved, all business

education degree programs and related programmatic activities operating within the independent business academic unit are included in the scope of the AACSB accreditation review. This approach to scope does not preclude more than one business academic unit within an institution from seeking AACSB accreditation as an independent business academic unit. A single business academic unit may apply for status as an independent business academic unit, in effect acting as the entity applying for accreditation.

AACSB accreditation is granted by default to the institution, meaning that all business and management degree and related programmatic activities operating within the institution are to be included in the scope of the AACSB accreditation review (see below for guidance on requesting program exclusions).² With the 2013 standards, it became possible for a school to apply for accreditation as a single academic unit within a larger institution offering business and management degree programs.³ For schools that do not make such a request, the assumption is that all business and management degree programs offered at the institution will be within the AACSB accreditation purview (institutional accreditation).

Redefining the accreditation entity, from institution to single business unit, is subject to the receipt of documentation that verifies that the business academic unit has a sufficient level of independence in four areas: (1) branding; (2) external market perception; (3) financial relationship; and (4) autonomy as it relates to the single business unit and the institution. The first two are necessary; the latter two are supplemental in making a determination about the unit of accreditation. This determination is made by the appropriate AACSB committee. The burden of proof is on the business academic unit to document its distinctiveness from the other academic units within the institution in the four areas noted above, which the association defines in the following ways:

- **Branding**—Independent branding of the business academic unit relates to the following: (1) market positioning; (2) promotion (e.g., websites, electronic and print advertising, collateral materials, etc.) of the business and management degree programs and other programmatic activities offered within the business academic unit; (3) business school name, faculty, and degree titles; and (4) other brand differentiation between the business academic unit and other academic units within the institution.
- **External Market Perception**—This criterion is focused on the extent to which the external markets (students, employers, other stakeholder groups, and the public) perceive that the business academic unit is differentiated from other academic units within the institution. This differentiation may include elements such as student admissions, graduate recruiting and placement histories, and starting salaries.
- **Financial Relationships with the Institution**—Financial relationships relates to the following: (1) approval of operating and capital budgets for the business academic unit; (2) the business academic unit's control over a large portion of the funds available to the unit; (3) subsidies to the institution; and (4) ownership or control of physical and financial assets.
- **Business Academic Unit Autonomy**—Autonomy of the business academic unit is described in terms of its adherence to the policies and

procedures of the larger institution or in terms of the source of approval of or constraints on its activities related to the following areas: (1) the strategic plan of the business academic unit; (2) approval of key decisions of the business academic unit; (3) appointment of the head or senior leader of the business academic unit; (4) geographic separation of the business academic unit and the larger institution; and (5) any other significant attribute of the relationship that affects the autonomy of the business academic unit.

- Based on AACSB approval of the entity that is applying for accreditation, the next step is to gain agreement on the programmatic scope of the accreditation review.— Programmatic scope will normally include all business and management degree programs at the bachelor's level or higher, research activities, and other mission components. Other mission components may include executive education or other mission-focused outreach activities if they are business related. Regardless of the entity seeking accreditation, the following guidelines establish factors that determine if a degree program should be included or excluded from the AACSB accreditation review process:

- Normally, bachelor degree programs in which 25 percent² or more of the teaching relates to traditional business subjects, or graduate programs in which 50 percent or more of the teaching relates to traditional business subjects are considered business degree programs. Traditional business subjects include accounting, business law, decision sciences, economics³, entrepreneurship, finance (including insurance, real estate, and banking), human resources, international business, management, management information systems, management science, marketing, operations management, organizational behavior, organizational development, strategic management, supply chain management (including transportation and logistics), and technology management. This list is not exhaustive and should be interpreted in the context of the school and mission. Normally, extensions of traditional business subjects, including interdisciplinary courses, majors, concentrations, and areas of emphasis will be included in an AACSB accreditation review.
- Degree programs with business content below the thresholds noted above may be excluded from the AACSB review process if such programs are not marketed or otherwise represented as business degree programs, and if such programs do not involve significant resources of the business academic units participating in the AACSB accreditation review process. Programs that could be construed as business degrees by the public should be requested for exclusion, even if they are below these thresholds.
- With the burden of proof on the entity applying for AACSB accreditation, degree programs with business content exceeding the minimum thresholds noted above may be excluded from the review process subject to approval by the appropriate

² The percent of business content is calculated by dividing the maximum total number of business credits that can be taken in a degree (including electives) by the total number of credits required to earn the degree. For example, a 120-hour bachelor's degree with 30 or more hours of traditional business credits would normally be included in scope unless an exclusion request is granted by the appropriate AACSB committee.

³ Economics degrees may be excludable depending on where they are housed and the curriculum of the degree.

AACSB committee, based on that committee's judgment regarding the following factors:

- Demonstration of limited or no participation in, and a high level of independence relative to, the development, delivery, and oversight of programs requested for exclusion.
 - Demonstration of program distinctiveness such that students, faculty, and employers clearly distinguish such programs from those degree programs identified for inclusion in the accreditation review process. For example, degree programs must be included in the accreditation review if they are business programs announced and advertised in catalogs, brochures, websites, and other materials in conjunction with programs that are identified for inclusion. That is, to be excluded, degree programs must not be presented in conjunction with the included programs, either in the institution's materials or in materials for programs for which the exclusion is sought. To be excluded, programs must be clearly distinguishable from the included programs by title; in published descriptions; and in representations to potential students, faculty, and employers. Exclusions will not be approved when such exclusion will create confusion about which programs within the institution have achieved AACSB accreditation.
 - Demonstration of a lack of operational control relative to program design, faculty hiring, development and promotion, student selection and services, curriculum design, and degree conferral. If the leadership of the entity applying for accreditation has influence over these factors or controls these factors relative to any business degree program, the program will be included in the scope of review.
- Other factors that may result in the exclusion of a degree program from an AACSB accreditation review are:
 - Degree programs subject to accreditation by other non-business accreditation organizations.
 - Specialized degree programs (e.g., hotel and restaurant management, engineering management, health care management, agribusiness, and public administration) that are not marketed in conjunction with the business program under AACSB review.
 - ~~Degrees offered on a separate or independent campus.~~
 - Degree programs offered via a consortium of schools that do not carry the name of the applicant entity on the diploma or transcript.
 - Degree programs in secondary business education, whether offered within the entity applying for accreditation or elsewhere.
 - Degree programs that are in a teach-out stage at the time of the accreditation visit are normally included in the scope of review. The nature of the accreditation review will be different than that for active degree programs which are still admitting students. Peer Review Teams will assess whether programs in teach out have sufficient and qualified faculty and will also review these programs in the context of the teaching and learning standards to validate program quality.
 - Degree programs offered by the entity applying for accreditation delivered jointly through partnership agreements, consortia, franchise arrangements, etc., are included in the scope of the review if there is any connotation that the entity applying for accreditation is recognized as one or more of the degree granting institutions.

Formatted: Font: Bold

~~• Degree programs in business and management delivered by other (non-business) academic units are reviewed primarily against standards related to student selection and retention, deployment of qualified faculty and professional staff, and teaching and learning.~~

- AACSB recognizes national systems and local cultural contexts, as well as regulatory environments in which an entity applying for accreditation operates. As a result, AACSB can vary the boundaries of what is considered traditional business subjects. AACSB will consider the definition of those boundaries in the local context in which the applicant entity operates. For AACSB to agree to vary its definition of a traditional business subject, the applicant entity must explain and document such variations within its local context.
- AACSB International must ensure that its brand is applied strictly, and only to the agreed upon entity applying for accreditation and the programs and programmatic activities included within the scope of its review. For that reason, the entity applying for accreditation must document its agreement and alignment with the following guidelines regarding the use of the AACSB International accreditation brand and related statements about accreditation:
 - In the case that the entity applying for accreditation is the institution, the AACSB accreditation brand applies to the institution (e.g., the University of Bagu), all business academic units (e.g., the College of Business, Graduate School of Business, or Bagu School of Management), all business and management degree programs delivered by the institution or business academic unit (e.g., BBA, MBA, or Masters of Science), and degree programs in business and management included in the review that are offered by other (non-business) academic units (e.g., BA in Management or MA in Organizational Leadership). Note: the AACSB accreditation brand may not be applied to other (non-business) academic units, only to the business and management degree programs included in the accreditation review that they offer.
 - In the case where the entity applying for accreditation is an independent business academic unit within an institution, the AACSB accreditation brand applies only to the independent business academic unit and all business and management degree programs it is responsible for delivering. The AACSB accreditation brand may not be applied to the institution or to other
 - (non-business) academic units or the business and management degree programs they offer.
- Applications for accreditation must be supported by the chief executive officer of the business school applicant and the chief academic officer of the institution, regardless of the accreditation entity seeking AACSB accreditation. When the applicant entity is an independent business academic unit at the same institution as another entity that already holds AACSB accreditation, the applicant must clearly distinguish the business programs it delivers from the AACSB-accredited entity. In all cases, the institution and all business academic units agree to comply with AACSB policies that recognize the entity that holds AACSB accreditation.
- For all AACSB-accredited entities, the list of degree programs included in the scope of accreditation review must be updated annually as part of the Business School Questionnaire, so that the list of approved program exclusions may be maintained on a continual basis by AACSB. New programs introduced by business academic units that are AACSB-accredited may be indicated as AACSB-accredited until the next continuous improvement of accreditation review. New business degree programs delivered by other (non-business) academic units may not be indicated as accredited prior to the next

review.⁴ ~~New programs introduced by business academic units will be included in the scope of accreditation review.~~

E. The school must be structured to ensure proper oversight, accountability, and responsibility for the school's operations; must be supported by continuing resources (human, financial, infrastructure, and physical); and must have policies and processes for continuous improvement. [OVERSIGHT, SUSTAINABILITY, AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT]

Basis for Judgment

- This criterion does not require a particular administrative structure or set of practices; however, the structure must be appropriate to sustain excellence and continuous improvement in business education within the context of a collegiate institution, as described in the preamble to these standards.
- ~~The organizational structure must provide proper oversight and accountability for the components of the school's mission that are related to business education. Additionally, the school's structure must foster an environment of shared governance in decision-making.~~
- The school must have policies and processes in place to support continuous improvement and accountability.
- The school must demonstrate sufficient and sustained resources (financial, human, physical, infrastructural, etc.) to support the business academic unit (or units) seeking AACSB accreditation in its efforts to fulfill its mission, strategies, and expected outcomes. Resources must be sufficient to support the number and complexity of academic programs and other mission-related activities.
- ~~The leadership of the business academic unit has responsibility for:~~
 - ~~the mission and its achievement,~~
 - ~~alignment of accreditation with the overall institutional strategic goals.~~
 - ~~ensuring that expected outcomes are monitored and delivered.~~
 - ~~ensuring resources for quality improvement and assurance are available,~~
 - ~~mobilizing the resources to achieve the mission,~~
 - ~~engaging, directing and supporting faculty, students, and staff to contribute to the effectiveness of the policies and processes for continuous improvement,~~
 - ~~and promoting improvement.~~

Guidance for Documentation

- Describe the organizational structure of the school, providing an organizational chart that identifies the school in the context of the larger institution (if applicable).
- Provide an overview of the structure of the school, its policies, and processes to ensure continuous improvement and accountability related to the school's operations. This overview also should include policies and processes that encourage and support intellectual contributions that influence the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business and management.
- Summarize the budget and financial performance for the most recent academic year. Describe the financial resources of the school in relationship to the financial resources of the

⁴ ~~Accreditation fees are set by the AACSB Board of Directors and increase based on the number of separate business academic units that are involved in the AACSB accreditation process.~~

whole institution (e.g., compare business degree program enrollments as a fraction of the institution's total enrollment).

- Describe trends in resources available to the school, including those related to finances, facilities, information technology infrastructure, human, and library/information resources. Discuss the impact of resources on the school's operations, outcomes (graduates, research, etc.), and potential for mission achievement going forward.
- Describe the total faculty resources for the school, including the number of faculty members on staff, the highest degree level (doctoral, master's, and bachelor's) of each faculty member, and the disciplinary area of each faculty member. Describe the sufficiency of faculty resources in relation to program array and complexity.
- For each degree program, describe the teaching/learning model (e.g., traditional classroom models, online or distance models, models that blend the traditional classroom with distance delivery, or other technology-supported approaches). In addition, describe the division of labor across faculty and professional staff, as well as the nature of participant interactions supported. Extend this analysis to each location and delivery mode.
- Describe the school resources that are committed to other mission-related activities beyond business degree programs and intellectual contributions.
- Explain how the people at the highest level of leadership are involved in and responsible for accreditation and continuous improvement of the institution or approved business academic unit.

F. All degree programs included in the AACSB accreditation review must demonstrate continuing adherence to AACSB accreditation standards. Schools are expected to maintain and provide timely, accurate information in support of each accreditation review. [POLICY ON CONTINUED ADHERENCE TO STANDARDS AND INTEGRITY OF SUBMISSIONS TO AACSB]

All degree programs included in the AACSB accreditation review must demonstrate an understanding and continuing alignment with the AACSB accreditation standards and policies. Schools in the initial accreditation process must demonstrate an understanding and alignment with the accreditation standards and complete the initial accreditation process within the maximum seven-year time period from the date that an Eligibility Application is accepted.

After a school achieves accreditation, AACSB reserves the right to request a review of that accredited institution's or academic business unit's programs at any time, if questions arise concerning the continuation of educational quality as defined by the standards. In addition, schools are expected to maintain and provide accurate information in support of each accreditation review.

Any school that deliberately misrepresents information to AACSB in support of an accreditation review shall be subject to appropriate processes. Such misrepresentation is grounds for the immediate denial of a school's initial application for accreditation or, in the case of a continuous improvement review, for revocation of a school's membership in the Accreditation Council.

SECTION 2
STANDARDS FOR BUSINESS ACCREDITATION
STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT AND INNOVATION

This section's focus on "Strategic Management" is based on the principle that a quality business school has a clear mission, acts on that mission, translates that mission into expected outcomes, and develops strategies for achieving those outcomes. It addresses three critical and related components: mission and strategy; scholarship and intellectual contributions; and financial model and strategies.

AACSB believes that a wide range of missions can be consistent with high quality, positive impact, and innovation. Such success is achieved when schools are clear about their priorities and when the mission, expected outcomes, and strategies are aligned and implemented across the school's activities. Under these conditions, the mission, expected outcomes, and strategies provide a context for the AACSB accreditation review. That is, in applying the standards, the quality and success of a school is assessed in relation to its mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies.

In this section, three criteria related to a school's mission are of critical importance. First, the mission must be appropriate, descriptive, and transparent to the school's constituents. Second, the mission must provide the school with an overall direction for making decisions. Finally, the school's strategies and intended outcomes must be aligned with the mission. The accreditation process takes a strategic, holistic look at the business school by reflecting on its mission, strategies, actions, participants, stakeholders, resources, expected outcomes, and impacts in the context of the culture of the school and its larger institution as appropriate. A complete and accurate understanding of the context and environmental setting for the school is paramount in the accreditation peer review team's ability to form a holistic view.

The standards in this section reflect the dynamic and diverse environment of business schools. These standards insist on the periodic, systematic review and possible revision of a school's mission, as well as on the engagement of appropriate stakeholders in developing and revising the mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies. Quality business schools have legacies of achievement, improvement, and impact. They implement forward-looking strategies to further their success, sustain their missions, and make an impact in the future. Central to the dynamic environment of business schools are intellectual contributions and financial strategies that support change and innovation.

Scholarship that fosters innovation and directly impacts the theory, practice, and teaching of business and management is a cornerstone of a quality business school. A broad range of scholarly activities ensures intellectual vibrancy across and among diverse faculty members and students; such activities contribute to the currency and relevance of the school's educational programs and directly foster innovation in business enterprises and academic institutions. Intellectual contributions that arise from these scholarly activities ensure the business school contributes to and is an integral part of an academic community of scholars within an institution and across the broader academic community of institutions in higher education. Outcomes of intellectual contributions are indicated by their impact or influence on the theory, practice, and teaching of business and management rather than just by the number of articles published or documents produced. Schools should make their expectations regarding the impact of intellectual contributions clear and publicly transparent.

Like intellectual contributions, sound financial models and strategies are essential for operational sustainability, improvement, and innovation in a business school. Sustaining quality business education and impactful research requires careful financial planning and an effective financial model. Schools cannot implement actions related to continuous improvement and innovation without sufficient resources. In addition, schools cannot make effective strategic decisions without a clear understanding of the financial implications.

Standard 1: The school articulates a clear and distinctive mission, the expected outcomes this mission implies, and strategies outlining how these outcomes will be achieved. The school has a history of achievement and improvement and specifies future actions for continuous improvement and innovation consistent with this mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. [MISSION, IMPACT, AND INNOVATION]

Definitions

- Mission is a single statement or set of statements serving as a guide for the school and its stakeholders. These statements capture the school's core purposes, express its aspirations, and describe its distinguishing features. The mission is not usually described entirely by the mission statement. It is more completely encapsulated in a set of statements that describe the school, including the mission statement, vision statement, and statements of values.
- The term distinctive refers to goals, characteristics, priorities, focus areas, or approaches of the school that are special or notable. These should be revealed by the mission of the school and evident in the expected outcomes and strategies. Distinctiveness does not imply that the school is unique or different from all others.
- Expected outcomes are conveyed as broad or high-level statements describing impacts the school expects to achieve in the business and academic communities it serves as it pursues its mission through educational activities, scholarship, and other endeavors. Expected outcomes translate the mission into overarching goals against which the school evaluates its success.
- Strategies describe, in general, how the school intends to achieve its mission and expected outcomes, including how it finances activities to achieve its mission. Strategies are general, or overarching statements of direction derived from the strategic management processes of the school.

Basis for Judgment

- The mission guides decision making and identifies distinguishing characteristics, attributes, focus areas, priorities, etc., that indicate how the school positions itself among the international community of business schools. Distinctiveness does not imply that the business school must somehow be different from all other AACSB-accredited business schools. Rather, through the mission, expected outcomes, and strategies, the school clearly articulates those attributes that describe the school to its various constituencies and across the global community of business schools.
- The business school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies are mutually consistent and reflect a realistic assessment of the diverse and changing environment of business schools. The alignment of a school's mission and strategies with its expected outcomes signal that it is highly likely that the school can achieve those outcomes. In the dynamic environment of higher education and business schools, innovation and change are the norm rather than the exception.

- The school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies clearly define the school's focus on educational activities, including the range of degree and non-degree programs offered and the diverse students, organizations, and communities those programs are intended to serve. The unit aligns its teaching/learning models with its mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.
- The school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies clearly define the school's focus on quality intellectual contributions that advance the theory, practice, and teaching/pedagogy of business.
- The school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies clearly define the school's focus on other applicable activities (e.g., civic engagement) and on the diverse people, organizations, and/or communities they intend to serve.
- The mission, expected outcomes, and strategies are appropriate to a collegiate school of business and consonant with the mission of any institution of which the school is a part. Accordingly, the mission, expected outcomes, and strategies address the level of education the school is targeting; the positive and significant impact the school intends to make on business and society; the stakeholders to whom the school is accountable; and the ways in which the school intends to advance the business education industry.
- The school periodically reviews and revises the mission, expected outcomes, and strategies as appropriate and engages key stakeholders in the process.
- The school's mission and expected outcomes are transparent to all stakeholders.
- The school systematically evaluates and documents its progress toward mission fulfillment. Past examples of continuous improvement and innovation are consistent with the mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies intended to support future mission fulfillment.
- The school's future actions for continuous improvement, its rationale for such actions, and its identification of potential areas of innovation are consistent with and demonstrate support for its mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.
- The school has clearly defined its future strategies to maintain its resource needs, assign responsibilities to appropriate parties, and set time frames for the implementation of actions that support the mission. The school also has clearly defined how these actions promise to impact expected outcomes.

Guidance for Documentation

- Provide the strategic plan of the business unit which encompasses the strategies and expected outcomes to be pursued by the school, consistent with the school's mission. The strategic plan should include a description of the mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies, including how the mission is encapsulated in supporting statements such as vision and values statements. -Appendix II, A Collective Vision for Business Education: Utilizing the Framework within the Context of Strategic Planning & Accreditation Reviews may be useful in the strategic planning process.
- ~~Describe the mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies, including how the mission is encapsulated in supporting statements (e.g., mission statement, vision statement, values statements, and strategic plan) and how these statements are aligned. Appendix II, A Collective Vision for Business Education: Utilizing the Framework within the Context of Strategic Planning & Accreditation Reviews, may be useful in the strategic planning process.~~
- Describe how the mission influences decision making in the school, connects the actions of participants, and provides a common basis for achieving the mission and expected outcomes.
- Describe the appropriateness of the mission for the school's constituencies, including students, employers, and other stakeholders; and discuss how the mission positively

contributes to society, business education, the diversity of people and ideas, and the success of graduates.

- Describe the mission of the school in relation to the mission of any larger organization of which it is a part.
- Describe how the mission, expected outcomes, and strategies clearly articulate the school's areas of focus in regards to educational activities, intellectual contributions, and other activities.
- Describe how teaching/learning models in degree programs are aligned and consistent with the mission, expected outcomes, and strategy of the school.
- Describe processes for creating and revising the mission, determining expected outcomes, developing strategies, and establishing how these strategies relate to each other.
- Summarize and document key continuous improvement successes, innovations, and achievements since the last AACSB accreditation review or for at least the past five years.
- Describe how past achievements are aligned with the mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies.
- Identify future plans for continuous improvement and potential opportunities for innovation; indicate how they are linked to mission, expected outcomes, and strategies; and outline the resources, responsible parties, and time frame needed to implement the action.

Standard 2: The school produces high-quality intellectual contributions that are consistent with its mission, expected outcomes, and strategies and that impact the theory, practice, and teaching of business and management. [INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS, IMPACT, AND ALIGNMENT WITH MISSION]

Definitions

- Intellectual contributions are original works intended to advance the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business and management. They are scholarly in the sense that they are based on generally accepted research principles, are validated by peers and disseminated to appropriate audiences. Intellectual contributions are a foundation for innovation. Validation of the quality of intellectual contributions includes the traditional academic or professional pre-publication peer review, but may encompass other forms of validation, such as online post-publication peer reviews, ratings, surveys of users, etc. Intellectual contributions may fall into any of the following categories:
 - Basic or discovery scholarship (often referred to as discipline-based scholarship) that generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding and/or development of new methods. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the theory or knowledge of business.
 - Applied or Integration/application scholarship that synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to contribute to and impact the practice of business.
 - Teaching and learning scholarship that develops and advances new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the teaching and/or pedagogy of business.
- Impact of intellectual contributions is the advancement of theory, practice, and/or teaching of business through intellectual contributions. Impact is concerned with the difference made or innovations fostered by intellectual contributions—e.g., what has been changed, accomplished, or improved.

Basis for Judgment

- The school has produced intellectual contributions that have had an impact on the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business consistent with the mission, expected outcomes, and strategies of the school.
- The school expresses expectations regarding the impact of intellectual contributions in the mission in ways that clearly articulate the contributions to society and are transparent to the public.
- The school applies relevant metrics to assess the extent to which expected impacts from intellectual contributions have been achieved and are aligned with mission.
- The school maintains a current portfolio of high quality intellectual contributions that could impact theory, practice, and/or teaching in the future. The portfolio of intellectual contributions includes contributions from a substantial cross-section of the faculty in each discipline. Normally, a significant level of the contributions in the portfolio must be in the form of peer-reviewed journal articles or the equivalent. The portfolio of intellectual contributions reflects the research priorities of the school reflected in the mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.
- The school supports the depth and breadth of faculty participation in scholarship leading to high-quality intellectual contributions that could impact theory, practice, and/or teaching in the future. If outcomes rely heavily on the intellectual contributions of faculty members who have primary faculty appointments with other institutions, the school must provide documentation regarding how its relationship with the individual faculty members and other institutions supports the success, mission, and intellectual contributions of the school. The school documents intellectual contributions that demonstrate high quality and impact, as well as alignment with mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. In documenting quality, the school produces evidence of high-quality intellectual contributions within the most recent five-year AACSB accreditation review period. In documenting impact, however, the school may produce evidence from intellectual contributions produced prior to the most recent five-year AACSB accreditation review period. The review process recognizes that impact often occurs over time.

Guidance for Documentation

- Provide a portfolio of evidence including qualitative and quantitative measures that summarize the portfolio of intellectual contributions over the most recent five-year review period, ending with the most recently completed, normal academic year. [Normally, the intellectual contributions underlying this table are for the same faculty reported in Table 15-1. Disclose in a footnote to the table, any changes in faculty subsequent to the most recent academic year that would materially impact the results reported herein.](#)
- This evidence can be enhanced by including validating evidence of the accomplishments of such work. At a minimum, the portfolio of evidence should include: (1) A listing of the outlets (journals, research monographs, published cases, funded and competitive research grants, scholarly presentations, invited presentations, published textbooks, other teaching materials, etc.); (2) an analysis of the breadth of faculty engagement and production of intellectual contributions within each discipline; (3) awards, recognition, editorships, and other forms of validation of the accomplishments of faculty through their intellectual contributions; and (4) the ways in which the school's intellectual contributions impact external stakeholders, and the broader society.
- Table 2-1 is divided into four parts. Part A provides a five-year aggregate summary of intellectual contributions. Part B provides a qualitative description of how the portfolio of intellectual contributions aligns with mission, expected outcomes, and strategy. Part C

provides evidence demonstrating the quality of the portfolio of intellectual contributions. Part D provides evidence that the school's intellectual contributions have had an impact on the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business and management. Table 2-1 allows schools flexibility to develop their own indicators of quality for the portfolio of intellectual contributions.

- The validation of the accomplishments/impact of intellectual contribution outcomes may be reflected in:
 - Peer recognition of the originality, scope, and/or significance of intellectual contributions.
 - Editorial board recognition of the originality, scope, and/or significance of the work.
 - The applicability and benefits of the new knowledge to the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business.
 - Evidence of the influence of the intellectual contribution on professional practice, professional standards, legislative processes, and outcomes or public policy.
 - The usefulness and/or originality of new or different understandings, applications, and insights resulting from the creative work.
 - The breadth, value, and persistence of the use and impact of the creative work.
 - The originality and significance of the creative work to learning, including the depth and duration of usefulness.
 - Research awards and recognition (e.g., selection as a fellow of an academic society).
 - Adoptions and citations of the creative work, including its impact on the creative and intellectual work of others.
 - Evidence in the work of leadership and team-based contributions to the advancement of knowledge.
 - Alignment of the work with mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.

The above is not an exhaustive list of how a school can present or measure the possible impacts of its intellectual contribution portfolio. As a school documents its portfolio of intellectual contribution outcomes, the key is to provide the peer review team with the means to make an initial assessment of the portfolio's alignment with mission and draw broader conclusions about its impact on teaching and practice (refer to Appendix I). The validation documentation is an important part of the process because it serves to illustrate the depth and breadth of faculty participation in the production of intellectual contributions (i.e., to show a substantial cross-section of activity in each disciplinary context and the level of peer review journal outcomes). Finally, the spirit and intent of this standard applies to both intellectual contributions grounded solely in a single disciplinary area and interdisciplinary contributions. Interdisciplinary intellectual contributions will be judged in the same context as contributions in a single disciplinary area and are in no way discounted in the context of this standard; however, interdisciplinary outcomes should be aligned with mission, expected outcomes, and strategies of the business school.

- Provide a summary of impact indicators resulting from the intellectual contributions produced by the faculty of the school. See Appendix I for a non-exhaustive list of possible impact indicators, including publications in highly recognized peer-review journals, citation counts, editorship and associate editorships, elections to leadership positions in academic and/or professional associations, external recognitions for research quality and impact, evidence of impact of intellectual contributions on business practice and society, invitations to participate in research conferences, use of academic work in doctoral seminars, awards of competitive grants from major national or international agencies, patent awards, appointments as visiting

professors or scholars at other institutions, case studies of research that leads to the adoption of new teaching/learning practices, textbooks that are widely adopted, research-based learning projects with companies, and/or non-profit organizations, and widely used instructional software.

- Provide an analysis of how the portfolio includes intellectual contributions from a substantial cross-section of faculty in each discipline, as well as a significant amount of peer-reviewed journal work or the equivalent.
- The school adopts and shows evidence of appropriate policies to guide faculty members in the production of intellectual contributions that align with the mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. Such policies should guide faculty as to how the school prioritizes different types of scholarship, determines quality, and validates or assesses outcomes as positive contributions to the advancement of business theory, practice, and learning. [Interdisciplinary outcomes may be presented in a separate category, but the disciplines involved should be identified.](#)
- The number of publications must reflect an unduplicated count for co-authored publications.
- Faculty vitae supporting Table 2-1 should be available upon request by the peer review team.
- Table 2-1 does not require a breakdown by level of faculty (e.g., assistant professor, associate professor, etc.).

Table 2-1 Intellectual Contributions

Part A: Five-Year Summary of Intellectual Contributions																	
Faculty * Aggregate and summarize data to reflect the organizational structure of the school's faculty (e.g., departments, research groups). Do not list by individual faculty member.	Portfolio of Intellectual Contributions			Types of Intellectual Contributions								Percentages of Faculty Producing ICs					
	Basic or Discovery Scholarship	Applied or Integration/Application Scholarship	Teaching and Learning Scholarship	Total*	Peer-Reviewed Journals	Peer-Reviewed Academic/Professional-Editorial-Reviewed Journals and Articles	Peer-Reviewed Academic/Professional Meeting Proceedings	Academic/Professional Meeting Presentations	Competitive Research Awards Received	Textbooks	Case Studies	Other Teaching Materials	Professional practice standards, or public policy	Other IC Type Selected by the School	Total*	Percent of Participating Faculty Producing ICs*	Percentage of total Full Time Equivalent (FTE) faculty producing ICs†
Department 1																	
Department 2																	
Department 3																	
Grand Total																	
Part B: Alignment with Mission, Expected Outcomes, and Strategy																	
Provide a qualitative description of how the portfolio of intellectual contributions is aligned with the mission, expected outcomes, and strategy of the school.																	
Part C: Quality of Five-Year Portfolio of Intellectual Contributions																	
Provide evidence demonstrating the quality of the above five-year portfolio of intellectual contributions. Schools are encouraged to include qualitative descriptions and quantitative metrics and to summarize information in tabular format whenever possible.																	
Part D: Impact of Intellectual Contributions																	
Provide evidence demonstrating that the school's intellectual contributions have had an impact on the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business and management. The school is encouraged to include qualitative descriptions and quantitative metrics and to summarize the information in tabular format whenever possible to demonstrate impact. Evidence of impact may stem from intellectual contributions produced beyond the five-year AACSB accreditation review period. Examples can be found in Appendix I.																	

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

*The sum of the Portfolio of Intellectual Contributions columns should equal the Types of Intellectual Contributions columns.

*After each group of faculty, in the two columns on the right, please indicate the percentage of participating faculty and percentage of total full time equivalent (FTE) faculty producing ICs. Intellectual contributions for faculty who are included on Table 15-1 should be included. Peer-reviewed journals and editorial board reviewed journals should be included. Include all faculty employed during the year of record. Do not include faculty who are no longer employed and have left during the reporting period, or will be joining the faculty in the future.

Notes: Please add a footnote to this table summarizing the school's policies guiding faculty in the production of intellectual contributions. The data must also be supported by analysis of impact/accomplishments and depth of participation by faculty across disciplines. The data presented in Table 2-1 should be supported by faculty vitae that provide sufficient detail to link individual citations to the information presented here. Interdisciplinary outcomes may be presented in a separate category but the disciplines involved should be identified.

Table 2-2:
Five-Year Summary of Peer- and Editorial-Reviewed Journals and Number of Publications in Each

Based on the data in Table 2-1, provide a five-year summary of peer- and editorial-reviewed journals (by name) and the number or publications appearing in each. The number of publications ~~should~~ must reflect an unduplicated count for co-authored publications.

Please organize by organizational structure of the school's faculty (e.g., departments, research groups) in the same manner as Table 2-1. Please split fractionally for co-authorship among faculty employed by the school such that each publication is counted only once.

<u>Peer- and Editorial-Reviewed Journals (by Organizational Structure)</u>	<u>Number of Publications⁵</u>
<u>Grand Total</u>	

⁵To represent co-authors, please list the number of publications and the number of authors from the college in parentheses. Provide the number of publications and in parentheses provide the number of faculty involved. For example, if 5 articles were published in the Journal of Marketing Science and 7 faculty members were involved, this would be presented as 5 (7).

Standard 3: The school has financial strategies to provide resources appropriate to, and sufficient for, achieving its mission and action items. [FINANCIAL STRATEGIES AND ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES]

Basis for Judgment

- The school has realistic financial strategies to provide, sustain, and improve quality business education. The financial model must support high-quality degree programs for all teaching and learning delivery modes.
- The school has adequate financial resources to provide infrastructure to fit its activities (e.g., campus-based learning, distance learning, research, and executive education). Classrooms, offices, laboratories, communications and information technology equipment and services, and other basic facilities are adequate for high-quality operations.
- The school has adequate financial resources to provide support services for students, including academic advising and career development, and for faculty, including instructional support and professional development.
- The school has adequate financial resources to provide technology support for students and faculty appropriate to its programs (e.g., online learning and classroom simulations) and intellectual contribution expectations (e.g., databases and data analysis software).
- The school has adequate financial resources to support high-quality faculty intellectual contributions and their impact in accordance with its mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.
- The school identifies realistic sources of financial resources for current and planned activities. The school has analyzed carefully the costs and potential resources for initiatives associated with its mission and action items.

Guidance for Documentation

- Describe the business school's financial resources and strategies for sustaining those resources, demonstrating they are capable of supporting, sustaining, and improving quality consistent with the mission of the school. Provide an analysis of trend in resources over the past five-years, especially in light of different cost structures depending on the teaching and learning models employed.
- Describe the contingency planning process that the school would use, should a reduction in resources occur. The school should be prepared to discuss the specifics of this planning process and expected outcomes with the peer review team.
- Describe the financial support for all major strategic activities (e.g., degree programs, intellectual contributions, and other mission components).
- Describe the school's financial support for student advising and placement, student and faculty technology, and faculty intellectual contributions and professional development.
- Describe how the resources or financial model have changed in the past five years and any substantial changes anticipated for the next five years.
- In alignment with the school's financial resources, show the sources of funding for the three to four most significant major initiatives using a table similar to the one on the next page.

The table outlines the school's major initiatives, the implementation timetable, and funding sources. The initiatives identified must be clearly linked to the school's mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies and reflect substantive actions that support mission success, impact, and innovation. This information allows a peer review team to understand what planning the school has done and how this planning fits with the school's mission, financial resources, and strategies. The school should append to the table narrative explanations of how

these action items will enhance mission fulfillment and whether they could necessitate revisions to the mission.

University of Pirsig School of Business Financial Support for Strategic Initiatives				
Initiative	Start Date	First-Year Cost or Revenue	Continuing Annual Cost or Revenue	Source or Disposition of Funds
Faculty release time for curriculum development	September 20XX	150,000 USD	100,000 USD	Commitment for entire amount through June 20XX from the ABC Foundation
Center for Regional Economic Forecasting	January 20XX	500,000 USD	425,000 USD	Three-year commitment from the XYZ Foundation, then self-sustained with endowment
Implement specialized Master's program	September 20XX	Net positive 250,000 USD	Net positive 350,000 USD	Tuition, self-funding
Reconfiguration of classrooms and student areas, technology enhancements	July 20XX	2,500,000 USD	500,000 USD	First year expenses allocated from university capital budget. On-going costs budgeted within School of Business annual operating budget.

PARTICIPANTS – STUDENTS, FACULTY, AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Participants (the students, faculty, and professional staff of a school) are critical to the achievement of a school's mission. Students who are matched to the expectations of degree programs—as well as prepared and supported to achieve those expectations—are essential for successful educational programs. Professional staff members facilitate and support learning and provide essential services for students and faculty. Faculty resources develop and manage curricula and teach students, as well as produce intellectual contributions that advance the knowledge, practice, and teaching of business and management. Diversity in people and ideas enhances the educational experience in every business education program. Accordingly, the following standards focus on the admission, support, and progression of students, as well as on the deployment of sufficient faculty and professional staff to support mission achievement.

In identifying faculty resources, a school should focus on the participation and work of faculty members. Faculty contractual relationships, title, tenure status, full-time or part-time status, etc., can help to explain and document the work of faculty, but these factors are not perfectly correlated with participation or with the most critical variables in assessing faculty sufficiency, deployment, and qualifications. What is most important is that the production and maintenance of faculty's intellectual capital (as framed in Standard 15) bring currency and relevance to a business school's programs and support its mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.

These standards also recognize that with the advent of different program delivery models, certain responsibilities once managed exclusively by those traditionally considered "faculty" may now be shared or managed by others. That is, developing curricula, creating instructional materials, delivering classroom lectures, regardless of the medium, tutoring small groups of students, conducting and grading student papers, etc., may be conducted by traditional faculty, by nontraditional faculty, or by a team of diverse individuals. Regardless of the blend of faculty and other key members of the business school's team, the critical issue is ensuring quality outcomes. Therefore, the school under review must make its case that its division of labor across faculty and staff, as well as its supporting policies, procedures, and infrastructure, deliver high-quality learning outcomes in the context of the teaching/learning models it employs. In addition, the school must ensure that faculty and professional staff members are sufficient to support research outcomes and other mission-related activities, and that policies, procedures, and feedback mechanisms exist to provide evidence that all participants in these activities produce outcomes of quality and embrace continuous improvement. Where there are problems, evidence of corrective actions is essential.

Standard 4: Policies and procedures for student admissions, as well as those that ensure academic progression toward degree completion, and supporting career development, are clear, effective, consistently applied, and aligned with the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. [STUDENT ADMISSIONS, PROGRESSION, AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT]

Basis for Judgment

- Policies and procedures related to student admissions to degree programs are clear, effective, and transparent to all participants in the process, and are consistent with the mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies of the school.
- Normally, graduate business degree program admission criteria should include, among other requirements, the expectation that applicants have or will earn a bachelor's degree prior to admission to the graduate program. The school should be prepared to document how exceptions support quality in the graduate business degree program.

- The school prepares and supports students to ensure academic progression towards degree completion, including clear and effective academic performance standards and processes, consistent with degree program learning goals. The school has clearly articulated policies and processes to:
 - Prepare students to learn to employ the modalities and pedagogies of degree programs.
 - Evaluate student progress.
 - Provide early identification of retention and progression issues.
 - Intervene with support, where appropriate.
 - Separate students from programs, if necessary.
- The school provides effective career development support for students and graduates consistent with degree program expectations and the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.
- In addition to public disclosure information required by national or regional accreditors, schools provide reliable information to the public on their performance including student achievement information as determined by the school. Examples of such information include: attrition and retention rates; graduation rates; job placement outcomes; certification or licensure exam results; and employment advancement. This information should be available on the school's website as well as by other means determined by the school.

Guidance for Documentation

- Describe admissions policies and processes, demonstrate that they are consistent with program expectations and the mission of the school, and show that they are transparent to all participants.
- Document and explain how the characteristics of the current student body for each degree program are the result of the application of admission policies and processes that are consistent with the school's mission and expected outcomes. If exceptions are made, provide justification and basis for quality.
- Describe efforts to achieve diversity in the current student body.
- Describe and provide evidence that the school's policies and procedures successfully prepare admitted students to make use of the teaching and learning model(s) employed.
- Document and demonstrate the effectiveness of current policies and procedures to ensure academic progression toward degree completion, including standards for academic performance, as well as to ensure integrity of student participation and appraisal in degree programs. Examples of evidence may include data on the completion rates in degree programs relative to the normal expected time-to-degree expectations, the number of students identified with retention issues, the interventions undertaken, and the number of students separated over the last academic year.
- Document processes and demonstrate the effectiveness of career development support that is consistent with degree program expectations and the mission of the school. Examples of evidence may include job acceptance rates for graduates over the most recent five-year period as well as case examples of successful graduates.
- Document school performance and student achievement information on an annual basis, and document how this information is made available to the public via web sites and other means on an annual basis.

Standard 5: The school maintains and deploys a faculty sufficient to ensure quality outcomes across the range of degree programs it offers and to achieve other components of its mission. Students in all programs, disciplines, locations, and delivery modes have the opportunity to receive instruction from appropriately qualified faculty. [FACULTY SUFFICIENCY AND DEPLOYMENT]

Definitions

- A participating faculty member actively and deeply engages in the activities of the school in matters beyond direct teaching responsibilities. Such matters might include policy decisions, advising, research, and service commitments. The faculty member may participate in the governance of the school and be eligible to serve as a member on appropriate committees responsible for academic policymaking and/or other decisions. The individual may participate in a variety of non-class activities, such as directing an extracurricular activity, providing academic and career advising, and representing the school on institutional committees. Normally, the school considers participating faculty members to be long-term members of the faculty, regardless of whether or not their appointments are of a full-time or part-time nature, whether or not their position with the school is considered the faculty member's principal employment, and whether or not the school has tenure policies. The individual may be eligible for, and participate in, faculty development activities and have non-teaching assignments, such as advising, as appropriate to the faculty role the school has defined, taking into consideration the depth and breadth of the non-teaching assignment.
- A supporting faculty member does not, as a rule, participate in the intellectual or operational life of the school beyond the direct performance of teaching responsibilities. Usually, a supporting faculty member does not have deliberative or involvement rights on faculty issues, membership on faculty committees, or assigned responsibilities beyond direct teaching functions (e.g., classroom and office hours). Normally, a supporting faculty member's appointment is on an ad hoc basis—for one term or one academic year without the expectation of continuation—and is exclusively for teaching responsibilities.

Basis for Judgment

- A school adopts and applies criteria for documenting faculty members as "participating" or "supporting" that are consistent with its mission. The interpretive material in the standard provides guidance only. Each school should adapt this guidance to its particular situation and mission by developing and implementing criteria that indicate how the school is meeting the spirit and intent of the standard. The criteria should address:
 - The activities that are required to attain participating 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 depth and breadth of activities expected within a typical AACSB accreditation review cycle to maintain participating status.The criteria should be periodically reviewed and reflect a focus on continuous improvement.
- Depending on the teaching and learning models and associated division of labor across faculty and professional staff, the faculty is sufficient in numbers and presence to perform or oversee the following functions related to degree programs:
 - Curriculum development: A process exists to engage multidisciplinary expertise in the creation, monitoring, evaluation, and revision of curricula.

- Course development: A process exists to engage content specialists in choosing and creating the learning goals, learning experiences, media, instructional materials, and learning assessments for each course, module, or session.
- Course delivery: A process exists for ensuring access to instruction from appropriately qualified faculty and staff at the course level.
- Assessment and assurance of learning: The obligations specified in the assurance of learning processes for the school are met.
- Other activities that support the instructional goals of the school's mission.
- Faculty also should be sufficient to ensure achievement of all other mission activities. This includes high-quality and impactful intellectual contributions and, when applicable, executive education, community service, institutional service, service in academic organizations, service that supports economic development, organizational consulting, and other expectations the school holds for faculty members.
- Normally, participating faculty members will deliver at least 75 percent of the school's teaching (whether measured by credit hours, contact hours, or another metric appropriate to the school).
- Normally, participating faculty members will deliver at least 60 percent of the teaching in each discipline, academic program, location, and delivery mode.
- Participating faculty are distributed across programs, disciplines, locations, and delivery modes consistent with the school's mission.
- If the school adopts a faculty model that relies on different levels of support or different means of deployment of faculty and professional staff for classroom instruction (e.g., senior faculty teaching large classes supported by a cadre of teaching assistants) the school must document how the model supports high-quality academic programs and meets the student-faculty interaction standard.
- In cases where a substantial proportion of a business school's faculty resources hold primary faculty appointments with other institutions, the school must provide documentation of how this faculty model supports mission achievement, overall high quality, and continuous improvement and how this model is consistent with the spirit and intent of this standard. In particular, the school must show that the faculty model is consistent with achieving the research expectations of the school.

Guidance for Documentation

- Provide the school's criteria for documenting faculty members as "participating" or "supporting" and demonstrate that it is applied consistently in ways that align with its mission.
- Describe the division of labor across faculty and professional staff for each of the teaching and learning models employed. The division of labor should address the design, delivery/facilitation, assessment, and improvement of degree programs.
- Describe the faculty complement available to fulfill the school's mission and all instructional programs they staff in the most recently completed academic year.
- Demonstrate that the faculty is sufficient to fulfill the functions of curriculum development, course development, course delivery, and assurance of learning for degree programs in the context of the teaching and learning models employed and division of labor across faculty and professional staff.
- Describe alternative instructional models, such as lead teachers supported by teaching assistants, tutors, instructors, or other support staff. Provide evidence that describes how such models result in high quality outcomes.

- If the school offers a joint and/or dual degree with another institution, the faculty from the partner institution teaching courses in the curriculum for the home institution's degree must be included in Tables 15-1 and 15-2.

- Demonstrate that the faculty complement is also sufficient to ensure achievement of all other mission activities. This includes high-quality and impactful intellectual contributions and, when applicable, executive education, community service, institutional service, service in academic organizations, service that supports economic development, organizational consulting, and other expectations the school holds for faculty members. It also could include academic assistance, academic advising, career advising, and other related activities if applicable to the school.
- Demonstrate that students have access and exposure to diverse perspectives from faculty.
- Table 15-1 should be completed to document the deployment of participating and supporting faculty for the most recently completed, normal academic year. Peer review teams may request documentation for additional years; for individual terms; or by program, location, disciplines, and/or delivery modes.

Standard 6: The school has well-documented and well-communicated processes to manage and support faculty members over the progression of their careers that are consistent with the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. [FACULTY MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT]

Basis for Judgment

- Faculty management processes systematically assign faculty responsibilities to individuals. These processes fulfill the school's mission while setting realistic expectations for individual faculty members.
- The school communicates performance expectations to faculty members clearly and in a manner that allows timely performance.
- Faculty assignments may reflect differences in expectations for different faculty members. However, workloads from all activities are reasonably distributed across all faculty members.
- Faculty evaluation, promotion, and reward processes are systematic and support the school's mission.
- The school has effective processes for providing orientation, guidance, mentoring, and inclusive practices for faculty.
- In an alternative delivery model, describe how teaching assistants, tutors, or other staff are managed and supported.
- The school has an overall faculty resource plan that reflects its mission and that projects faculty resource requirements and anticipated resource actions.
- Policies guiding faculty scholarship should be clear and consistent with the mission and with expected outcomes from intellectual contributions.
- Faculty evaluation and performance systems recognize and include intellectual contributions outcomes in the assessment of faculty performance.

Guidance for Documentation

- Describe processes for assigning faculty responsibilities to individuals.
- Describe processes for determining performance expectations for faculty.
- Describe evaluation, promotion, and reward processes, as well as ways that faculty are engaged in these processes.
- Describe processes for orientation, guidance, and mentoring of faculty, including for individuals who support alternative delivery models.
- Describe processes and practices that advance diversity and inclusion among faculty.

- Describe the overall faculty resource plan.
- Document that intellectual contributions are incorporated into the assessment of faculty performance.

Standard 7: The school maintains and deploys professional staff and/or services sufficient to ensure quality outcomes across the range of degree programs it offers and to achieve other components of its mission. [PROFESSIONAL STAFF SUFFICIENCY AND DEPLOYMENT]

Definitions

- Professional staff and/or services provide direct support for learning, instructional development, the deployment and use of informational technology, the production and impact of intellectual contributions, the strategic management and advancement of the school, and other key mission components, but they do not have faculty appointments. It is not required that professional staff be permanent staff of the school or the institution.

Basis for Judgment

- Depending on the teaching and learning models employed and the associated division of labor across faculty and professional staff, professional staff and services are sufficient to support student learning, instructional development, and information technology for degree programs.
- Professional staff must also be sufficient to provide for intellectual contributions and their impact, student academic assistance and advising, career advising and placement, alumni relations, public relations, fundraising, student admissions, and executive education, as well as other mission related activities.
- Processes for managing and developing professional staff and services are well-defined and effective.
- The organizational structure of the business school is consistent with mission, expected outcomes, and strategies and supports mission achievement.
- Student support services are sufficient and available, but may be provided by staff, faculty members, or a combination, and may be located within or outside the school.

Guidance for Documentation

- Describe the overall resource plan related to professional staff and services, including the organization and deployment of professional staff across mission-related activities.
- Demonstrate that professional staff and services are sufficient to support student learning, instructional development, and information technology for degree programs.
- Show that professional staff and services are sufficient to provide for intellectual contributions and their impact, student academic assistance and advising, career advising and placement, alumni relations, public relations, fundraising, student admissions, and executive education, as well as other mission related activities, depending on the organization.
- Document management processes—including hiring practices, development, and evaluation systems for professional staff—that support diversity of people and perspectives, and ensure high-quality outcomes relative to mission and strategies.

LEARNING AND TEACHING

High-quality business schools have processes for determining for each degree program, learning goals that are relevant and appropriate, as well as for designing and delivering curricula to maximize the potential for achieving the expected outcomes. Subsequently, these schools have systems in place to assess whether learning goals have been met. If learning goals are not met, these schools have processes in place to improve. The first standard in this section addresses these processes.

If curriculum management processes are working well, the peer review team will expect to observe a number of general characteristics or attributes of the curriculum:

- Curricula address general content areas—skills and knowledge—that would normally be included in the type of degree program under consideration. While most skill areas are likely to remain consistently important over time, knowledge areas are likely to be more dynamic as theory and practice of business and management changes over time.
- Curricula facilitate and encourage active student engagement in learning. In addition to time on task related to readings, course participation, knowledge development, projects, and assignments, students engage in experiential and active learning designed to be inclusive for diverse students, and to improve skills and the application of knowledge in practice.
- Curricula facilitate and encourage frequent, productive student-student and student-faculty interaction designed to achieve learning goals. Successful teaching and learning demand high levels of interaction between and among learners, as well as between and among teachers and learners.
- Educational programs are structured to ensure consistent, high-quality education for the same degree programs, regardless of differences and changes in technology and delivery modes. This commitment to consistent high quality is especially important in light of pressures to shorten time to degree completion, as well as to reduce the time allotted for learning, interaction, engagement, and skill development.

The standards in this section address these critical areas of teaching and learning.

Standard 8: The school uses well-documented, systematic processes for determining and revising degree program learning goals; designing, delivering, and improving degree program curricula to achieve learning goals; and demonstrating that degree program learning goals have been met. [CURRICULA MANAGEMENT AND ASSURANCE OF LEARNING]

Definitions

- Learning goals state the educational expectations for each degree program. They specify the intellectual and behavioral competencies a program is intended to instill. In defining these goals, the faculty members clarify how they intend for graduates to be competent and effective as a result of completing the program.
- A curriculum maps out how the school facilitates achievement of program learning goals. It is defined by content (theories, concepts, skills, etc.), pedagogies (teaching methods, delivery modes), and structures (how the content is organized and sequenced to create a systematic, integrated program of teaching and learning). A curriculum is also influenced by the mission, values, and culture of the school.

- Assurance of learning refers to processes for demonstrating that students achieve learning expectations for the programs in which they participate. Schools use assurance of learning to demonstrate accountability and assure external constituents, such as potential students, trustees, public officials, supporters, and accrediting organizations, that the school meets its goals. Assurance of learning also assists the school and faculty members to improve programs and courses. By measuring learning, the school can evaluate its students' success at achieving learning goals, use the measures to plan improvement efforts, and (depending on the type of measures) provide feedback and guidance for individual students. For assurance of learning purposes, AACSB accreditation is concerned with broad, program-level focused learning goals for each degree program, rather than detailed learning goals by course or topic, which must be the responsibility of individual faculty members.
- Curricula management refers to the school's processes and organization for development, design, and implementation of each degree program's structure, organization, content, assessment of outcomes, pedagogy, etc. Curricula management captures input from key business school stakeholders and is influenced by assurance of learning results, new developments in business practices and issues, revision of mission and strategy that relate to new areas of instruction, etc.

Basis for Judgment

- Learning goals derive from and are consonant with the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. Curricula management processes are guided by the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. Curricula management processes align curricula for all programs with the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.
- Learning goals and curricula reflect currency of knowledge. Appropriately qualified faculty members are involved in all aspects of curricula management, including the determination of learning goals and the design and ongoing revision of degree program content, pedagogies, and structure to achieve learning goals. The peer review team expects to see evidence of curricula improvement based on a systematic assurance of learning process.
- Depending on the teaching/learning models and the division of labor, curricula management facilitates faculty-faculty and faculty-staff interactions and engagement to support development and management of both curricula and the learning process.
- Learning goals and curricula reflect expectations of stakeholders. Schools incorporate perspectives from stakeholders, including organizations employing graduates, alumni, students, the university community, policy makers, etc., into curricula management processes.
- Learning goals are achieved. Systematic processes support assurance of learning and produce a portfolio of evidence demonstrating achievement of learning goals. These processes also produce a portfolio of documented improvements based on collected evidence. The school provides a portfolio of evidence for each business degree program to demonstrate that students meet the learning goals. Or, if assessment demonstrates that students are not meeting the learning goals, the school has instituted efforts to eliminate the discrepancy.
- Evidence of recent curricula development, review, or revision demonstrates the effectiveness of curricula/program management.
- Results of regular assessment activities should be reflected in changes to program curriculum.

Guidance for Documentation

- Describe processes for determining and revising learning goals, curricula management, and assurance of learning. Discuss mission, faculty, and stakeholder involvement in these processes.
- Show how curricula management processes have produced new or revised curricula for degree programs, describing the source of information that supports the new or revised program development.
- Discuss and provide evidence of faculty-faculty and faculty-staff interaction in curricula management processes.
- List the learning goals for each business degree program—this list should include both conceptual and operational definitions. Also, provide curriculum maps and assessment schedule, demonstrating regular assessment of learning goals.
- Provide a portfolio of evidence, including direct assessment of student learning, showing that students meet all of the learning goals for each business degree program. Or, if assessment demonstrates that students are not meeting learning goals, describe efforts that the unit has instituted to eliminate the discrepancy. Indirect assessments (e.g., employer satisfaction or alumni surveys, etc.) may be used as part of the portfolio of evidence, to provide contextual information for direct assessment or information for continuous improvement.
- If the business school is subject to formalized regulations or quality assessment processes focused on the evaluation of student performance, and these processes are consistent with AACSB expectations and best practices, they may be applied to demonstrate assurance of learning. The burden of proof is on the school to document that these systems support effective continuous improvement in student performance and outcomes.

Standard 9: Curriculum content is appropriate to general expectations for the degree program type and learning goals. [CURRICULUM CONTENT]

Definitions

- Curriculum content refers to theories, ideas, concepts, skills, knowledge, etc., that make up a degree program. Content is not the same as learning goals. Learning goals describe the knowledge and skills students should develop in a program and set expectations for what students should do with the knowledge and skills after completing a program. Not all content areas need to be included as learning goals.

Basis for Judgment

- Contents of degree program curricula that result from effective curricula management processes normally include generally accepted sets of learning experiences to prepare graduates for business and management careers.
- Normally, curricula management processes result in curricula that address the broadly-defined skill and knowledge content areas described by the program types listed below. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive of all the areas that a curriculum should cover; in fact, the lists below are purposely general. It is up to schools to translate these general areas into expected competencies consistent with the degree program learning goals, students served, etc.

Bachelor's Degree Programs and Higher

All general management and specialist degree programs at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral level would normally include learning experiences that address the following general

skill areas and general business and management skill areas (higher level of mastery for master's and doctoral programs is expected):

General Skill Areas

- Written and oral communication (able to communicate effectively orally and in writing)
- Ethical understanding and reasoning (able to identify ethical issues and address the issues in a socially responsible manner)
- Analytical thinking (able to analyze and frame problems)
- ~~Information technology (able to use current technologies in business and management contexts)~~
- Interpersonal relations and teamwork (able to work effectively with others and in team environments)
- Diverse and multicultural work environments (able to work effectively in diverse environments)
- Reflective thinking (able to understand oneself in the context of society)
- ~~Application of knowledge (able to translate knowledge of business and management into practice)~~
- Integration of real-world business experiences

General Business Knowledge Areas

- Economic, political, regulatory, legal, technological, and social contexts of organizations in a global society
- Social responsibility, including sustainability, diversity and ethical behavior and approaches to management
- Financial theories, analysis, reporting, and markets
- Systems and processes in organizations, including planning and design, production/operations, supply chains, marketing, and distribution
- Group and individual behaviors in organizations and society
- Other specified areas of study related to concentrations, majors, or emphasis areas

Technology Agility

- Evidence-based decision making that integrates current and emerging technologies, including the application of statistical tools and statistical techniques, data management, data analytics and information technology throughout the curriculum as appropriate.
- ~~Student experiences integrate real-world business strategies, Ethical use and dissemination of data, including privacy and security of data, privacy and security concerns, ethical issues, data management, data analytics, technology-driven changes in the work environment, and the complexities of decision making.~~
- Understanding of the role of technology in society, including behavioral implications of technology in the workplace
- Demonstration of technology agility and a "learn to learn" mindset, including the ability to rapidly adapt to new technologies.
- Demonstration of higher-order cognitive skills to analyze an unstructured problem, formulate and develop a solution using appropriate technology, and effectively communicate the results to stakeholders.

General Business Master's Degree Programs

In addition to the general skill and knowledge areas, general business master's degree programs would normally include learning experiences in the following areas:

- Leading in organizational situations
- Managing in a diverse global context
- Thinking creatively
- Making sound decisions and exercising good judgment under uncertainty
- Integrating knowledge across fields

Specialized Business Master's Degree Programs

In addition to the general skill areas, specialized business master's degree programs would normally include learning experiences in the following areas:

- Understanding the specified discipline from multiple perspectives
- Framing problems and developing creative solutions in the specialized discipline
- Applying specialized knowledge in a diverse global context (for practice-oriented degrees) or
- Conducting high-quality research (for research-oriented degrees)

Doctorate Degree Programs

In addition to the general skill and knowledge areas and additional learning experiences for specialized master's degrees, doctoral degree programs normally would include:

- Advanced research skills for the areas of specialization leading to an original substantive research project
- Understanding of managerial and organizational contexts for areas of specialization
- Preparation for faculty responsibilities in higher education, including but not limited to teaching

Doctoral degrees normally would also include learning experiences appropriate to the type of research emphasized, as follows:

Programs emphasizing advanced foundational discipline-based research in an area of specialization:

- Deep knowledge of scholarly literature in areas of specialization

Programs emphasizing rigorous research for application to practice in a specified discipline:

- Understanding the scholarly literature across a range of business and management disciplines
- Preparation for careers applying research to practice

Guidance for Documentation

- Describe learning experiences appropriate to the areas listed in the basis for judgment, including how the areas are defined and fit into the curriculum.

- If a curriculum does not include learning experiences normally expected for the degree program type, explain why.

Standard 10: Curricula facilitate student-faculty and student-student interactions appropriate to the program type and achievement of learning goals. [STUDENT-FACULTY INTERACTIONS]

Basis for Judgment

- The level and quality of sustained, documented student-student and student-faculty interactions are consistent with the degree program type and achievement of learning goals. For any teaching/learning model employed, students have opportunities to work together on some learning tasks and learn from each other in an inclusive environment.
- Student-faculty interactions involve all types of faculty members, particularly those faculty members who have primary responsibilities for program development, course development, course delivery, and evaluation. For any teaching/learning model employed, students have access to content experts (for instruction, dialogue, and feedback) in curricula and extracurricular situations for instruction.
- Curricula design and documented activities support alignment with the spirit and intent of the standard.

Guidance for Documentation

- Describe how curricula include opportunities for student-student and student-faculty interaction to facilitate learning across program types and delivery modes. Required and voluntary opportunities for interaction may be measured by review of syllabi, classroom observation, or other appropriate means.
- Summarize how student-student and student-faculty interactions are supported, encouraged, and documented across program types and delivery modes. Describe how the associated division of labor across faculty and professional staff supports these interactions. Demonstrate that all students have access to relevant content and learning process expertise.
- Document how student-student and student-faculty interactions are assessed for impact and quality across program types and delivery modes.
- Provide analysis of how the interactions are aligned with mission and the degree program portfolio.

Standard 11: Degree program structure and design, including the normal time-to-degree, are appropriate to the level of the degree program and ensure achievement of high-quality learning outcomes. Programs resulting in the same degree credential are structured and designed to ensure equivalence. [DEGREE PROGRAM EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, STRUCTURE, AND EQUIVALENCE]

Definitions

- Normal time-to-degree reflects the period of time (years, terms, etc.) that is customary to complete a full-time degree program. Local, provincial, or national norms, as well as the practice of other AACSB-accredited institutions, provide guidance to establish what constitutes normal time-to-degree.
- Teaching/learning models include traditional face-to-face classroom models, distance (online) models, blended models that employ face-to-face and distance (online) components, other forms of technologically enhanced instruction, or any other form of instructional methodology.

Basis for Judgment

- Degree programs are structured and designed to support the content coverage, rigor, interactions, and engagement that are normally expected at this level of study. Expectations may vary dependent on the educational practices and structures in different world regions and cultures.
- Expectations for student effort for the same degree credentials are equivalent in terms of depth and rigor, regardless of delivery mode or location. The school is responsible for establishing, supporting, and maintaining the quality of learning that students must demonstrate to satisfy degree requirements, regardless of delivery mode or location.
- Normally, the majority of learning in traditional business subjects counted toward degree fulfillment (as determined by credits, contact hours, or other metrics) is earned through the institution awarding the degree.
- The school defines and broadly disseminates its policies for evaluating, awarding, and accepting transfer credits/courses from other institutions. These policies are consistent with its mission, expected outcomes, strategies, and degree programs. These policies should ensure that the academic work accepted from other institutions is comparable to the academic work required for the school's own degree programs.
- Competency based education (CBE) allows students to progress at their own pace, based on their ability to demonstrate proficiency with a specific skill or competency. CBE is categorized into two types: course/credit-based and direct assessment. Direct assessment CBE allows a student to receive credit toward a degree if they can demonstrate mastery of a competency. If competency-based education (CBE) credit is awarded, normally the equivalent quality, including credit for prior learning, is assured via direct assessment of students. CBE credit should normally reflect a small percentage of the total academic program.
- If the school awards a business degree as part of a joint/partnership degree program, the expectation that the majority of business subjects counted toward degree fulfillment is earned at the institution awarding the degree can be met through the agreements supporting the joint/partnership degree program. However, in such joint programmatic efforts, the school must demonstrate that appropriate quality control provisions are included in the cooperative agreements and that these agreements are functioning to ensure high quality and continuous improvement. Such agreements should address and ensure that the joint/partnership programs: demonstrate mission alignment in the content they offer and the students they serve; have student admission criteria that are consistent for all students admitted by all partner institutions; deploy sufficient and qualified faculty at all partner institutions; and implement curricula management processes, including assurance of learning processes, which function for the entire program, including components delivered by partner or collaborating institutions. Furthermore, the school should demonstrate appropriate, ongoing oversight and engagement in managing such programs. If such joint degree programs involve partners that do not hold AACSB accreditation, quality and continuous improvement must be demonstrated.

Guidance for Documentation

- Show that degree program structure and design expectations are appropriate to the level of degree programs, regardless of delivery mode or location.
- Demonstrate that expectations across educational programs that result in the same degree credentials are equivalent, regardless of delivery mode, location, or time to completion. Schools should document this equivalence with direct assessment of student performance as part of the Assurance of Learning system, results and analysis.

- Schools will be expected to describe the amount of effort normally required to complete the degree. The descriptive characteristics will differ by the pedagogical and delivery characteristics of the degree. Traditional, campus-based education may be described by contact hours, credit hours, or course equivalencies. Distance learning programs may require other metrics and may depend more heavily on demonstration of achievement of learning outcomes. The school should assist accreditation reviewers by clarifying the delivery modes and the kinds and extent of student effort involved in degree programs and by demonstrating that the spirit and intent of these standards are met by such programs.

Standard 12: The school has policies and processes to enhance the teaching effectiveness of faculty and professional staff involved with teaching across the range of its educational programs and delivery modes. [TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS]

Basis for Judgment

- The school has a systematic process for evaluating quality as an integral component of the faculty and professional staff performance review process. This process should extend beyond student evaluations of teaching and include expectations for continuous improvement.
- The school provides development activities focused on teaching enhancement to all faculty members, appropriate professional staff, and graduate students who have teaching responsibilities across all delivery modes.
- Faculty are adequately prepared to teach while employing the modalities and pedagogies of degree programs.
- Faculty are adequately prepared to teach diverse students and perspectives in an inclusive environment
- Faculty and professional staff substantially participate in teaching enhancement activities.

Guidance for Documentation

- Describe how faculty and professional staff teach while employing the modalities and pedagogies of degree programs, as well as provide evidence of the effectiveness of their delivery and preparation. Discuss how the school ensures that the faculty and professional staff engaged in different teaching/learning models have the competencies required for achieving quality.
- Describe how the school evaluates teaching performance across its various program delivery models and how this process affects faculty and related professional staff.
- Describe continuous improvement and development initiatives for faculty and professional staff that focus on teaching enhancement and student learning for a diverse student body. Document faculty and staff participation in these initiatives over the past five years.
- Summarize awards or other recognitions that faculty and professional staff have received for outstanding teaching and professional support of student learning.
- Document innovative and/or effective teaching practices that have had significant, positive impact on student learning.

ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL ENGAGEMENT

Business schools are professional schools in that they exist at the intersection of theory and practice. In this context, it is important for a school to be firmly grounded in both the academic study and the professional practice of business and management. Business schools can achieve effective business education and impactful research by striking different balances between academic study and professional engagement. However, if schools largely ignore one side or the other, both their degree programs and scholarly output will suffer. Accreditation should encourage an appropriate balance and integration of academic and professional engagement consistent with quality in the context of a school's mission.

Most important, academic study and professional engagement within a business school are not separate activities; rather, they intersect in significant ways. This section of the accreditation standards is designed to foster such integration and intersection in ways that are appropriate to the mission of the school. It identifies three critical activities that help schools connect theory and practice: (a) the teaching and learning activities fostered by degree program curricula that highlight the importance of student engagement and experiential learning; (b) executive education activities; and (c) the initial preparation, development, and ongoing engagement activities of faculty.

Standard 13: Curricula facilitate student academic and professional engagement appropriate to the degree program type and learning goals. [STUDENT ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL ENGAGEMENT]

Definitions

- Student academic and professional engagement occurs when students are actively involved in their educational experiences, in both academic and professional settings, and when they are able to connect these experiences in meaningful ways.

Basis for Judgment

- For any teaching and learning model employed, students give the appropriate attention and dedication to the learning materials and maintain their engagement with these materials even when challenged by difficult learning activities.
- For any teaching and learning model employed, degree program curricula include approaches that actively engage and include all students in learning. Many pedagogical approaches are suitable for challenging students in this way—problem-based learning, projects, simulations, etc.
- For any teaching and learning model employed, the school provides a portfolio of experiential learning opportunities for business students, through either formal coursework or extracurricular activities, which allow them to engage with faculty and active business leaders. These experiential learning activities provide exposure to business and management in both local and diverse global contexts.
- While all curricula should facilitate both academic and professional engagement, the amount and balance depend on a variety of factors, including degree program type, expected outcomes, and experience levels of incoming students.
- Students are able to connect their academic and professional experiences in meaningful ways consistent with the degree program type and learning goals.

Guidance for Documentation

- Document curricula approaches that actively engage and include students in academic learning across program types and teaching/learning models employed. The outcomes of the learning process in the form of projects, papers, presentations, examination performances, and other demonstrations of learning, should show clear evidence of significant active student engagement in learning.
- Document experiential learning activities that provide business students with knowledge of and experience in the local and global practice of business and management across program types and teaching/learning models employed. These experiential learning activities may include field trips, internships, consulting projects, field research, interdisciplinary projects, extracurricular activities, etc.
- Demonstrate that approaches to academic and professional engagement are sufficient for and consistent with the degree program type and learning goals.

Standard 14: If applicable, executive education (activities not leading to a degree) complements teaching and learning in degree programs and intellectual contributions. The school has appropriate processes to ensure high quality in meeting client expectations and continuous improvement in executive education programs.
[EXECUTIVE EDUCATION]

Definitions

- Executive education involves educational activities that do not lead to a degree but have educational objectives at a level consistent with higher education in management. Examples include corporate training or professional development seminars.

Basis for Judgment

- This standard is applicable if executive education is an important part of the mission, strategy, and educational activities of the school. Although there is no pre-established minimum to be considered “significant” or “material,” normally if five percent or more of total school annual resources are generated from executive education as defined above, this standard should be addressed. A school may request that executive education be included in the accreditation review if it is less than five percent or excluded from the accreditation review if it is more. A school should justify such a request.
- The school’s involvement in executive education enhances the quality of student learning in degree programs and supports the generation of intellectual contributions from faculty. Similarly, executive education is enhanced by the degree program and scholarly activities.
- As a significant point of professional engagement, the school has effective processes to determine the extent to which client expectations are met and to identify and develop opportunities for improvement.

Guidance for Documentation

- Describe the portfolio of executive education programs, identifying who the intended audiences are, what levels of education the members of this audience possess, how the program portfolio is aligned with the school’s mission and strategy, and how the executive education program makes a contribution to mission achievement.
- Discuss how the school’s executive education programs, degree programs, and intellectual contributions complement each other, giving examples when appropriate.
- Where executive education participation leads to opportunities for degree program admission, document the process and provide evidence of the success of degree program graduates admitted through this process.

- Describe processes for ensuring that client expectations are met consistently, summarize feedback from these processes, and demonstrate the impact of these processes on enhancing executive education programs.

Standard 15: The school maintains and strategically deploys participating and supporting faculty who collectively and individually demonstrate significant academic and professional engagement that sustains the intellectual capital necessary to support high-quality outcomes consistent with the school's mission and strategies. [FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT]

Definitions

- Initial academic preparation is assessed by earned degrees and other academic credentials. Initial professional experience is assessed by the nature, level, and duration of leadership and management position(s) in the practice of business and/or other types of organizational work.
- Sustained academic and professional engagement is combined with initial academic preparation and initial professional experience to maintain and augment qualifications (i.e., currency and relevance in the field of teaching) of a faculty member over time.
 - Academic engagement reflects faculty scholarly development activities that support integration of relevant, current theory of business and management consistent with the school's mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies.
 - Professional engagement reflects faculty practice-oriented development activities that support integration of relevant, current practice of business and management consistent with the school's mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies.
- Qualified faculty status applies to faculty members who sustain intellectual capital in their fields of teaching, demonstrating currency and relevance of intellectual capital to support the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies, including teaching, scholarship, and other mission components. Categories for specifying qualified faculty status are based on the initial academic preparation, initial professional experience, and sustained academic and professional engagement as described below.

		Sustained engagement activities	
		Academic (Research/Scholarly)	Applied/Practice
Initial academic preparation and professional experience	Professional experience, substantial in duration and level of responsibility	Scholarly Practitioners (SP)	Instructional Practitioners (IP)
	Doctoral degree	Scholarly Academics (SA)	Practice Academics (PA)

- Scholarly Academics (SA) sustain currency and relevance through scholarship and related activities. Normally, SA status is granted to newly hired faculty members who earned their research doctorates within the last five years prior to the review dates. Subsequent to hiring, SA status is sustained as outlined below.
- Practice Academics (PA) sustain currency and relevance through professional engagement, interaction, and relevant activities. Normally, PA status applies to faculty members who augment their initial preparation as academic scholars with development and engagement activities that involve substantive linkages to practice, consulting, other forms of professional engagement, etc., based on the faculty members' earlier work as an SA faculty member. PA status is sustained as outlined below.
- Scholarly Practitioners (SP) sustain currency and relevance through continued professional experience, engagement, or interaction and scholarship related to their professional background and experience. Normally, SP status applies to practitioner faculty members who augment their experience with development and engagement activities involving substantive scholarly activities in their fields of teaching. SP status is sustained as outlined below.
- Instructional Practitioners (IP) sustain currency and relevance through continued professional experience and engagement related to their professional backgrounds and experience. Normally, IP status is granted to newly hired faculty members who join the faculty with significant and substantive professional experience as outlined below. IP status is sustained as outlined below.
- Documenting faculty qualification status requires the school to demonstrate faculty members are either "Scholarly Academics," "Practice Academics," "Scholarly Practitioners" or "Instructional Practitioners". Those individuals who do not meet the criteria for these categories will be classified as "Other."
- Total faculty resources - The aggregate or total faculty resources (SA, PA, SP, IP, and other) is the sum of all full and partial (based on a measure of percent-of-time devoted to the school's mission) assignments. For example, if a school has 12 faculty members who are 100 percent devoted to the mission and seven faculty members who are only 50 percent devoted to mission, total faculty resources equal 15.5.

Basis for Judgment

- The school must develop appropriate criteria consistent with its mission for the classification of faculty according to initial academic preparation, professional experience, ongoing scholarship, and ongoing professional engagement. The standard provides guidance only; each school should adapt this guidance to its particular situation and mission by developing

and implementing criteria that indicate how the school is meeting the spirit and intent of the standard. The critical factor in determining whether faculty members bring current and relevant information is the alignment of their engagement activities with their primary teaching responsibilities and with the overall mission, expected outcomes and strategies of the school. Schools should develop specific policies to provide criteria by which qualifications status is granted and maintained. These criteria should address the following:

- The combinations of academic preparation and professional experience required of faculty at the time of hiring, as well as the types of academic and professional development activities required of faculty after they have been hired in order for them to sustain their qualification status.
- How it assigns priority and value to different continuing academic and professional engagement activities; how such assignments support its portfolio of SA, PA, SP, and IP faculty; and how this portfolio of faculty supports its mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.
- The qualitative standards it requires for various, specified development activities and illustrates the ways that it assures the quality of these activities.
- The depth, breadth, and sustainability of academic and professional engagement (linked to reasonable outcomes) that faculty members are expected to undertake within the typical five-year AACSB review cycle in order to maintain their qualification status.

These criteria may apply to the faculty resources as a whole or to segments of the faculty (e.g., by level, nature of teaching responsibilities and/or students served). Criteria for granting and for maintaining various qualifications for participating faculty who also hold significant administrative appointments (e.g., deans, associate deans, department head/chairs, or center directors) in the business school may reflect these important administrative roles.

- Normally, a doctoral degree emphasizing advanced foundational discipline-based research is appropriate initial academic preparation for SA and PA status, and there must be ongoing, sustained, and substantive academic and/or professional engagement activities supporting SA and PA status. Individuals with a graduate degree in law will normally be considered SA or PA for teaching business law and legal environment of business, subject to ongoing, sustained, and substantive academic and/or professional engagement activities demonstrating currency and relevance related to the teaching field.
- Faculty who have earned a doctoral degree will normally be considered SA or PA (depending on the nature of the doctoral degree and the school's criteria) for a maximum of 5 years from the date the degree is awarded. Doctoral students who have achieved ABD status will normally be considered SA or PA (depending on the nature of the doctoral degree and the school's criteria) for a maximum of 3 years from the date that ABD status is achieved.
- Individuals with a graduate degree in taxation or an appropriate combination of graduate degrees in law and accounting will normally be considered SA or PA to teach taxation subject to continued, sustained academic and professional engagement that demonstrates relevance and currency in the field of teaching.
- For SA and PA status, the less related faculty members' doctoral degrees are to their fields of teaching, the more they must demonstrate higher levels of sustained, substantive academic and/or professional engagement to support their currency and relevance in their fields of teaching and their contributions to other mission components. In such cases, the burden of proof is on the school to make its case for SA or PA status.
- If individuals have doctoral degrees that are less foundational disciplined-based research-oriented or if their highest degrees are not doctorates, then they must demonstrate higher

levels of sustained, substantive academic and/or professional engagement activities to support their currency and relevance in their fields of teaching and their contributions to other mission components. The burden of proof is on the school to make its case for SA or PA status in such cases. AACSB expects that there will be only a limited number (normally not to exceed 10%) of cases in which individuals without doctoral degrees also have SA or PA status.

- Academic and professional engagement activities must be substantive and sustained at levels that support currency and relevance for the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. Engagement can result from the work of a single faculty member, collaborations between and among multiple faculty, or collaborations between faculty and other scholars and/or practitioners.
- Normally, faculty members may undertake a variety of academic engagement activities consistent with the school's mission-linked research of business and management to support maintenance of SA status. A non-exhaustive list of academic engagement activities may include the following:
 - Scholarly activities leading to the production of scholarship outcomes as documented in Standard 2
 - Relevant, active editorships with academic journals or other business publications
 - Service on editorial boards or committees
 - Validation of SA status through leadership positions, participation in recognized academic societies and associations, research awards, academic fellow status, invited presentations, etc.
- Normally, faculty may undertake a variety of professional engagement activities to interact with business and management practice to support maintenance of PA status. A non-exhaustive list of professional engagement activities may include the following:
 - Consulting activities that are material in terms of time and substance
 - Faculty internships
 - Development and presentation of executive education programs
 - Sustained professional work supporting qualified status
 - Significant participation in business professional associations, professional standard-setting bodies or policy-making bodies
 - Practice-oriented intellectual contributions detailed in Standard 2
 - Relevant, active service on boards of directors
 - Documented continuing professional education experiences
 - Participation in professional events that focus on the practice of business, management, and related issues
 - Participation in other activities that place faculty in direct contact with business or other organizational leaders
- Normally, at the time that a school hires an IP or SP faculty member, that faculty member's professional experience is current, substantial in terms of duration and level of responsibility, and clearly linked to the field in which the person is expected to teach.
- The less related the faculty member's initial professional experience is to the field of teaching or the longer the time since the relevant experience occurred, the higher the expectation is for that faculty member to demonstrate sustained academic and/or professional engagement related to the field of teaching in order to maintain professional qualifications.

- Normally, IP and SP faculty members also have master's degrees in disciplines related to their fields of teaching. In limited cases, IP or SP status may be appropriate for individuals without master's degrees if the depth, duration, sophistication, and complexity of their professional experience at the time of hiring outweighs their lack of master's degree qualifications. In such cases, the burden of proof is on the school to make its case.
- For sustained SP status, a non-exhaustive list of academic and professional engagement activities may include the following:
 - Relevant scholarship outcomes as documented in Standard 2
 - Relevant, active editorships with academic, professional, or other business/management publications
 - Service on editorial boards or committees
 - Validation of SP status through leadership positions in recognized academic societies, research awards, academic fellow status, invited presentations, etc.
 - Development and presentation of continuing professional education activities or executive education programs
 - Significant participation in academic associations, professional standard-setting bodies or policy-making bodies
- For sustained IP status, a non-exhaustive list of professional engagement activities and interactions may include the following:
 - Consulting activities that are material in terms of time and substance
 - Faculty internships
 - Development and presentation of executive education programs
 - Sustained professional work supporting IP status
 - Significant participation in business professional associations, professional standard-setting bodies or policy-making bodies
 - Relevant, active service on boards of directors
 - Documented continuing professional education experiences
 - Documented professional certifications in the area of teaching
 - Participation in professional events that focus on the practice of business, management, and related issues
 - Participation in other activities that place faculty in direct contact with business and other organizational leaders
- The school's blend of SA, PA, SP, and IP faculty members in support of degree programs, locations, and disciplines and other mission components must result from a strategic choice and be consistent with the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. Making reference to Tables 15-2 and 15-1, the school describes how deployment of faculty has changed during the past five-years and articulates a well-developed plan for future faculty recruitment and deployment of qualified faculty in alignment with standards 15 and 2, in light of the school's mission, strategies, expected outcomes and program mix.
- Normally, 90 percent of faculty resources are Scholarly Academics (SA), Practice Academics (PA), Scholarly Practitioners (SP), or Instructional Practitioners (IP).
- Normally, 40 percent of faculty resources are Scholarly Academics (SA). Normally, 60 percent of faculty resources are Scholarly Academics (SA), Practice Academics (PA), or Scholarly Practitioners (SP).

- In the aggregate, qualifications in the school's portfolio of participating and supporting faculty members are sufficient to support high-quality performance in all activities in support of the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.
- The school ensures students in all programs, disciplines, locations, and delivery modes are supported by high-quality learning experiences delivered or directed by an appropriate blend of qualified faculty that is strategically deployed and supported by an effective learning infrastructure. For example, schools with research doctoral and research master's degree programs are expected to have higher percentages of SA and PA faculty, maintain a strong focus on SA faculty, and place high emphasis on faculty who possess research doctoral degrees and who undertake scholarly activities to maintain SA status. Schools that emphasize practice-oriented degrees may have a more balanced approach to the distribution of SA, PA, SP, IP, and other faculty members, subject to the limitations in the stated guidance and criteria that place high emphasis on a balance of theory and practice.
- Qualified faculty are appropriately distributed across all programs, disciplines, locations, and delivery modes. The deployment of faculty resources is consistent with mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.

Guidance for Documentation

General Guidance

- The school should provide its policies related to faculty qualifications, summarize its approach to the deployment of faculty resources across the business school, and explain how this approach is consistent with its mission, strategies, and expected outcomes.
- In cases of non-alignment with this standard, provide justification and evidence of overall high-quality. For example, disciplines such as tax, cybersecurity, brand management or other emerging disciplines may necessitate a different faculty staffing model.
- The school must provide information on each faculty member. Included should be evidence to support the classification of each faculty member. This information may be provided in the form of academic vitae or equivalent documents, but must include sufficient detail as to actions, impacts, and timing to support an understanding of faculty engagement activities and their impact on the deployment of qualified faculty resources.
- If the school offers a joint and/or dual degree with another institution, the faculty from the partner institution teaching courses in the curriculum for the home institution's degree must be included in Tables 15-1 and 15-2.
- Deployment of qualified faculty is a strategic decision. In addition to Tables 15-2 and 15-1 that show faculty deployment during the year of record for an accreditation review, schools should provide, using a narrative, changes in the deployment of all classifications of faculty in the past five years and the strategies and plans for recruitment and deployment of qualified faculty in the next five years. Schools should articulate how the recruitment and deployment of faculty aligns with Standards 2 and 15.
- For interdisciplinary programs, faculty teaching non-business courses should not be included in Tables 15-1 or 15-2. Traditional business areas are described in Eligibility Criteria D.
- Describe the qualifications of teaching assistants, tutors, instructors, or other support staff involved in alternative delivery models. Provide evidence that describes how such models maintain high quality outcomes.

Completion of Table 15-1

- Table 15-1 must be completed to document the qualification status of participating and supporting faculty members, the percent of their time that is devoted to mission, and the ways their work aligns with the objective expectations detailed above. Table 15-1 must not include faculty members who left prior to the normal academic year reflected in the table. Table 15-1 must include faculty members who joined the business school during the normal academic year reflected in the table. Peer review teams may request documentation for additional years; for individual terms; or by program, location, delivery mode, and/or disciplines.
- This summary information is useful in assisting the peer review team in its initial assessment of alignment with Standards 5 and 15. The summary information allows the team to effectively focus its in-depth review of individual faculty vitae or other documents supporting the conclusions presented in the table. List all faculty contributing to the mission of the school, including participating and supporting faculty, graduate students who have formal teaching responsibilities, and administrators holding faculty rank. For faculty not engaged in teaching, leave columns 4 and 5 (Faculty Sufficiency) blank. Faculty who left during the time frame would ordinarily not be included. Faculty members who joined the school for any part of the time frame are to be included. The school must explain the “normal academic year” format/schedule. Peer review teams may request documentation for additional years; for individual terms; or by programs, location, delivery mode, and/or discipline.
- The measure of “teaching productivity” must reflect the operations of the business school, e.g., student credit hours (SCHs), European Credit Transfer Units (ECTUs), contact hours, individual courses, modules, or other designations that are appropriately indicative of the teaching contributions of each faculty member. Concurrence on all aspects of the metric must be reached with the peer review team early in the review process. If a faculty member has no teaching responsibilities, he or she must be listed and reflected in the qualifications section of the table. Online courses should use the same teaching metric being used for in-person courses and the manner in which this is calculated should be described.
- Indicate the normal professional responsibilities of each faculty member using the following guide: UT for undergraduate teaching; MT for master’s level teaching; DT for doctoral level teaching/mentoring; ADM for administration; RES for research; ED for executive education; SER for other service and outreach responsibilities. A faculty member may have more than one category assigned. Individuals who teach only in non-credit executive education programs should not be listed in this table.
- For faculty qualifications based on engagement activities, faculty members may be Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), Instructional Practitioner (IP), or Other (O). Faculty members should be assigned one of these designations based on the school’s criteria for initial qualifications and continuing engagement activities that support currency and relevance in the teaching field and to support other mission components. Faculty may meet the school’s criteria for more than one category (e.g. SA and PA) but must be listed in only one category. Doctoral students who have obtained ABD status are normally considered SA or PA (depending on the nature of the doctoral degree) for 3 years. Faculty who have earned a doctoral degree will normally be considered SA or PA (depending on the nature of the doctoral degree) for 5 years from the date the degree is awarded. The “Other” category should be used for those individuals holding a faculty title but whose qualifications do not meet the criteria established by the school for SA, PA, SP, or IP status.
- The “percent of time devoted to mission” reflects each faculty member’s contributions to the school’s overall mission during the period of evaluation. Reasons for less than 100 percent might include part-time employment, shared appointment with another academic unit, or

other assignments that make the faculty member partially unavailable to the school. A full-time faculty member's percent of time devoted to mission is 100 percent. For doctoral students who have formal teaching duties, the percent of time devoted to mission should reflect their teaching duties only, and not any other activities associated with their roles as a student, e.g., work on a dissertation. For example, a doctoral student who teaches one class over the normal academic year, and a part-time faculty member whose responsibilities are limited to the same level of activity, should be assigned the same "percent of time devoted to mission." A faculty member teaching in more than one discipline may be listed multiple times, but the percent of time devoted to mission should be reflected proportionally in each discipline and not be more than 100 percent. For part-time faculty, the expected percentage is less than 100 percent and should reflect the amount of time devoted to the mission. If a school used a full-time equivalent (FTE) human resources system, then the FTE may be a reasonable approximation for "percent of time devoted to mission." In the absence of an FTE system, the school should have a rational manner of assigning the percentage to part-time faculty that is agreed to by the Peer Review Team well in advance of the submission of the report.

Completion of Table 15-2

- The school should provide an analysis of the deployment of SA, PA, SP, IP, and other faculty by degree program level (bachelor's, master's, doctoral). Bachelor's degrees can be combined into one line; postgraduate degrees should be broken out by degree program. The school must complete Table 15-2 in the format provided in this document to demonstrate deployment of faculty resources across each degree program level. Deployment should be consistent with mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. Peer review teams may request more detail related to a discipline, program, delivery mode, and/or location.
~~The school should provide an analysis of the deployment of SA, PA, SP, IP, and other faculty by degree program level or program type. (bachelor's, master's, doctoral). The school must complete Table 15-2 to demonstrate deployment of faculty resources across each degree program level or program type. Deployment should be consistent with mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. Peer review teams may request more detail related to a discipline, program, delivery mode, and/or location.~~
 - Provide information for the most recently completed normal academic year. Percentages should be provided for each individual degree program. Each cell represents the percent of total teaching (whether measured by credit hours, contact hours, courses taught or another metric appropriate to the school) for each degree program at each level, by faculty qualifications status. Peer review teams may also request faculty deployment by program location and/or delivery mode. The sum across each row should total 100 percent. Provide a brief analysis that explains the deployment of faculty, as noted above, to mission, expected outcomes, and strategies.
- All cells should be formatted consistently and reflected as percentages (e.g. 40%).

~~The school should provide its policies related to faculty qualifications, summarize its approach to the deployment of faculty resources across the business school, and explain how this approach is consistent with its mission, strategies, and expected outcomes. Table 15-1 must be completed to document the qualification status of participating and supporting faculty members, the percent of their time that is devoted to mission, and the ways their work aligns with the objective expectations detailed above. Graduate students or the equivalent with teaching responsibilities must be included in Table 15-1. Table 15-1 must not~~

~~include faculty members who left prior to the normal academic year reflected in the table. Table 15-1 must include faculty members who joined the business school during the normal academic year reflected in the table. Peer review teams may request documentation for additional years; for individual terms; or by program, location, delivery mode, and/or disciplines.~~

~~In cases of non-alignment with this standard, provide justification and evidence of overall high-quality. For example, disciplines such as tax, cybersecurity, brand management or other emerging disciplines may necessitate a different faculty staffing model.~~

- ~~• The school should provide information on each faculty member. This information may be provided in the form of academic vitae or equivalent documents, but must include sufficient detail as to actions, impacts, and timing to support an understanding of faculty engagement activities and their impact on the deployment of qualified faculty resources.~~

~~Deployment of qualified faculty is a strategic decision. In addition to Tables 15-2 and 15-1 that show faculty deployment during the year of record for an accreditation review, schools should provide, using a narrative, changes in the deployment of all classifications of faculty in the past five years and the strategies and plans for recruitment and deployment of qualified faculty in the next five years. Schools should articulate how the recruitment and deployment of faculty aligns with Standards 2 and 15.~~

~~For interdisciplinary programs, faculty teaching non-business courses should not be included in Tables 15-1 or 15-2. Traditional business areas are described in Eligibility Criteria D. that~~

TABLE 15-1: FACULTY SUFFICIENCY AND QUALIFICATIONS SUMMARY FOR MOST RECENTLY COMPLETED NORMAL ACADEMIC YEAR (RE: Standards 5 and 15)

<u>Faculty Portfolio</u>			<u>Faculty Sufficiency Related to Teaching (Std. 5) SCHs, ECTUs, contact hours, or courses</u>		<u>Normal Professional Responsibilities³</u>	<u>Percent of Time Devoted to Mission for Each Faculty Qualification Group (Std 15)</u>					<u>Brief Description of Basis for Qualification (Enter brief quantitative and/or qualitative information corresponding to the school's criteria for each category.)</u>
<u>Faculty Member's Name (Please organize and list individually in sections reflecting the school's organizational structure and/or discipline (e.g., departments))</u>	<u>Date of First Appointment to the school</u>	<u>Highest Degree, Year Earned</u>	<u>Participating Faculty Teaching Productivity (P)</u>	<u>Supporting Faculty Teaching Productivity (S)</u>		<u>Scholarly-Academic (SA)</u>	<u>Practice Academic (PA)</u>	<u>Scholarly Practitioner (SP)</u>	<u>Instructional-Practitioner (IP)</u>	<u>Other (O)</u>	
<u>Department 1</u>											
<u>Faculty A</u>											
<u>Faculty B</u>											
<u>Faculty C</u>											
<u>Total Department 1</u>											

Formatted: Expanded by 0.15 pt

Formatted: Expanded by 0.15 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted Table

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.11"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.12"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.11"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.12"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.19"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.11"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.12"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.19"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.11"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.12"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.19"

Department 1 Ratio																					
Department 2																					
Faculty A																					
Faculty B																					
Faculty C																					
Total Department 2																					
Department 2 Ratio																					
Grand Totals																					
Grand Total																					
Overall Ratios																					
Faculty Sufficiency Indicators:											Faculty Qualifications Indicators:										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall guideline: $P/(P+S) > 75\%$ Guideline by discipline, location, delivery mode, or program: $P/(P+S) > 60\%$ 											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SA guideline: $(SA)/(SA + PA + SP + IP + O) > 40\%$ SA + PA + SP guideline: $(SA + PA + SP)/(SA + PA + SP + IP + O) > 60\%$ SA + PA + SP + IP guideline: $(SA + PA + SP + IP)/(SA + PA + SP + IP + O) > 90\%$ 										

- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.11"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.11"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.06"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.11"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.06"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.11"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.12"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.06"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.12"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.17"

4. This summary information is useful in assisting the peer review team in its initial assessment of alignment with Standards 5 and 15. The summary information allows the team to effectively focus its in-depth review of individual faculty vitae or other documents supporting the conclusions presented in the table. List all faculty contributing to the mission of the school including participating and supporting faculty, graduate students who have formal teaching responsibilities, and administrators holding faculty rank. For faculty not engaged in teaching, leave columns 4 and 5 (Faculty Sufficiency) blank. Faculty who left during the time frame represented in the table should not be

- included. Faculty members who joined the school for any part of the time frame are to be included. The school must explain the “normal academic year” format/schedule. Peer review teams may request documentation for additional years; for individual terms; or by programs, location, delivery mode, and/or discipline.
2. The measure of “teaching productivity” must reflect the operations of the business school, e.g., student credit hours (SCHs), European Credit Transfer Units (ECTUs), contact hours, individual courses, modules, or other designations that are appropriately indicative of the teaching contributions of each faculty member. Concurrence of the metric must be reached with the peer review team early in the review process. If a faculty member has no teaching responsibilities, he or she must be listed and reflected in the qualifications section of the table. Online courses should use the same teaching metric being used for in-person courses and the manner in which this is calculated should be described.
 3. Indicate the normal professional responsibilities of each faculty member using the following guide: UT for undergraduate teaching; MT for master’s level teaching; DT for doctoral level teaching/mentoring; ADM for administration; RES for research; ED for executive education; SER for other service and outreach responsibilities. A faculty member may have more than one category assigned. Individuals who teach only in non-credit executive education programs should not be listed in this table.
 4. For faculty qualifications based on engagement activities, faculty members may be Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), Instructional Practitioner (IP), or Other (O). Faculty members should be assigned one of these designations based on the school’s criteria for initial qualifications and continuing engagement activities that support currency and relevance in the teaching field and to support other mission components. Faculty may meet the school’s criteria for more than one category (e.g., e.g. SA and PA), but but must be listed in only one category. Doctoral students who have obtained ABD status are normally considered SA or PA (depending on the nature of the doctoral degree) for 3 years. Faculty who have earned a doctoral degree will normally be considered SA or PA (depending on the nature of the doctoral degree) for 5 years from the date the degree is awarded. The “Other” category should be used for those individuals holding a faculty title but whose qualifications do not meet the criteria established by the school for SA, PA, SP, or IP status.
 5. The “percent of time devoted to mission” reflects each faculty member’s contributions to the school’s overall mission during the period of evaluation. Reasons for less than 100 percent might include part-time employment, shared appointment with another academic unit, or other assignments that make the faculty member partially unavailable to the school. A full-time faculty member’s percent of time devoted to mission is 100 percent. For doctoral students who have formal teaching duties, the percent of time devoted to mission should reflect their teaching duties only and not any other activities associated with their roles as a student, e.g., work on a dissertation. For example, a doctoral student who teaches one class over the normal academic year and a part-time faculty member whose responsibilities are limited to the same level of activity should be assigned the same “percent of time devoted to mission.” A faculty member teaching in more than one discipline may be listed multiple times, but the percent of time devoted to mission should be reflected proportionally in each discipline and not be more than 100 percent. For part-time faculty, the expected percentage is less than 100 percent and should reflect the amount of time devoted to the mission. If a school used a full-time equivalent (FTE) human resources system system, then the FTE may be a reasonable approximation for “percent of time devoted to mission.” In the absence of an FTE system, the school should have a rational manner of assigning the percentage to part-time faculty that is agreed to by the Peer Review Team well in advance of the submission of the report.

TABLE 15-2: DEPLOYMENT OF FACULTY BY QUALIFICATION STATUS IN SUPPORT OF DEGREE PROGRAMS FOR THE MOST RECENTLY COMPLETED NORMAL ACADEMIC YEAR ¹

	Faculty percent of teaching by program and degree level (indicate metric used - credit hours, contact hours, courses taught or another metric appropriate to the school)					
	Scholarly Academic (SA) %	Practice Academic (PA) %	Scholarly Practitioner (SP) %	Instructional Practitioner (IP) %	Other (O) %	Total %
Bachelor's Program						
MBA Program						
Other Master's Programs <i>(Please provide the percentage for each Master's program, adding a line for each degree program)</i>						
Doctoral Program						
Other Programs (Specify)						

Formatted: Centered

¹-Provide information for the most recently completed normal academic year, including all participating and supporting faculty who taught during the year. The percentage of each faculty member's time allocated to each academic program or program level should be a fraction of their total time devoted to teaching in which a faculty member who teaches a full course load would allocate 100 percent. For example, a participating faculty member who was assigned six courses during the year, four at the bachelor's level and two at MBA level, would allocate 67 percent to the bachelor's level program and 33 percent to the MBA program. The sum across each row should total 100 percent.

APPENDIX I

Examples of Impact Metrics in Support of Documentation

Examples of metrics that schools might use to assess the impact of their activities, including scholarship and the creation of intellectual contributions, are provided below. Some activities, including scholarship, may have multiple impacts, while others have limited or no impact. Sometimes the impact of an activity or intellectual contribution may not be known or identifiable for a number of years. It is also important to note that evidence that intellectual contribution outcomes have “made a difference” may result from a single outcome produced by one or more faculty members and/or students, a series or compilations of works, or collaborative work with colleagues at other institutions or in practice. The list of categories and examples provided in this appendix is not intended to be limiting or exhaustive. Schools may identify and report other examples not included below, including impact on constituencies, such as society, community, business practitioners, students, alumni, etc.

MISSION ALIGNMENT IMPACT

- Alignment of intellectual contribution outcomes with themes or focus areas valued by the business school’s mission (e.g., global development, entrepreneurship, innovation)
- Percentage of intellectual contribution outcomes that align with one or more “mission-related” focus areas for research
- Percentage of faculty with one or more intellectual contribution outcomes that align with one or more mission-related focus areas
- Research awards and recognition that document alignment with one or more “mission-related” focus areas for research
- Substantive impact and carry-forward of mission as stated in Standard 1 and as referenced throughout the remaining accreditation standards
- Linkage between mission as stated in Standard 1 and financial history and strategies as stated in Standard 3

ACADEMIC IMPACT

- Publications in highly recognized, leading peer-review journals (journals in a designated journal list, Top 3, Top 10, etc.)
- Citation counts
- Evidence of impact on stakeholders and society such as changes in business practices, professional standards, or public policy
- Case studies that document the impact of intellectual contributions on stakeholders and society
- Download counts for electronic journals
- Editorships, associate editorships, editorial board memberships, and/or invitations to act as journal reviewers for recognized, leading peer-review journals
- Elections or appointments to leadership positions in academic and/or professional associations, standards setting bodies and professional societies
- Recognitions for research (e.g., Best Paper Award), Fellow Status in an academic society, and other recognition by professional and/or academic societies for intellectual contribution outcomes
- Invitations to participate in research conferences, scholarly programs, and/or international, national, or regional research forums
- Inclusion of academic work in the syllabi of other professors’ courses

- Use of academic work in doctoral seminars
- Competitive grants awarded by major national and international agencies (e.g., NSF and NIH) or third-party funding for research projects
- Patents awarded
- Appointments as visiting professors or scholars in other schools or a set of schools

TEACHING/INSTRUCTIONAL IMPACT

- Grants for research that influence teaching/pedagogical practices, materials, etc.
- Case studies of research leading to the adoption of new teaching/learning practices
- Textbooks, teaching manuals, etc., that are widely adopted (by number of editions, number of downloads, number of views, use in teaching, sales volume, etc.)
- Publications that focus on research methods and teaching
- Research-based learning projects with companies, institutions, and/or non-profit organizations
- Instructional software (by number of programs developed, number of users, etc.)
- Case study development (by number of studies developed, number of users, etc.)

BACHELOR'S/MASTER'S LEVEL EDUCATION IMPACT

- Mentorship of student research reflected in the number of student papers produced under faculty supervision that lead to publications or formal presentations at academic or professional conferences
- Documented improvements in learning outcomes that result from teaching innovations that incorporate research methods from learning/pedagogical research projects
- Results from engagement of students in consulting or business based projects
- Increased recruitment, retention, graduation, placement of under-represented student populations
- New venture formation
- Hiring/placement of students
- Career success of graduates beyond initial placement
- Placement of students in research-based graduate programs
- Direct input from organizations that hire graduates regarding graduates' preparedness for jobs and the roles they play in advancing the organization
- Movement of graduates into positions of leadership in for-profit, non-profit, and professional and service organizations

DOCTORAL EDUCATION IMPACT

- Hiring/placement of doctoral students, junior faculty, and post-doctoral research assistants
- Publications of doctoral students and graduates
- Invited conference attendance, as well as awards/nominations for doctoral students/graduates
- Research fellowships awarded to doctoral students/graduates
- Funding awards for students engaged in activities related to doctoral research
- Case studies that document the results of doctoral research training activities, such as the transfer of knowledge to industry and impact on corporate or community practices
- Research outputs of junior faculty members (including post-doctoral junior professors, assistant professors, doctoral research assistants, and doctoral students) that have been

influenced by their mentors/supervisors

PRACTICE /COMMUNITY IMPACT

- Media citations (e.g., number, distribution, and effect)
- Requests from the practice community to utilize faculty expertise for consulting projects, broadcast forums, professional development activities, researcher-practitioner meetings, faculty/student consulting projects, etc.
- Publications in practitioner journals or other venues aimed directly at improving management expertise and practice
- Consulting reports resulting from the engagement of faculty and students
- Research income from various external sources, such as industry and community/governmental agencies to support individual and collaborative research activities
- Community enhancement outcomes resulting from the engagement of faculty and students in community issues
- Case studies based on research that has led to solutions to business problems
- Adoption of new practices or operational approaches as a result of faculty scholarship
- Presentations and workshops for business professionals
- Invitations for faculty to serve as experts on policy formulation, witnesses at legislative hearings, members of special interest groups/roundtables, etc.
- Tools/methods developed for companies
- Memberships on boards of directors of corporate and non-profit organizations
- Memberships on professional standards setting bodies or policy-making bodies

EXECUTIVE EDUCATION IMPACT

- Sustained and consistent involvement of research-active faculty in executive education programs
- Sustained success of executive education programs based on demand, level of participation, and repeat business
- Market research confirming value of executive education programs delivered by research-active faculty
- Consulting activities of research active faculty that stem from participation in executive education activities
- Inclusion of cases and other materials in degree programs that can be identified as resulting from executive education activity
- Partnerships between the school and organizations that participate in executive education programs, which benefit the school's teaching, research, and other activities and programs
- Involvement of executive education participants and their organizations in the teaching mission of the school (e.g., executive-in-residence program)
- Linkage between organizations participating in executive education and student internships, as well as placement of graduates in entry-level positions

RESEARCH CENTER IMPACT

- Invitations by governmental or other agencies/organizations for center representatives to serve on policy-making bodies
- Center research projects funded by external governmental, business, or non-profit agencies

- Continued funding (e.g., number of donors, scale of donations)
- Number of web visits to research center website (e.g., tracking data from Google Analytics)
- Number of attendees (representing academics, practitioners, policymakers, etc.) at center-sponsored events
- Sustained research center publications that are funded by external sources or that are highly recognized as authoritative sources of analysis and perspectives related to the center's core focus

Appendix II
A Collective Vision for Business Education:
Utilizing the Framework within the Context of Strategic Planning & Accreditation Reviews

This Appendix provides a brief overview of the opportunities outlined within *A Collective Vision for Business Education*, and draws on them to suggest some prompts for exploration within the school's strategic planning and strategic innovation efforts. In addition, many schools will find opportunities to explore these questions and others related to the *Vision* in discussion with mentors, peer reviewers, and others acting formally or informally in an advisory capacity. A broader suite of resources is available at www.aacsb.edu/vision.

This appendix is provided in support of the school's strategic planning process. Schools are not required to adopt any portion of the *Collective Vision for Business Education*, or the opportunities identified in the report, to align with the AACSB accreditation standards.

In April 2016, AACSB released *A Collective Vision for Business Education*. The result of a multi-year process of collaborative research and exploration, the *Collective Vision for Business Education* draws on inputs from business schools and stakeholders of business education. The *Vision* identifies five broadly defined areas of opportunity for business schools to consider as they seek positive societal impact, aligned with shifting stakeholder needs, through innovation and engagement.

A Collective Vision for Business Education is a strategic innovation and strategic planning complement to the quality assurance focus of the *Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation*. It aims to encourage and empower schools “to transform—in some ways gradually and in other ways dramatically—to address the needs of the students they educate and the stakeholders they serve.” Through accreditation reviews, the quality and success of a school is assessed in relation to its mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies. *A Collective Vision for Business Education* similarly provides a framework for exploring—and for raising in consultative discussions with accreditation reviewers—opportunities to leverage the school's unique circumstances to strengthen and evolve the value it provides, in areas that stretch the boundaries of the ways that business schools have traditionally defined themselves.

Five Opportunities to Thrive

Five key opportunities call for schools to draw on existing strengths to extend their impact and evolve in new directions. These are opportunities for business schools to embrace roles as:

1. **Catalysts for Innovation:**
Entrepreneurship and management innovation will continue to drive new business creation and economic development in the future. With their multi-disciplinary approaches, strong networks, and the power to convene across sectors, business schools possess significant assets for taking a leading role in fostering innovation in society.
2. **Co-Creators of Knowledge:**
Today's business, economic, and social landscapes face questions that are complex and multidisciplinary. New insights and understanding will emerge where business schools firmly position themselves at the intersection of industry and practice, as conveners and partners in knowledge creation, rather than simply suppliers.

3. **Hubs of Lifelong Learning:**
Business schools have the potential to contribute to learning opportunities for a wide variety of individuals, at different points in their career life cycles. By connecting expertise and experiences, business schools will broaden the possibilities for learning and knowledge exchange.
4. **Leaders on Leadership:**
Aspiring leaders will benefit from better science behind leadership development. With experience in executive education, domain knowledge, and their industry connections, business schools can lead the discovery of new data-informed insights into effective leadership and leadership development models that support ethical business and serve the common good.
5. **Enablers of Global Prosperity:**
Business is increasingly expected to be an active participant in addressing broad societal goals and social challenges. Business schools contribute to global measures of well-being that go far beyond wealth creation. Business schools must continue to lead in the development of insights regarding effective, efficient, and ethical organizations, and also provide graduates with frameworks for driving inclusive, positive impact.

Three Critical Success Factors

Successfully embracing the five opportunities outlined above depends on commitments to collaboration and experimentation. More specifically, success requires business schools to:

1. **Cultivate a position at the intersection of academia and practice.**
Business schools and organizations across industries and sectors must co-educate and develop managerial talent, co-create new ideas and understanding, and innovate to establish new business.
2. **Connect with other disciplines.**
Business schools should seize opportunities to reinforce and expand the models and incentives that support interdisciplinary research and the structures to facilitate interdisciplinary learning.
3. **Be a driver of innovation in higher education.**
Business schools have an opportunity to help lead transformation in the models and processes for education, knowledge creation, and economic development, through incremental change as well as uncommon strategies and solutions.

Questions for Exploration and Discussion:

The questions that follow draw on the opportunities and critical success factors identified in *A Collective Vision for Business Education* to help frame discussions about the business school's evolving strategies, tactics, and metrics for success. They can be used in strategic planning exercises as well as for exploratory and consultative discussions with the school's mentor, peer review team, or in reports that are submitted to an AACSB Accreditation Operating Committee (IAC, CIRC or AAC). The accreditation process, after all, exists to not only provide an assessment of overall high-quality and alignment with the accreditation standards but to also

provide consultative guidance and provoke reflection and further exploration about possibilities for continued evolution in the spirit of continuous improvement.

While the questions below are framed with *A Collective Vision for Business Education* in mind, they could easily be inclusive of other frameworks as well.

1. For which of the five identified opportunities and three critical success factors could we make a strong case that the business school is currently either:
 - a. Embracing this role (or a variation of it) as an inherent and highly recognizable part of the school's identity and activities; or
 - Pushing the boundaries of traditionally defined business school models and roles, with uncommon strategies and solutions?
2. How does (or could) the school redefine the generically defined opportunities as a set of more customized calls to action that are linked to and supportive of the school's mission and context, and specific global or local challenges that need addressing?
3. How might the school more fully embrace these roles and calls to action through additional attention in other existing areas of strategic focus or activity? Through development of new strategies or concepts that support the desired strategic market position and desired societal impacts of the school?
4. What relationships—with inter-disciplinary, business, and community partners—will be essential for moving deeply, strategically, and successfully in pursuit of these opportunities? How might existing relationships need to evolve and what new collaborations might be pursued?
5. What are the possibilities for experimenting with new models and processes to enable the shifts that are envisioned? Is there alignment between “what is valued” and what gets reinforced and rewarded? What metrics would be used to measure success? In what ways—both enabling and constraining—do quality assurance systems at the national, regional or AACSB level influence experimentation?
6. What new opportunities might emerge for business schools to make the case directly to their customers—and their supporters—that they deliver on their promises of societal value, with outcomes and impacts that are positive and sizable?

Appendix III: Sample AACSB Tables

University of Pirsig-School of Business																
Table 2-1 Intellectual Contributions, September 2012-May 2017																
Part A: Five Year Summary of Intellectual Contributions																
	Portfolio of Intellectual Contributions				Types of Intellectual Contributions										Percentage of Faculty Producing ICs	
	Faculty Aggregate and Summarize data to reflect the organizational structure of the school's faculty (e.g., departments, research groups). Do not list by individual faculty member.	Basic or Discovery Scholarship	Applied or Integration/Application Scholarship	Teaching and Learning Scholarship	Total	Peer-Reviewed Journals	Editorial-Reviewed Journals	Peer-Reviewed Academic/Professional Meeting Proceedings	Peer-Reviewed Academic/Professional Meeting Presentations	Competitive Research Awards Received	Textbooks	Case Studies	Professional Practice standards or public policy	Other IC type selected by the school	Total	Percent of Participating Faculty Producing ICs
Accounting	116	88.5	90	294.5	152.5	2	5	50	0	19	22	6	38	294.5	95%	91%
Finance	174	72.5	19	265.5	104.5	1	21	83	1	2	5	3	45	265.5	99%	80%
Marketing and Management	300	287	68	655	100	3	6	425	1	10	12	1	97	655	100%	98%
Total	590	448	177	1215	357	6	32	558	2	31	39	10	180	1215	96.8%	90.2%
Part B: Alignment with Mission, Expected Outcomes, and Strategy																
Provide a qualitative description of how the portfolio of intellectual contributions is aligned with the mission, expected outcomes, and strategy of the school.																
Part C: Quality of Five Year Portfolio of Intellectual Contributions																
Provide evidence demonstrating the quality of the above five-year portfolio of intellectual contributions. Schools are encouraged to include qualitative descriptions and quantitative metrics and to summarize information in tabular format whenever possible.																
Part D: Impact of Intellectual Contributions																
Provide evidence demonstrating that the school's intellectual contributions have had an impact on the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business and management. The school is encouraged to include qualitative descriptions and quantitative metrics and to summarize the information in tabular format whenever possible to demonstrate impact. Evidence of impact may stem from intellectual contributions produced beyond the five- year AACSB accreditation review period.																

**Table 2-2:
Five-Year Summary of Peer and Editorial-Reviewed
Journals and Number of Publications in Each**

Based on the data in Table 2-1, provide a five-year summary of peer and editorial- reviewed journals (by name) and the number or publications appearing in each. The number of publications should reflect an unduplicated count for co-authored publications.

Please organize by organizational structure of the school's faculty (e.g., departments, research groups) in the same manner as Table 2-1. Please split fractionally for co-authorship among faculty employed by the school such that each publication is counted only once.

Peer and Editorial-Reviewed Journals (by Organizational Structure)	Number of Publications
Accounting	
The Accounting Review	20
Accounting and Business Research	32
Journal of Accounting Research	7
Journal of Financial Economics	6.5
Journal of Financial Reporting	44
Management Science	45
Accounting Total	154.5
Finance	
Accounting & Finance	17
Annual Review of Financial Economics	3
Applied Financial Economics	19
Cases in Corporate Finance	5
Financial Analysts Journal	6
Journal of Financial Economics	12.5
Quarterly Journal of Economics	13
Review of Finance	4
The Review of Financial Studies	26
Finance Total	105.5
Marketing and Management	
Academy of Management Journal	22
Academy of Management Review	9
Behavioral Science and Policy	14
Cross Cultural and Strategic Management Journal	3
Journal of Behavioral Decision Making	34
Journal of Consumer Affairs	1
Journal of Marketing	7
Marketing Science	13
Marketing and Management Total	103
Grand Total	363

**University of Pirsig-School of Business
Supplement to Table 15-1**

Faculty Name	Date of First Appointment to the School	Date of Departure (if applicable)	Other Information	Included in Tables?
Brown, Bob	01/02/13	N/A		No, teaches only communications courses.
Doe, Jane	09/1/12	N/A		Yes
Frank, Tom	09/1/00	N/A		Yes
Johnson, Sandy	09/01/16	N/A		Yes
Jones, Justine	05/01/10	N/A	Administrator (Dean)	Yes; Dean with faculty rank, doing research, no teaching
Lee, Brian	01/02/06	N/A		Yes
Leonard, Amy	08/15/13	12/05/17	Retired	No; retired mid-year
O'Reilly, Wilbur	06/01/17	N/A		No; hired after the end of the reporting year.
Rogers, Daniel	09/01/13	05/31/17	Has accepted a job at another school for Fall 2017	Yes, since he was teaching on faculty at the end of the normal academic year
Scott, Christine	09/01/14	N/A		Yes
Smith, Robert	01/02/16	N/A	ABD; Successfully defended dissertation proposal 01/02/17, working on completing his dissertation	Yes, since he is teaching; would be SA since ABD for 3 years
Tucker, Carlton	01/02/12	N/A	On sabbatical	Yes
Wilson, John	09/01/03	N/A		Yes

University of Pirsig-School of Business

TABLE 15-1: FACULTY SUFFICIENCY AND QUALIFICATIONS SUMMARY FOR September 2016-May 2017 (RE: Standards 5 and 15)

Faculty Portfolio			Faculty Sufficiency Related to Teaching (Std. 5) SCHs		Normal Professional Responsibilities ³	Percent of Time Devoted to Mission for Each Faculty Qualification Group (Std 15)					Brief Description of Basis for Qualification (Enter brief quantitative and/or qualitative information corresponding to the school's criteria for each category.)
Faculty Member's Name (Please organize and list individually in sections reflecting the school's organizational structure and/or discipline (e.g., departments))	Date of First Appointment to the School	Highest Degree, Year Earned	Participating Faculty Teaching Productivity (P)	Supporting Faculty Teaching Productivity (S)		Scholarly –Academic (SA)	Practice Academic (PA)	Scholarly Practitioner (SP)	Instructional –Practitioner (IP)	Other (O)	
Accounting											
Doe, Jane	09/01/12	PhD, 2012	360		MT, DT RES	100					3 PRJs
Frank, Tom	09/01/00	MST, 1986	900		UT			100			State boards, active accounting practice
Smith, Robert	01/02/16	MST, 2014	675		UT	100					ABD for 3 years
Total Accounting			1935			200 (66.7%)	0	0	100 (33.3%)	0	
Accounting Ratio			>= 60% requirement for P met (100%)			Minimum SA >= 40% met (66.7%) Minimum SA+PA+SP >= 60% met (66.7%) Minimum SA+PA+SP+IP >= 90% met (100%)					

Finance											
Rogers, Daniel	09/01/13	PhD, 1995	360		ADM, UT,MT		100				Consulting Practice, Department Chair
Scott, Christine	09/01/14	MBA, 1980		240	MT				25		CFO
Tucker, Carlton ⁷	01/02/12	PhD, 2011	300		DT, RES	100					5 PRJs
Total Finance			660	240		100 (44.4%)	100 (44.4%)	0	25 (11.1%)	0	
Finance Ratio			>= 60% requirement for P met (73.33%)			Minimum SA >= 40% met (44.4%) Minimum SA+PA+SP >= 60% met (88.9%) Minimum SA+PA+SP+IP >= 90% met (100%)					
Marketing and Management											
Lee, Brian	01/02/06	PhD, 2004	279		UT, MT, RES	100					Research Productive, 5 PRJs
Johnson, Sandy	09/01/16	PhD, 2010	429		UT, MT		50				Phd, Depth of Industry experience
Jones, Justine	05/01/10	PhD, 1995	0	0	RES, ADM	100					Dean
Wilson, John	09/01/03	MBA, 1987	738		UT, ADM			100			Industry Experience, Center Chair
Total Marketing and Mgt			1446			200 (57.1%)	50 (14.3%)	100 (28.6%)	0	0	
Marketing and Mgt Ratio			>= 60% requirement for P met (100%)			Minimum SA >= 40% met (57%) Minimum SA+PA+SP >= 60% met (100%) Minimum SA+PA+SP+IP >= 90% met (100%)					
Grand Total			4041	240		500 (57.1%)	150 (17.1%)	100 (11.4%)	125 (14.3%)	0	

⁷ Tucker, Carlton is currently on sabbatical. -He left for sabbatical at the beginning of Spring 2017 and will remain on sabbatical until the end of Fall 2018.

Overall Ratio		>= 75% requirement for P met (94.4%)	Minimum SA >= 40% met (57.1%) Minimum SA+PA+SP >= 60% met (85.7%) Minimum SA+PA+SP+IP >= 90% met (100%)
Faculty Sufficiency Indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall guideline: $-P/(P+S) \geq 75\%$ • Guideline by discipline, location, delivery mode, or program: $-P/(P+S) \geq 60\%$ 			Faculty Qualifications Indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SA guideline: $(SA)/(SA + PA + SP + IP + O) \geq 40\%$ • SA + PA + SP guideline: $(SA + PA + SP)/(SA + PA + SP + IP + O) \geq 60\%$ • SA + PA + SP + IP guideline: $(SA + PA + SP + IP)/(SA + PA + SP + IP + O) \geq 90\%$

University of Pirsig-School of Business

**TABLE 15-2: DEPLOYMENT OF FACULTY BY QUALIFICATION STATUS IN SUPPORT OF DEGREE PROGRAMS
FOR September 2016-May 2017**

	Faculty percent of teaching by program and degree level (using Student Credit Hours)					
	Scholarly Academic (SA) %	Practice Academic (PA) %	Scholarly Practitioner (SP) %	Instructional Practitioner (IP) %	Other (O) %	Total %
Bachelor's Programs Administration	36.3 28.0%	7.4 15.6%	25.4%	30.9%	0%	100 100%
MBA	39.8%	35.0%	0%	25.2%	0%	100%
EMBA	60%	20%	0%	10%	10%	100%
MS Marketing	30%	25%	0%	45%	0%	100%
MAcc	62%	4%	0%	20%	14%	100%
MTax	63%	0%	18.5%	18.5%	0%	100%
Doctoral Program	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Table 15-2 Sample Data (Provided for Informational Purposes)

The tables below show a sample of how to calculate the deployment of faculty by qualification status in support of degree programs using **student credit hours (SCHs)**.

	Scholarly Academic (SA)	Practice Academic (PA)	Scholarly Practitioner (SP)	Instructional Practitioner (IP)	Other (O)	Total
Bachelor's Program						
Tom Frank				900		
Robert Smith	675					
Daniel Rogers*		240				
Brian Lee*	140					
Sandy Johnson*		215				
John Wilson			738			
Total Bachelor's Program	815	455	738	900	0	2908
Percent Bachelor's Program	28.0%	15.6%	25.4%	30.9%	0.0%	100.00%

*Daniel Rogers, Brian Lee, and Sandy Johnson teach at both the bachelor's level and in the MBA program

	Scholarly Academic (SA)	Practice Academic (PA)	Scholarly Practitioner (SP)	Instructional Practitioner (IP)	Other (O)	Total
MBA Program						
Jane Doe*	240					
Daniel Rogers*		120				
Christine Scott				240		
Brian Lee*	139					
Sandy Johnson*		214				
Total MBA Program	379	334	0	240	0	953
Percent MBA Program	39.8%	35.0%	0.0%	25.2%	0.0%	100.00%

*Jane Doe, Daniel Rogers, Brian Lee, and Sandy Johnson all teach at various degree levels.

	Scholarly Academic (SA)	Practice Academic (PA)	Scholarly Practitioner (SP)	Instructional Practitioner (IP)	Other (O)	Total
PhD program						
Jane Doe*	120					
Carlton Tucker	300					
Total PhD Program	420	0	0	0	0	420
Percent PhD Program	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.00%

*Jane Doe teaches at both the master's and doctoral degree levels.

Appendix IV: Frequently Asked Questions

The following questions represent some of the most frequently asked questions staff and volunteers receive from schools. The responses are intended to provide guidance to schools, insofar as how peer review teams and committees look at these issues in the context of the standards. Specific details and nuances or individual school situations could potentially alter the advice below. -Ultimately, the peer review team's judgment often comes into play.

1. In Tables 2-1 and 2-2 how are co-authored intellectual contributions properly reflected?

In Table 2-1 co-authored intellectual contributions would be fractionally apportioned for co-authors at the same institution so as not to double-count the article in the table. For example, Professor X and Professor Y co-author a peer-reviewed journal article. Each professor would get .5 allocation for that co-authored piece.

Likewise, Table 2-2 is intended to document the number of peer- and editorial-reviewed journal articles by journal name. Thus, this table should reflect an unduplicated count. In the example above, this co-authored publication would count as one publication in that journal.

2. Do tutors, teaching assistants, or other faculty supporting a lead professor need to be included in our faculty tables?

If the tutor or teaching assistant is the primary person to whom a student has access, and the tutor is responsible for grading, assessment, or other activities central to the course delivery or student learning, they may need to be included in the tables. A Peer Review Team and committee members will look closely at the tutor or facilitator's activities, and if the student-faculty interaction is primarily with the facilitator or tutor, and the facilitator or tutor is also responsible for other teaching activities as mentioned above, a team or committee would ask for the faculty members in question to be included. While each situation is unique, and each case will be looked at individually, we encourage schools to research comparable schools that may have implemented a faculty model similar to your school.

3. In Table 15-1, how do we represent a faculty member who teaches in more than one department?

If a faculty member is involved through teaching or research in two departments, he/she should be listed in each department and footnoted. However, the percentage of time devoted to mission should not be 100% in both lines. The percentages should reflect the faculty member's allocation of time devoted to mission in each department e.g. 50/50. Percentages also depends on the initial qualification and sustained engagement in research/industry of the faculty member in question.

4. In Table 15-2, does a school need to represent the deployment of faculty by degree level or each program within a degree level?

Data should be presented in Table 15-2 by individual degree program, and not aggregated by degree level. If the school has multiple postgraduate programs, each program should be listed separately in Table 15-2.

5. **Doctoral students who have obtained All But Dissertation (ABD) status are considered SA for 3 years. How is ABD defined? Further, how should ABD faculty be reflected on the tables?**

The school can define ABD in a manner that makes sense for the particular type of program, duration, etc. in question. Normally individuals are classified as ABD after passing their comprehensive or qualifying exams.

Doctoral students may be placed on Table 15-1 if they have formal teaching responsibilities. Their percent of time devoted to mission should reflect their teaching duties only, and not any other activities associated with their role as a student (e.g. work on a dissertation).

6. **How should a faculty member who meets the criteria for more than one faculty definition be classified? Can this person be listed for 100% in more than one category?**

The school applies its own criteria for faculty and ensures that the criteria are aligned with the mission statement. Individuals are reported in one category only.

7. **What is "percent of time devoted to mission"?**

"Percent of time devoted to mission" is intended to broadly represent and encompass all professional responsibilities of each faculty member, including teaching, research, and other professional responsibilities that may be assigned. Table 15-1 should not be developed using a metric that only captures teaching. Clearly, for full-time faculty members including those holding administrative roles within the business school/accounting program that also are full time, the "percent of time devoted to mission" is 100%. For part-time faculty members, something less than 100% should be specified.

8. **How do you calculate "percent of time devoted to mission" for part-time faculty members?**

For part-time faculty members, something less than 100% should be specified. If the school uses a full-time equivalent (FTE) model for its human resource system, then FTE may be a reasonable approximation of "percent of time devoted to mission." For example, an individual teaching one class in both academic terms may be 25% devoted to mission. However, in the absence of an FTE model, the school should have a rational way of assigning the percentage to part-time faculty.

9. **How should faculty members who are on sabbatical leave (or other short term leave) be documented in the tables?**

Faculty members who are on sabbatical leave during periods in which accreditation reports on faculty must be filed should be included in the tables because they are part of "total faculty resources." Since faculty on sabbatical leave do not normally teach, schools should include them in Table 15-1 but clearly identify them as on sabbatical leave either in a footnote or other materials that support the data included in the tables. Their intellectual contributions would also be reflected on Table 2-1. The same guidelines apply for faculty members who are visiting at other schools, are on sick leave, Fulbright fellowships, etc.

10. How are faculty members in the business school who teach business communications or other general education classes reported?

Business communication faculty may normally be excluded from these analyses to the extent they are teaching business communications classes in writing and speaking. The same applies to faculty in the business unit teaching general education classes. If these faculty members teach traditional business subjects (See Part 2 Section 2 under Eligibility Criteria for a list of traditional business subjects), they would be included in Standard 5 and 15 analyses to the extent of this teaching. Clear disclosure of the treatment of such faculty housed in the business school should be provided.

11. Should we include non-business faculty that teach in cross-disciplinary programs in our documentation and on our tables?

Generally speaking, with cross-disciplinary programs, schools are not expected to document the qualifications of faculty teaching outside of the business discipline. If it were to be determined that the content of their courses contained traditional business content, the faculty teaching those courses may need to be included.

12. Must faculty members publish in order to be qualified as Scholarly Academic, Practice Academic, or Scholarly Practitioner?

Standard 15 provides a non-exhaustive list of activities normally expected of SA, PA, and SP status. While the standard does not specifically require publication of peer- or editorial-reviewed journal articles, schools normally are expected to have guidelines and criteria consistent with their mission and their peers. A peer review team may question a school's criteria if it appears the criteria are not in alignment with the school's mission and peer institutions. Note that Standard 2 does require that "The portfolio of intellectual contributions includes contributions from a substantial cross-section of the faculty in each discipline. Normally, a significant level of the contributions in the portfolio must be in the form of peer-reviewed journal articles or the equivalent."

13. Standard 8 specifies a systematic process for assurance of learning. -What do peer review teams usually expect in determining whether this standard is met?

The assurance of learning process is designed to ensure systematic continuous improvement of curriculum. Peer review teams will seek evidence that shows learning goals for each degree program are in place. Generally, some commonly observed best practices of mature AoL programs include four to eight learning goals for each degree program and assessment of the objectives related to each learning goal twice and closing the loop once during the review cycle. Closing the loop is defined as making appropriate changes in the curriculum based on assessment results. Results of the assessment should be documented and available for peer review teams upon request. The assessment processes and results should lead to documented continuous improvement in curriculum.