

Updated July 1, 202~~2~~⁴

Effective July 28, 2020



2020 INTERPRETIVE GUIDANCE FOR AACSB BUSINESS ACCREDITATION

ENGAGEMENT • INNOVATION • IMPACT

2020 INTERPRETIVE GUIDANCE FOR AACSB BUSINESS ACCREDITATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Strategic Management and Innovation	3
Standard 1: Strategic Planning.....	3
Standard 2: Physical, Financial, and Virtual Resources.....	8
Standard 3: Faculty and Professional Staff Resources.....	9
Learner Success	28
Standard 4: Curriculum.....	28
Standard 5: Assurance of Learning	31
Standard 6: Learner Progression	38
Standard 7: Teaching Effectiveness and Impact.....	40
Thought Leadership, Engagement, and Societal Impact	42
Standard 8: Impact of Scholarship	42
Standard 9: Engagement and Societal Impact	51
Appendix A	57

INTRODUCTION

The *Interpretive Guidance* document complements the *2020 Business Accreditation Standards* and supplies additional guidance beyond what is provided in the *Standards* document, including examples or sample tables where appropriate.

Note that with respect to updating of these two documents—the *2020 Business Accreditation Standards* and the *Interpretive Guidance*—the AACSB accreditation standards (shown in bold print in a separate document) are the responsibility of the Accreditation Council (i.e., representatives of the schools currently holding AACSB business accreditation); however, the Definitions, Basis for Judgment, and Suggested Documentation that reside within the *Standards* document may be updated as needed in between updates to the standards. This *Interpretive Guidance* document is also intended to be updated as needed in between updates to the standards. In both cases, the Business Accreditation Policy Committee (BAPC) is vested with the authority to approve changes to all components except the standards (bold print) themselves. The date last updated is reflected on the front of both the *Standards* and *Interpretive Guidance* documents.

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT AND INNOVATION

The three standards comprising “Strategic Management and Innovation” are designed to provide schools with guidance on the process of meaningful strategic management, as well as management of all necessary resources.

Standard 1: Strategic Planning

I. Rationale

The standard on strategic planning is presented first because AACSB-accredited schools view a robust strategic plan as fundamental to the successful AACSB-accredited business school. It is one of the first documents reviewed by the peer review team to identify the school’s mission, what its goals are, how it intends to achieve those goals, and how leadership will allocate resources to meet the school’s goals.

II. Clarifying Guidance

AACSB is not prescriptive in the *form* of the plan, and the standards are not intended to provide one particular template. Schools are free to use any one of a variety of differing forms of strategic plans; however, there are essential elements found in most robust strategic plans.

Some elements of a robust strategic plan for AACSB standards purposes may include a mission statement; strategic initiatives, goals, objectives, and key performance indicators; a discussion of how the school intends to make a positive societal impact; risk assessment and contingency planning; how the plan is monitored; and how key stakeholders are meaningfully involved. Strategic plans should be regularly monitored by the school, and key stakeholders should be involved in this process.

Mission

A mission statement is not usually described entirely by one statement alone; rather, it is a set of statements that describe the school and its mission, vision, and values. These ideas, taken together, express the school's mission and define its core identity, values, stakeholders, and aspirations.

The mission statement or supporting set of statements normally include the primary purpose and focus of the school, the types of degrees offered, characteristics of learners served, and the school's focus with respect to the production of intellectual contributions.

Strategic Initiatives

As a necessary component of strategic planning, the school should identify what it seeks to achieve in both the near and the far term, with such time horizons identified by the school. For example, a school may have a short-range strategic plan, supplemented with a broader set of goals it would like to achieve in a longer period of time. Strategic initiatives describe what the school intends to pursue, and consequently allocate resources to, on a strategic basis. These initiatives answer what the school intends to do above and beyond its normal operational goals, which are not generally included in a strategic plan, although the school may choose to supplement the strategic plan with an operating plan.

Examples of strategic initiatives include such ideas as creating or expanding new programs or new target markets, seeking strategic partnerships, building or expanding facilities, creating interdisciplinary programs, seeking to build a particular area of thought leadership or higher profile, etc. Activities such as routine hiring of faculty and staff, maintenance of programs, ongoing maintenance of the school's budget, and learner recruitment and enrollment management are normally considered operational, as they relate to the day-to-day routine in which all business schools participate. While operational activities are generally not included in the school's strategic plan, at times these routine activities may rise to the level of being strategic in nature when there is a definite strategic element. For example, an enrollment growth target of two percent annually may be routine, or, an enrollment growth that will be achieved by recruiting learners from underserved communities could be considered strategic. The line between operational and strategic activities usually depends on whether activities are considered routine and ongoing versus above and beyond normal for the school.

Goals, Objectives, Tactics, and Key Performance Indicators

Each strategic initiative should be supported by one or more goals and accompanying objectives that identify the expected outcomes related to that strategic initiative.

While *goals* are broad statements that identify what the school wants to achieve, *objectives* are the specific and measurable components that describe how the school will achieve that goal. AACSB does not prescribe the number of objectives that correspond to a specific goal, but by way of guidance, we note that it is common to see two to four objectives for each goal. A school may have more or fewer as appropriate for their purposes. In comparison, *tactics* are usually embedded under objectives and identify specific activities that will be undertaken in support of a given objective. Tactics can be thought of as the action items necessary to meet objectives. Key performance indicators are metrics that a school identifies to gauge their progress towards meeting their goals. While the school may actually track a large number of metrics, key performance indicators are by definition a smaller number of metrics that the school uses to determine if they are on track strategically.

Societal Impact

The school should be specific in its desired societal impact, how it is monitored, and how progress is measured. Societal impact can be defined at the level consistent with the school's mission and resources. That is, some schools will have goals to improve their local communities, some will have goals to impact the business community, and others will have goals to make an international impact on society. The key is for the school to align its activities with its mission.

Risk Analysis

Many schools find themselves in difficult financial or environmental circumstances for which they have no training or planning. Some examples include a sudden drop in enrollment, a significant budget cut, or numerous other issues that could threaten the reputation, brand, or financial viability of the school. A good strategic plan contains risks and threat assessments and plans for how the effects of events would be mitigated. Contingency planning also relates to succession planning. This planning becomes even more important with faculties that have low turnover and for which a large number of faculty vacancies may occur within a short time. Additionally, as a best practice the school should integrate succession planning into their strategic plan.

Monitoring

The school should actively and regularly monitor and measure its progress toward achieving its strategic initiatives, goals, and objectives. Often this monitoring is done as part of a school's yearly summary of activities. The peer review team will generally review evidence that the school is using its plan to guide decision making within the school and to ensure that the plan is regularly reviewed and updated as necessary, including the mission statement and all other components.

Stakeholder Involvement

An important component of a well-devised strategic plan is that key stakeholder involvement is demonstrated at every stage of the process, from the creation of the strategic plan to regular review, ideally at least annually, and reporting of progress toward achieving goals explicated within the plan. Shared governance in this area is particularly important, and faculty play an integral role at all stages. A plan that is devised solely with administrative input is not in keeping with the spirit of the standards. Other key stakeholders normally included in strategic planning include learners, representatives from the business community, advisory boards, key university representatives where there are explicit connections and/or support provided to the business school, and alumni. Within the broader university environment, it is important that the accredited school's strategic plan aligns with and supports the university's or parent organization's plan.

III. Examples

The example below demonstrates the relationship between strategic initiatives, goals, objectives, and tactics typical of a school's strategic plan. This is not intended to be a template, but rather one example that might be used effectively within a school.

Strategic Initiative 1: Reduce class sizes while maintaining high-quality instructional faculty				
Goal	Objective	Tactics	Measure of Success	Resources Needed
1.1 Increase quality and size of faculty	1.1 Hire two new high-quality faculty	1.1 Recruit at the top three academic conferences 1.2 Benchmark proposed salaries against our peer set of schools using AACSB DataDirect 1.3 Pay at the 75th percentile of AACSB Compensation Survey to attract high quality faculty	1.1 Two high-quality faculty hired, and class size reduced to 30:1	1.1 Search committee, recruiting budget of xx.

The following is an example of a risk analysis that accompanies a school's strategic plan.
RISK ANALYSIS – HIGHLAWN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
AUGUST 1, 2020

Risk Description	Likelihood of Risk Occurring	Impact If the Risk Occurred	Severity (Based on Impact and Likelihood)	Mitigating Action(s)	Responsible Parties
Significant reduction in 2021-2022 freshman enrollment due to lingering effects of COVID-19	Medium	High	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule several additional virtual and de-densified, on-campus Open House Events Engage alumni in recruiting efforts (panel discussions, individual outreach) Increase personal interactions with prospective learners (email and mailing campaigns) 	Undergraduate Admissions, University Advancement, Dean's Office
Expected retirement of several tenured faculty members over the next 3-5 years	High	Medium	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop promising internal candidates (adjunct faculty) for tenure-track or full-time contract positions Obtain Provost's Office approval of 5-year hiring plan 	Dean's Office
Failure of Learning Management System and disruption of online and on-ground offerings	Low	Medium	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain backup system with copies of course materials/resources Schedule and test regular updates to platform 	Department of IT
Govt. policy restrictions and continuing impacts of COVID-19 lead to reduction in graduate business international student enrollments ¹	High	Medium	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide additional scholarship incentives for current undergraduate learners who continue in graduate programs Increase opportunities for revenue generation through continuing education and certificate programs Increase advertising, promotion and recruiting efforts domestically 	Graduate Admissions, Dean's Office, Graduate Program Directors
Govt. restrictions and continuing impacts of COVID-19 lead to reduction in graduate business international student enrollments	75%	\$800,000	\$600,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide additional scholarship incentives for current undergraduate learners who continue in graduate programs Increase opportunities for revenue generation through continuing education and certificate programs 	Graduate Admissions, Dean's Office, Graduate Program Directors
Changing demographics in the region result in fewer future high school graduates and fewer entering freshmen	High	High	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase promotion and recruiting efforts in more demographically favorable regions Explore opportunities for internal and external alliances to add attractive degree program options 	Undergraduate Admissions, University

¹ Risk duplicated to show both a qualitative and quantitative approach to assessing risk.

Standard 2: Physical, Virtual, and Financial Resources

I. Rationale

How a school manages its resources is a crucial part of its success both in meeting its mission and other components of its strategic plan. Resources in Standard 2 include all types of resources with the exception of faculty and professional staff, which are covered in Standard 3. In this standard we set the expectation that a school can demonstrate operational vitality to achieve ongoing operations, as well as the resources to achieve their strategic initiatives as identified by the school. Also of interest is the overall operating budget and efficiency measures related to the budget, and how the school's budget has changed since the last review. An AACSB-accredited school should be able to demonstrate financial health, a sound financial model, and facilities and technology appropriate to a quality education.

II. Clarifying Guidance

Physical Resources

Here the peer review team is concerned with the quality of the school's facilities, including buildings, furniture, and fixtures. Is the space in good condition, or is it in disrepair? Are there any safety issues with respect to the space? Additionally, the physical space in which the business school conducts classes is expected to be reflective of current pedagogies. Sufficient space for team activities and other collaborative activities should be available to learners. That space may be located in other places besides the business school (e.g., the library).

Virtual Resources

Technology is expected to be infused through the curriculum and is vital to the production of scholarship and thought leadership. Here the peer review team will seek to determine whether the school has current computing technology—both hardware and software—for faculty and staff that is sufficient to achieve the school's mission and strategic plan. For example, do faculty have access to the databases or other sources of data needed to conduct research? Is the technology infrastructure current to support the desired teaching quality and modality?

Financial Resources

Table 2-1 is included for the school to demonstrate its financial vitality from a strategic perspective.

III. Sample Table

Table 2-1
Strategic Initiatives and Expected Source of Funds
for the Next Accreditation Cycle

Strategic Initiatives	Total Estimated Investment	Expected Source of Funds
Improving learner-facing technical infrastructure	800,000 USD	Government-provided funds/grants
Increase Scholarly Academic faculty in marketing and management	650,000 USD	University funds
Marketing the new MS in finance degree program	300,000 USD	University funds
Awarding of endowed professorship in marketing	1,000,000 USD	Private donor

Standard 3: Faculty and Professional Staff Resources

I. Rationale

One hallmark that distinguishes an AACSB-accredited school from a non-AACSB accredited school is the quality of faculty and staff employed by the school. AACSB looks at both the degree to which faculty participate in the life of the school on a meaningful basis (“faculty sufficiency”) and what the academic credential and ongoing activities are that sustain faculty currency and relevancy (“faculty qualifications”). These measures are a combination of both input and output measures that proxy for quality of faculty.

II. Clarifying Guidance

Discipline and Specialty Field

Table 3-1 requires reporting faculty by discipline, irrespective of organizational structure. For example, a school with a Department of Accounting, Finance, and Information Systems should report those faculty within the disciplines identified by the school, according to what discipline (subject) they normally teach. In cases where a school’s national regulator requires the school to combine certain disciplines for reporting purposes (e.g., accounting and finance), the school may do so for AACSB purposes, as well. This approach should be discussed with AACSB accreditation staff and the school’s peer review team. Teams may request a more detailed breakdown if deemed necessary for the review.

Disciplines are defined by the school in the context of their mission. Normally, the disciplines should align with the degree programs and/or majors or other areas where intellectual capital would be expected to be maintained, including concentrations and specialties. For example, a school offering a Master of Accountancy would normally be expected to identify accounting as a discipline. It is important to note, however, that not every degree program will require a unique discipline be identified. For example, the discipline of management may offer a multitude of degrees and/or majors (e.g., entrepreneurship, strategy, human resources, etc.) for which faculty could all be reported under the discipline of management.²

[Discipline reporting should focus on the macro level disciplines \(e.g., accounting, finance, management, etc.\) instead of the individual sub-disciplines \(e.g., audit, tax, risk, HR, strategy, supply chain, etc.\). It is commonly observed that the management discipline will be large by virtue of the many sub-disciplines contained within management.](#)

If a faculty member teaches in two disciplines, the faculty member can be apportioned between the disciplines accordingly. In such a case, the faculty member should be classified depending on the faculty member's qualification in each discipline. For example, a faculty member who teaches two courses in accounting and two courses in finance, and who achieves SA status in both areas, would be shown in both accounting and finance with teaching hours apportioned for faculty sufficiency purposes; SA status would reflect the appropriate percentage of time devoted to mission in each of the respective disciplines for faculty qualifications purposes. Note that faculty qualification status does not automatically carry over for every discipline in which the faculty member is listed. Rather, faculty members must meet the qualification criteria defined by the school for each discipline, which can mean two different classifications for one faculty member. The burden is on the school to clearly document that the faculty member meets the school's faculty qualifications criteria in multiple disciplines. The faculty member's intellectual contributions would be shown in accounting and finance as appropriate in Table 8-1. If the amount of teaching in the second discipline is immaterial, the school may choose not to apportion the faculty member but report their qualifications in the primary teaching discipline, in accordance with a principles-based approach.

Some disciplines may not offer degree programs but in fact may contain courses that service other degree programs. For example, courses or modules in business law may support multiple degree programs without any associated degree programs in business law alone. In that case, the school should list business law as a separate discipline in Table 3-1 and check the box that indicates no degree, majors, etc. are offered in this discipline. This logic carries over to any similar service courses. Common examples of

² For additional guidance and examples on organizing Table 3-1, refer to Appendix A.

such service courses include, but are not limited to, statistics and economics (when taught within the business school).

Commonly observed business disciplines include accounting, business law, economics, finance, management, marketing, and information systems (or another form of information systems, such as management information systems or information technology/operations management).

Faculty are also listed with the specialty subfield within their discipline in Table 3-1. Specialty Field is the field/discipline of focus, from the master list provided by AACSB, that most closely aligns with the individual faculty member's focus and role. The Specialty Field classification supports peer benchmarking and aggregate or trend analysis of faculty compensation, faculty sufficiency, and faculty qualifications. Given the many unique variations in how business schools structure their faculty, the specialty field may or may not match the discipline heading for the faculty member reported in Table 3-1. However, among schools that participate in the annual *AACSB Staff Compensation and Demographics Survey*, the specialty field should match the individual's field/discipline as reported in that survey. The specialty list to be used in Table 3-1 can be found [here](#).

Table 3-1 should also 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 non-degree executive education, and SER for other service and outreach responsibilities. A faculty member may have more than one category assigned.

The final column of Table 3-1 is "Brief Description of Basis for Qualification." This column is intended to provide the peer review team with a high-level overview of the basis on which a faculty member is classified as SA, PA, SP, IP, as reflected in the school's faculty qualifications guidelines. Schools should provide a code or brief description for each faculty member for the benefit of the peer review team; additional information should be attached as needed to understand a school's coding system.

Faculty Sufficiency

A participating faculty member will be engaged beyond teaching in matters such as policy decisions, advising, research, and service commitments to the school. 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.

Normally, the school considers participating faculty members to be ongoing members of the faculty, regardless of whether a faculty member's appointment is of a full-time or part-time nature, whether their position with the school is considered their principal employment, and whether 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 or committee assignments, 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 usually 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). Similar to the above, classification as a supporting faculty member does not rely on the person's contractual status with the institution.

Depending on the teaching and learning models and associated division of labor across faculty and professional staff, the faculty body 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 competencies, 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 should be sufficient to ensure achievement of all mission activities. This could include 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.

Completion of Table 3-1: Faculty Sufficiency

As per the standard, normally, participating faculty members will deliver at least 75 percent of the school's teaching globally (i.e., across the entire accredited unit) and 60 percent of the teaching within each discipline, as defined by the school.

Table 3-1 should be completed to document the distribution of participating and supporting faculty for the most recently completed, regular academic year prior to the year of a peer review visit (often referred to as the "self-study year"). For example, if School A's visit is in February 2025 and its normal academic year runs from September to June, Table 3-1 will capture September 2023 to June 2024.

The teaching productivity metric used to calculate faculty sufficiency must reflect the operations of the business school (e.g., student credit hours [SCH], European Credit Transfer System [ECTS], contact hours, individual courses, modules, or other designations that are appropriately indicative of each faculty member's teaching contributions). To avoid any unnecessary conflicts, concurrence on all aspects of the metric with the peer review team well in advance of the visit is a best practice.

If a faculty member has no teaching responsibilities, they must be included in Table 3-1 and reflected in the qualifications section of the table. In this case the two columns related to faculty sufficiency should be left blank.

Deans/heads of business units should be included in the table and classified based on the school's faculty qualifications criteria.

Digital courses should use the same teaching productivity metric being used for in-person courses and the method used should be described.

Faculty Qualifications

AACSB standards recognize four distinct faculty qualification categories in which faculty members may be classified, depending on the nature of their initial academic preparation and subsequent academic and/or professional engagement activities.

Each school must document the classification for each faculty member in accordance with one of the following categories: (1) Scholarly Academic (SA), (2) Practice Academic (PA), (3) Scholarly Practitioner (SP), or (4) Instructional Practitioner (IP). Faculty who do not meet the school's criteria within this framework are classified as Additional (A) faculty.

Criteria for each of the four categories should align with the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies, and should include the following essential elements:

- The combinations of academic preparation and/or professional experience required of faculty at the time of hiring, as well as the types of academic and/or professional development activities required of faculty for them to sustain their qualification status after they have been hired.
- How the school 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 the school requires for various, specified development activities and the ways that it assures the quality of these activities.

- The depth and breadth of academic and professional engagement that faculty members are expected to undertake within the normal AACSB review cycle in order to maintain their qualification status.

A single set of criteria may be applied to all faculty resources. Alternatively, the school may also choose to vary criteria based on level of teaching (e.g., undergraduate vs. graduate) or role as relates to one's contribution to the mission of the school. For example, a school may maintain one set of SA criteria for undergraduate faculty and a separate set of criteria for graduate or research faculty. This distinction is particularly relevant with respect to the higher level of intellectual contributions expected of graduate and research faculty. Standard 8 provides additional guidance in the area of intellectual contributions by level of faculty. Note that location or modality, in and of themselves, are not sufficient to maintain separate faculty qualifications criteria and would be inappropriate.

Criteria for granting and for maintaining various qualifications for participating faculty who also hold significant administrative appointments (e.g., deans, associate deans, department heads/chairs, or center directors) in the business school may reflect these important administrative roles. That is, a school may maintain different faculty qualifications criteria for such administrators within the business school if they so choose. Note that it is inappropriate to confer SA status to an administrator without some level of accompanying ongoing activities with the spirit of what their own SA faculty are expected to be engaging in to be deemed "Scholarly Academics."

Title alone is not sufficient to confer qualification status. Administrators who cease administrative functions and return as faculty members would ordinarily be granted a reasonable amount of time to regain currency in teaching or research as needed and would maintain their faculty qualifications status during this transition time, after which he/she would be expected to be classified according to the school's normal faculty qualifications criteria. The school may define what it considers reasonable transition time, but such transition time would normally not exceed three years.

Below is additional guidance on each of these categories in terms of both definitions and the types of activities in which each type of faculty engages on an ongoing, sustained basis.

- (1) *Scholarly Academic (SA)* faculty normally possess a terminal degree in a field related to their area of teaching. The standard specifically includes a PhD or DBA, MST, LLM, or JD, but other terminal degrees may also be appropriate as described below.

Other terminal degrees may be appropriate for SA or PA status. For example, an MD teaching in a healthcare management program may be appropriately classified as SA or PA if the faculty member engages in ongoing sustained activities consistent with the school's criteria for SA or PA classification. We envision a future environment where terminally qualified faculty outside of business are increasingly

common as SA and PA faculty, and they bring a broad and rich perspective to business education in ways that truly accelerate innovation, foster engagement, and amplify the impact of business education.

It is the closeness of the terminal degree to the faculty member's field of teaching and coupled with relevant ongoing activities in their field of teaching ~~that, combined with a terminal degree,~~ that establishes the appropriate faculty qualification status. The less related the terminal degree is to a faculty member's field of teaching, the more important it is for that faculty member to demonstrate sustained, substantive academic and/or professional engagement to support currency and relevancy in their field of teaching and contributions to other mission components.

In addition to producing peer- or editorial-reviewed publications, SA faculty will undertake a variety of academic engagement activities consistent with the faculty member's role (e.g., junior or senior faculty) and the school's mission, strategies, and expected outcomes to support maintenance of this status. Examples of academic engagement activities includes the following:

~~— Participation in research workshops and/or academic conferences related to the faculty member's field of teaching. Scholarly activities leading to the production of scholarship outcomes as documented in Standard 8~~

- Relevant, active editorships with academic journals or other business publications
- Service on editorial boards or committees
- Validation of SA status through academic leadership positions, participation in recognized academic societies and associations, research awards, academic fellow status, invited presentations, etc.
- Significant participation in academic associations, professional standard-setting or policymaking bodies

(2) *Practice Academic* (PA) faculty normally possess a terminal degree in a field related to their area of teaching. PA faculty may undertake a variety of professional engagement activities to interact with business and management practice to support maintenance of this status. While schools may choose to include a publication requirement in their own faculty qualification criteria, Standard 3 does not require a PA faculty member to publish.

~~A non-exhaustive list~~ Examples of professional engagement activities includes 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 policymaking bodies
- Practice-oriented intellectual contributions, as detailed in Standard 8
- 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 engagement with business or other organizational leaders

(3) *Scholarly Practitioner* (SP) faculty normally possess a master’s degree in a discipline related to the [ir](#) field of teaching. In limited cases, SP or IP 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 school is expected to make its case for SP or IP status.

Normally, at the time that a school hires an SP or IP 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 initial professional experience is to the faculty member’s field of teaching, or the longer the time since the relevant experience occurred, the faculty member must demonstrate higher levels of sustained, substantive academic and/or professional engagement related to the [ir](#) field of teaching in order to maintain professional qualifications.

A non-exhaustive list of academic and professional engagement activities an SP faculty member may engage in includes the following:

- Scholarly activities leading to the production of scholarship outcomes as documented in Standard 8
- Relevant, active editorships with academic, professional, or other business or 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 policymaking bodies

(4) *Instructional Practitioner* (IP) faculty may undertake a variety of professional engagement activities involving business and management practice to support maintenance of this status. A non-exhaustive list of professional engagement activities includes 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 policymaking bodies
- Relevant, active service on boards of directors
- Documented continuing professional education experiences
- Documented professional certifications in the [ir](#) 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

While the standard does not prescribe minimum ratios by degree program, location, and modality, the standard expects the school to have an appropriate blend of qualified faculty across these dimensions.

Completion of Table 3-1: Faculty Qualifications

For all AACSB tables (including Standard 3 tables), schools are expected to adhere to the template and should not make structural adjustments. The header of Table 3-1 should specify the normal academic year format or schedule being used (e.g., September 2020–June 2021). Shorter terms such as summer or intersession terms should be excluded from the academic year for these purposes.

Table 3-1 should list all faculty contributing to the mission of the school, including the following faculty members:

- Participating and supporting faculty
- Graduate learners who are instructors of record with formal teaching responsibilities
- Faculty with significant administrative responsibilities, regardless of whether such administrators are teaching
- Faculty teaching prerequisite business courses in the accredited unit if not specifically excluded in the list below
- Faculty who are on short-term leave and who are expected to return to faculty should be included in the table and a footnote explanation provided
- Visiting faculty should also be included in the table and classified according to the criteria of the school they are visiting with respect to both faculty sufficiency and qualifications. Intellectual contributions from their home school would not be reflected in Table 8-1 unless supported by the school in which they are visiting.

Normally, the determining factor for who is included in Table 3-1 is: Which individuals have *primary engagement with the learner*, regardless of the modality and method of delivery of the course. The instructional faculty members who have primary engagement with the learner, either directly or indirectly, must be reported in Table 3-1, regardless of whether they are full-time, adjuncts, or faculty contracted through a third party. Examples of indirect engagement with learner include engagement through the use of teaching assistants/tutors or through enhanced artificial intelligence. In the case of an individual who designs the course but does not have any subsequent engagement with learners, the individual would not be included in the table. Instead, it would be the individual(s) that have primary engagement with the learners who are included in the table. In the case of teaching assistants/tutors supporting a faculty member teaching large courses, the teaching assistants/tutors would not be included in the table. Schools using such models should document how the model supports high-quality academic programs.

While a faculty member could technically meet the school's criteria for more than one category (e.g., SA and PA), the faculty member should be reported in only one category.

Table 3-1 should *not* include the following faculty members:

- For interdisciplinary programs, faculty teaching non-business courses.
- Faculty teaching courses or modules that service the general university population (for example accounting for nonbusiness majors).³
- Lower-level business communications courses where basic oral and written communications is the primary content.
- Courses serviced outside the business school [that are taught from the perspective of a non-business discipline](#) -(e.g., business law taught in the law school, economics taught in a college of arts and letters or a separate school of economics [that is social science oriented](#), or information systems taught in the school of computing [from a computer science perspective](#).)
- Non-business courses that are prerequisites to business [taught from a non-business perspective](#), such as calculus and/or statistics courses serviced outside the business school, or foreign language classes.⁴
- Faculty teaching in partner schools supporting a collaborative provision program that is deemed out of scope for the AACSB-accredited school.⁵

³ If a faculty member is teaching both required business courses as well as general education courses, their teaching productivity would reflect only the hours of the required courses and not the general education courses. However, an individual's percent of time devoted to mission is unaffected by teaching general education courses.

⁴ Required statistics courses and economics courses taught within the business school are included in Table 3-1.

⁵ Refer to "Collaborative Provisions/Transfer Credit" in the front matter to the standards for partnership programs that are out of scope for AACSB.

- Faculty supporting any transfer credit such as advanced placement courses, dual credit courses through high school and university arrangements, courses transferred in through articulation agreements, or study abroad courses transferred in.
- Faculty members who are solely dedicated to the delivery of non-credit executive education programs, non-credit certificates, etc. For faculty who deliver both non-credit executive education and credit-bearing courses, the faculty member should be included in the tables with respect to the credit-bearing courses only.
- Faculty members who terminated employment with the school prior to the most recently completed regular academic year should not be included in Table 3-1. However, faculty who left mid-year for the most recent regular academic year of record (i.e., they left during the self-study year) may be included for the portion of the year they were a faculty member, with an appropriate footnote to denote that the faculty member has left. Percent of time devoted to mission should be adjusted accordingly. For example, a full-time faculty member who left midway through the self-study year would be reflected as 50 percent devoted to mission in Table 3-1. Faculty members who joined the school mid-year are similarly treated. For Table 8-1 purposes, it is not necessary to apportion the intellectual contributions portfolio for such faculty members; thus, the entire intellectual contributions portfolio is included.
- Teaching assistants or tutors who support an instructor of record by assisting in grading, test proctoring, tutoring, and conducting labs for learners. [These individuals may be excluded as long as they are not functioning as the primary instructor.](#)

Calculating “Percent of Time Devoted to Mission”

“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 normally 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 should not be more than 100 percent. For part-time faculty, the expected percent 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 (e.g., total contracted hours, etc.) of assigning the percent to part-time faculty that is, as a best practice, agreed to by the peer review team well in advance of the report submission.

The key is to determine, on a percentage basis, the amount of time a school considers a normal teaching load for a given semester. That amount is then applied to those who are less than full time to determine the percent of time that individual is considered “devoted to mission” for all of the duties that individual performs in a given semester.

Sample Calculations of Percent of Time Devoted to Mission:

The following are three sample calculations under the assumption a school has a 40/30/30 FTE model, meaning 40 percent of the faculty member’s time is devoted to research, 30 percent of their time is devoted to teaching, and 30 percent of their time is devoted to service.

If an individual is assigned additional duties, this percentage would be added to the percentage devoted to teaching.

- Example 1: Faculty member teaches one 3-hour (expressed in student credit hours, or “SCH”) class per year and has no additional teaching, research, or service responsibilities. Standard teaching load is nine credit hours per semester, or 18 credit hours per year. The percent-of-time calculation is based on the standard teaching load for a full-time faculty member per year. Thus, the denominator in this example is 18 credit hours, while the numerator is the apportioned effort the school attributes to teaching—in this case 30%.

Percent of time devoted to mission is $30\%/18 \text{ credit hours} = 1.67\%/\text{credit hour}$
 $\times 3 \text{ credit hours for a class} = 5\%$. This is the number that would go in Table 3-1 under the appropriate faculty qualification cell.

- Example 2: Faculty member teaches one class per year and has 10% service assigned and no research expectations. Standard teaching load is 9 credit hours per semester, or 18 hours per academic year.

Percent of time devoted to mission is 5% (same calculation as above) + 10 service% = 15%. This is the number that would go in Table 3-1 under the appropriate faculty qualification cell.

- Example 3: Faculty member teaches two classes per year and has no additional teaching, research, or service responsibilities. Standard teaching load is 12 credit hours per semester, or 24 hours per academic year.

Percent of time devoted to mission is $30/24 = 1.25\%/\text{credit hour}$
 $\times 6 \text{ credit hours} = 7.5\%$. This is the number that would go in Table 3-1 under the appropriate faculty qualification cell.

Completion of Table 3-2: Deployment of Faculty by Qualification Status in Support of Degree Programs

- The school should provide an analysis of the deployment of SA, PA, SP, IP, and Additional 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. MBA programs may be combined into one line; however, where significant differences exist among types of MBA programs or target audiences, it is preferable to show these varying MBA programs broken out on separate lines.
- The school must complete Table 3-2 in the format provided in this document to demonstrate deployment of faculty resources across each degree program level. Deployment should be consistent with the school's 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 information for the most recently completed regular academic year. Each cell represents the percentage 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. 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%).

Faculty and Professional Staff Development

The school should be able to produce upon request promotion and tenure policies (if applicable) for the various units of the school, as well as annual evaluation policies. One question of interest to the peer review team is whether such policies are clearly communicated and understood by the faculty and staff.

Consistent with Standards 1 and 7, the school is expected to plan for and provide resources for assisting faculty in maintaining currency with current and emerging technology. This is especially important in areas in which technology is rapidly changing.

In areas where doctoral students or other graduate learners have teaching responsibilities, the school should describe how it ensures the quality and preparedness of these learners for successful classroom experiences. This is particularly true for doctoral students, consistent with Standard 7.

Development of both faculty and professional staff is also expected and may include internal or external training and upskilling as needed to remain current and support the school's faculty and learners. Certifications such as the Certified Management & Business Educator ("CMBE") credential offered by the Chartered Association of Business Schools for master teaching, provides the means for ongoing or continuous

development as well as validating expertise. Additionally, the Higher Education Academy HEA Fellows program can be explored as a way to externally validate expertise in teaching. These are intended as examples that exist among a number of programs.

While there is some overlap between Standards 3 and 7 with respect to the provision of teaching resources, the distinction is that Standard 3 lays out the expectation that appropriate training and technology, along with other resources needed for success in the classroom, are available, while Standard 7 is where the school describes how these resources have been employed to improve teaching effectiveness and impact of teaching.

III. Sample Tables

University of Pirsig School of Business
Table 3-1: Faculty Sufficiency and Qualifications Summary
for September 2020–May 2021 (Re: Standard 3)

Faculty Portfolio by Discipline			Faculty Sufficiency Related to Teaching (SCH, ECTS, contact hours)		Normal Professional Responsibilities	Faculty Qualifications With Respect to Percent of Time Devoted to Mission					Brief Description of Basis for Qualification (Enter brief quantitative and/or qualitative information corresponding to the school criteria for each category.)
Faculty Member Name (Please organize and list individually in sections reflecting each discipline.)	Specialty Field	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)	Additional Faculty (A)	
Accounting			Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/>						
Bora, Byung-Ho	Accounting	PhD, 2012	480		MT, DT, RES	100					PhD in field; 3 PRJs; editorial board, member 1 PRJ
Levin, Nathalie	Taxation	MST, 1986		450	UT				100		Active accounting practice; professional online tax seminar; leads college internship program
Smith, Robert	Taxation	MST, 2015	675		UT	100					1 PRJ; 3 Conference presentations; 1 grant (NEXUS)

Total Accounting			1155	450		200 (66.7%)	0	0	100 (33.3%)	0	
Accounting Ratio			>= 60% requirement for P met (72%)			SA >= 40% met (66.7%) SA+PA+SP+IP >= 90% met (100%)					
Finance	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/>							
Hjalmar, Shinobu	Real Estate	PhD, 1995	360		ADM, UT, MT		100				PhD in field; Dept Chair; program development; Board of Directors(HSBC)
Stone, Bob	Banking	MBA, 1990		100	MT				16.5		Former minister of finance, chairman of bank
Tucker, Suzanne	Finance	PhD, 2011	420		DT, RES	100					PhD in field; 3 PRJs; editorial boards
Total Finance			780	100		100 (46.2%)	100 (46.2%)	0	16.5 (7.6%)	0	
Finance Ratio			>= 60% requirement for P met (88.6%)			SA >= 40% met (46.2%) SA+PA+SP+IP >= 90% met (100%)					
Business Law	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/>			Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Scott, Christine	Business Law	LLM 1980		240	MT		25				Terminal degree, Practicing attorney, leader in Bar Association
Zubar, Justin	Business Law	JD 2004	900		UT, MT	100					Terminal degree, Member of State Bar of TX and FL ; 3 PRJs
Total Business Law			900	240		100 (80%)	25 (20%)	0	0	0	
Business Law Ratio			>=60%requirement for P met (79%)			SA >=40% (80%) SA+PA+SP+IP >= 90% (100%)					

Marketing		Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/>			Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Erasmus, Isa	Marketing Research	MBA, 2004	279		UT, MT, RES				50	MBA; full time work in field until 2018; 2 professional memberships
Johnson, Sandy	Supply Chain	PhD, 2010	429		UT, MT		50			PhD in field; strategy consulting;
Jones, Justine	Marketing	PhD, 1995	0	0	RES, ADM	100				Dean, 3 PRJs; 2 conference presentations; Board of Advisors (American Marketing Association)
Rabi, Osama	Marketing	MBA, 1987	738		UT, ADM			100		MBA; 1 PRJ; Industry Experience; Chair of Center for Consumer Behavior Research

Total Marketing			1446	0		100 (33.3%)	50 (16.7%)	100 (33.3%)	50 (16.7%)	0
Marketing Ratio			>= 60% requirement for P met (100%)			SA >= 40% (33.3%) SA+PA+SP+IP >= 90% (100%)				
Grand Total			4281	790		500 (53.1%)	175 (18.6%)	100 (10.6%)	166.5 (17.7%)	0
Overall Ratio			>= 75% requirement for P met (84.4%)			SA >= 40% met (53.1%) SA+PA+SP+IP >= 90% met (100%)				
Faculty Sufficiency Indicators:					Faculty Qualifications Indicators:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall discipline guideline: $P/(P+S) \geq 75\%$ 					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SA guideline: $(SA)/(SA + PA + SP + IP + A) \geq 40\%$ SA + PA + SP + IP guideline: $(SA + PA + SP + IP)/(SA + PA + SP + IP + A) > 90\%$ 					

University of Pirsig School of Business

**Table 3-2: Deployment of Faculty by Qualification Status in Support of Degree Programs
September 2020–May 2021**

Faculty percentage of teaching by program and degree level (using Student Credit Hours)						
	Scholarly Academic (SA) %	Practice Academic (PA) %	Scholarly Practitioner (SP) %	Instructional Practitioner (IP) %	Additional (A) %	Total %
BS Commerce and Business Administration	23.2%	15.6%	25.4%	35.8%	0	100%
MBA	33.6%	31.1%	0%	35.3%	0%	100%
Doctoral Program	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

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	Practice Academic	Scholarly Practitioner	Instructional Practitioner	Additional	Total
Bachelor's Program						
Nathalie Levin				900		
Robert Smith	675					
Shinobu Hjalmar*		240				
Isa Erasmos*				140		
Sandy Johnson*		215				
Osama Rabi			738			
Total Bachelor's Program	675	455	738	1040	0	2908
Percent Bachelor's Program	23.2%	15.6%	25.4%	35.8%	0.0%	100.00%

*Shinobu Hjalmar, Isa Erasmos, and Sandy Johnson teach at both the bachelor's level and in the MBA program.

	Scholarly Academic	Practice Academic	Scholarly Practitioner	Instructional Practitioner	Additional	Total
MBA Program						
Byung-Ho, Bora	360					
Shinobu Hjalmar*		120				
Christine Scott				240		
Isa Erasmos*				139		
Sandy Johnson*		214				
Total MBA Program	360	334	0	379	0	1073
Percent MBA Program	33.6%	31.1%	0.0%	35.3%	0.0%	100.00%

*Bora Byung-Ho, Shinobu Hjalmar, Isa Erasmos, and Sandy Johnson all teach at various degree levels.

	Scholarly Academic	Practice Academic	Scholarly Practitioner	Instructional Practitioner	Additional	Total
PhD program						
Byung-Ho, Bora	120					
Thaddeus Thompson	420					
Total PhD Program	540	0	0	0	0	540
Percent PhD Program	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.00%

*Bora Byung-Ho teaches at both the master's and doctoral degree levels.

LEARNER SUCCESS

The four standards comprising Learner Success are designed to ensure that all types of learners benefit from the school’s educational process. The word “learner” is broader than “student” and encompasses not only students but all stakeholders who are acquiring knowledge and skills. Learners are generally acknowledged to be intellectually curious beyond the classroom.

Standard 4: Curriculum

I. Rationale

Business schools provide education primarily through their curriculum. Each degree program, including curricular pieces or components that can aggregate to degree programs, is designed to provide learners with a distinct set of competencies. The knowledge and skills in these curricula should prepare learners for desired career outcomes and a lifelong learning mindset.

There are definitive core competencies that a business school graduate with either a generalized or specialized degree should be expected to have. Learners have the expectation and right to access curriculum that is current and relevant. Curriculum should also be innovative, impactful in its education of graduates, and promote engagement in multiple contexts. Because technology is so impactful in business, Standard 4 specifically addresses the need for learners to be agile with current technologies and possess technological agility.

II. Clarifying Guidance

Curriculum Content

The primary objective of the standard is to ensure that the curriculum is properly managed and covers appropriate competencies. The peer review team will want to examine each degree program’s list of course offerings to ensure currency and relevancy. Curricula should address competencies that would normally be included in the type of degree program under consideration. Given the pace of change in business practice today, both knowledge and skill areas may be dynamic over time.

Curriculum should be managed to ensure appropriate inclusion of technology. Schools are required to describe the types of current and emerging technologies with which learners are expected to graduate with competency, for each program level. The purpose of this requirement is to demonstrate that schools are providing learners with relevant technology competencies in line with what might be expected for business degree graduates. As an example, business graduates are generally expected to have a moderate or better level of competency with Microsoft Excel. Some business degrees may require competency in

statistical software, programming software, or database software. The use of technology in degree programs is just one example of curricular currency. However, lack of use of relevant technologies in degree programs can provide an important signal that the curriculum is not up to date and relevant.

Curriculum Management

Curriculum should be managed to ensure that it remains current and relevant. The school should have governance that facilitates regular reviews of curricular content and assurance of learning (AoL) processes and outcomes with internal (faculty and staff) and external stakeholders (discussed in Standard 5). The peer review team can review the school's governance structure to determine whether committees or task forces are in place related to curriculum updates and AoL. The peer review team should also ask about frequency of meetings of curriculum-related groups, and perhaps review minutes of these meetings if a concern exists, along with any other relevant documentation to ensure that the school has an active curriculum management process.

Innovation, Experiential Learning, Lifelong Learning, and Societal Impact

An innovative approach to curriculum incorporates elements of cutting-edge content, creative and experimental pedagogies, and variation in delivery or processes. A school might demonstrate that it delivers innovative curricular content by creating new courses, new degree programs, or new curricular and co-curricular initiatives. Examples might include adding topics or coursework in new topical areas or offering interdisciplinary courses. Other examples might involve curricular requirements for learners to acquire proficiency in a programming language or with an emerging technology. With respect to pedagogy, innovation can be expressed and documented where faculty are experimenting with different approaches to teaching. Examples would be initiatives to overcome unconscious bias and promote inclusive pedagogy or approaches that recognize different learner styles and paces of learning. Delivery modes are part of the pedagogy process and can include use of technology and online courses and varied classroom configurations and processes, such as a learner-centered classroom setting or "flipped" classrooms.

Curriculum should include experiential learning opportunities, including those that facilitate the connection between academic and professional experiences. The peer review team should be provided with examples of experiential learning opportunities that might include field trips, guest speakers, and professional development workshops.

Curriculum should foster a lifelong learning mindset. This can be demonstrated through myriad ways, including but not limited to learner engagement with professional associations, assignments that reach beyond what is taught in the classroom or a given course, and demonstration of facility with emerging technology beyond what is required in the classroom. Learners should not just be prepared for their first jobs. While learning current practices and technologies is important, the overall purpose of the education should be to equip learners to continue their learning. This is difficult to assess, but the report should include reference to how the school develops learner intellectual curiosity and critical thinking and helps them take ownership of their learning.

There are many ways that curricular offerings can incorporate societal well-being and foster and support learners' ability to have societal impact. Examples of curricular components would be specialized finance courses or class sessions that are dedicated to or cover environmental, social, or corporate governance ("ESG") investing; courses that have learners complete consulting projects for nonprofit organizations or provide services such as Voluntary Income Tax Assistance; and courses or class sessions that cover sustainability.

Engagement

Curriculum should facilitate and encourage active student engagement in learning [in all modalities](#). In addition to time on tasks related to readings, course participation, knowledge development, projects, and assignments, learners engage in experiential and active learning designed to be inclusive for a diverse student body, and to improve skills and the application of knowledge in practice. Curriculum facilitates and encourages [frequentregular](#), [productivemeaningful](#) learner-to-learner and learner-to-faculty academic and learner-to-industry professional engagement. Successful teaching and learning demand high levels of such [interactionengagement](#). The peer review team should seek examples of [interactionengagement across all modalities](#). [Examples of meaningful learner-to-faculty engagement include:](#)

- [Synchronous delivery of lectures or other course content. This may include synchronous instructor-led sessions on specific topics in line with the course content.](#)
- [Providing personalized written and/or verbal feedback directly to learners on assignments, quizzes, tests, and other assessment activities.](#)
- [Holding regular office hours of a reasonable length of time and meeting with learners.](#)
- [Engaging regularly with learners within the course platform in any number of substantial ways.](#)

Opportunities for learner-to-faculty engagement should be provided to learners on a routine basis throughout the course and should be primarily initiated by the faculty member. Note that delivering lectures with all other engagement provided by teaching assistants or other support personnel does not align with the spirit and intent of the standards. Regular, meaningful learner-to-learner and learner-to-faculty engagement is a hallmark of an AACSB accredited school.

~~As examples~~[With respect to learner-to-learner engagement](#), the peer review team might expect that learners interact with each other outside of class through student organization activities, ~~that faculty hold office hours to meet with learners, through that there are~~ applied projects and service learning opportunities, [and other small and large group activities.](#) ~~and that faculty and learners read current literature and news reports related to curricular subject matter.~~

Standard 5: Assurance of Learning (AoL)

I. Rationale

Quality faculty, a thoughtful and relevant curriculum, and support for teaching are all input contributions to learner success. However, to ensure that learners are prepared for careers or further study, it is necessary to assess competencies through a combination of direct and indirect assurance of learning (AoL) measures. Competencies include knowledge, skills and abilities and are a demonstration of learner ability to accomplish tasks. Thus, they are more outcome-focused and broader-based than learning goals.

It is important to know whether graduates are satisfied with their program of study, prepared for a world of work or further study, and successful in their future endeavors. The primary goal of AoL is to ensure competency or proficiency with business skills and knowledge. Direct measures are useful because they provide evidence that learners can demonstrate competency; however, indirect measures can be useful in assessing whether a curriculum is accomplishing desired objectives.

II. Clarifying Guidance

Philosophy of AoL

AoL is not intended to be a check-the-box, compliance exercise. Such an approach deprives a school and its learners of a real opportunity to live the spirit of continuous improvement for the degree programs covered by AACSB accreditation. Peer review teams should not approach AoL from a purely compliance mindset. Rather, they should keep in mind that they are determining whether the school is meeting the spirit and intent of Standard 5 and showing continuous improvement, and that the learners are substantially meeting stated learning competencies. The AoL standard is principles-based and is meant to provide guidance in conducting direct and indirect assessment of learner competency. It is AACSB's position that more complexity, a greater number of competency goals, or assessing every competency every year does not make an AoL process better. It is the systematic process, informed by the school's mission and strategies and resulting in meaningful improvements in curriculum and learning, that defines a strong and mature AoL system.

One of the essential elements of AoL is faculty and key stakeholder involvement. It cannot be emphasized enough that AoL is not about one or a few members of the faculty or staff doing most of the work. AoL should be faculty driven, with the majority of faculty involved at some level. Faculty in whose courses assurance of learning competencies are measured have a particularly high responsibility to ensure that the learning goals are appropriate and meaningful, and that student learning is enhanced through the AoL process. However, the faculty as a whole should be familiar with the

school's AoL processes and should be involved in reviewing and providing feedback on a continuous improvement basis. External stakeholders such as advisory councils can be invaluable assets in helping a school determine whether they have the right competencies specified for a given degree program. AACSB strongly encourages such input.

Essential Elements

The essential elements for alignment with Standard 5 emanate from the language in the standard and the interpretive guidance aligned with the standard and are as follows:

- A well-documented plan identifying competency goals for each degree program and describing where and when each competency is assessed.
- A process that involves broad faculty and other key stakeholder involvement.
- Competencies measured systematically (i.e., at regular pre-established intervals), with curriculum improvements emanating directly from the AoL process.
- A combination of direct and indirect assessment of learning across all degree programs, but each degree program may use either direct or indirect assessment or a combination of both; mission, strategy, and competency goals are factors in selecting the best approach.
- Competency goals consonant with the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies are established for each degree program.
- Demonstration that degree competency goals have been substantially met, or in cases where goals are not being met, the school has instituted efforts to eliminate the discrepancy.

Direct vs. Indirect Measures

Both direct and indirect measures of assessment should be used within the portfolio of programs. Any individual program may rely on either direct or indirect measures, or a combination of both. However, the peer review team will normally expect to see both measures across the portfolio of all degree programs.

In some cases, indirect assessments may have a more comprehensive impact on curriculum. For example, a survey of learners returning from internship experiences or of internship employers might indicate that learners are lagging in their presentation skills compared with interns from other institutions. The standard does not prescribe frequency or type of indirect assessment. Some schools may have regularly scheduled alumni surveys, while others may convene focus groups on an ad hoc basis. Indirect assessments might incorporate graduation and alumni surveys, feedback from employers, focus groups, interviews, and other advice from stakeholders. If direct measures are used solely for a particular program, then it is expected that there would be multiple competency goals with regular patterns of assessment, feedback, and curricular adjustment. If indirect assessment is the only AoL measure used in a

program, it is expected that there would be multiple stakeholders engaged in providing feedback in systematic fashion, on a regularly scheduled basis. The school should be prepared to provide its rationale for whichever approach it employs within respective degree programs.

Determining the Right Amount of Data to Collect and Analyze

One observation with respect to AoL is that schools sometimes gather data on every course, every semester, and on every learner. This practice is not the intent of AoL and is not appropriate. Sampling is entirely appropriate, keeping in mind the principles of sampling related to gathering a representative sample across the sample frame.

While a robust AoL system will have multiple competency goals for each degree program, AACSB does not prescribe an optimal number of competencies for a given degree program; Competency goals should focus on what is most important for learners to comprehend or possess. The school should create the AoL system across programs, with a combination of direct and indirect measures, that best supports its mission.

Because the standard is principles-based, it is helpful to keep the following clarifications in mind with respect to what the standard is *not* intended to do:

- Specify the number of competency goals a school should adopt.
- Require that each competency goal must be assessed solely with either direct or indirect measures of AoL.
- Prescribe that learning objectives must be included underneath each competency goal (though a school can choose to do so if they do desire).
- Prescribe how many times a competency goal must be assessed in order to constitute “regular” assessment.
- Describe specifically what a school needs to do to have a “mature” AoL system.
- Require formal AoL processes for components smaller than a degree.
- Require formal AoL processes for non-degree executive education.

Learning Objectives or Not?

How schools incorporate operational definitions is a school choice. Many schools choose to include learning objectives under each competency goal in direct assessment as the operationalization of competencies. Similar to competency goals, if a school chooses to include learning objectives under each competency goal, there is no optimal number of learning objectives; however, as a guideline, schools that use competency goals tend to have one to three learning objectives for each competency goal. This guideline may vary in practice. An alternative way to incorporate operational definitions is to write competency goals that contain specific and measurable components embedded within the goal. Either way, in a system of direct assessment, competency

goals are typically measured twice in a five-year cycle with improvements launched between the two measurement cycles in order to facilitate the curriculum improvement.

Closing the Loop

This terminology has created some confusion due to inconsistent interpretations. Simply put, AACSB interprets closing the loop to mean that a school shows how curriculum was improved as a result of the assurance of learning process. Specifically, data from the second measure allows faculty, a peer review team, or other engaged stakeholders, to judge whether the curriculum improvements that were driven by the first round of data/results have been effective in helping students learn and/or perform better. Schools typically “close the loop” at least once in their accreditation cycle for each competency goal. A commonly repeated phrase that is a misconception is that schools must “close the loop twice.” This misconception appears to be a misinterpretation related to the fact that schools commonly assess competency goals twice in a normal accreditation cycle.

Curriculum review and revision should occur routinely and systematically and be informed by the AoL process. Because curriculum changes emanate from a multitude of sources (e.g., external stakeholder input, university or school strategic choices, financial or competitive drivers, etc.), Standard 5 does require schools to identify the specific curriculum changes that were made directly as a result of their AoL process and how student learning was improved as a result of AoL. If process changes were made as a result of AoL (e.g., the school decides to measure learning outcome in a different course), these are important improvements that would also be captured in Table 5-1 for initial schools or elsewhere for continuous improvement review schools and indicated with a “P” for process change.

Other AoL Regulators and Quality Assurance Organizations

Many institutions are accredited by organizational entities other than AACSB. In some cases, these accreditors require assessment processes similar to the AoL requirements of AACSB. For AACSB purposes, it is the “Essential Elements” as listed above that are paramount, whether those are created solely for AACSB, or emanate from a process created for a different regulator. Direct substitution of a regional or country regulator is appropriate only where the process meets all of AACSB’s “Essential Elements” for AoL. For example, an assurance of learning process focused on the major, as opposed to the degree level, would not be directly substitutable but could be built upon and leveraged for AoL purposes at the degree level. When relying on a system developed for a regional or national regulatory system, gaps from AACSB-required essential elements should be identified and filled and the school is expected to tell its assurance of learning story within the AACSB framework.

Competency-Based Education

Competency-based education (CBE) is an outcomes-based approach to earning a college credential. CBE is commonly equated with prior-learning assessment (PLA) in which learning that occurs outside of the traditional classroom is evaluated for credit

toward a degree. While PLA is considered to be one type of CBE, another major type of CBE is credit awarded through project-based direct assessment. The standard indicates that CBE should reflect a small percentage of the total academic program. This refers to PLA and not CBE based on project-based direct assessment of the mastery of concepts for a course. This distinction between CBE based on PLA and CBE based on direct assessment is important in the context of this standard. In the case of direct assessment CBE, there is no limitation in terms of credit earned in this manner. The school must demonstrate that CBE programs are of the same quality and rigor as its traditional degree programs.

Microlearning Credentials and Non-Degree Executive Education

Microlearning credentials are certificates, badges, executive education courses, or clusters of courses offered that normally do not lead to degrees. AACSB standards expect that these types of credentials should be reviewed for quality; however, a formal AoL systematic process with competency goals in each program is not required.

The objective of this standard is to ensure that *all* educational offerings of the school are of the quality commensurate with the school's mission.

The standard indicates that non-degree executive education should be reviewed for quality if it exceeds five percent of the school's total annual resources. In recognition that client feedback and program sustainability provide some measures of AoL for this area, this quality review need not entail a comprehensive combination of direct and indirect assessment measures. Similar to the assessment of other non-degree offerings, the review should ensure that the executive education is of a quality commensurate with the school's mission and degree programs.

III. Sample Tables

Note as a reminder that Table 5-1 is mandatory for schools in the initial accreditation process for every program that is in scope for AACSB purposes. Such schools should complete this table to the best of their ability and submit it to the Initial Accreditation Committee. For example, recognizing that the assessment system is likely in the process of being implemented, schools seeking initial accreditation should provide approximate dates for which assessment milestones will be achieved (e.g., June 2022 first round of data collection, July-August 2022 analysis of data, Sept. 2022 second round of data collection, etc.). The table is optional for schools in the continuous improvement review (CIR) process, but many of these schools and teams have found this table to be helpful in reporting their AoL results. AoL is reported at the degree program level as opposed to the major level. For example, a school with one BBA program with 10 majors would have one corresponding table.

Table 5-1
Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA)
Assessment Plan and Results for Most Recently Completed Accreditation
Cycle

Competency	Performance Target	How Assessed	Where Assessed	When Assessed	Results	Improvements Identify whether process (P) or curriculum (C) (Date changes were made)
Direct Measures						
Communication Skills—Oral	75%	Oral presentation	MGT 400	Years 1,3	Year 1: 68% Year 3: 80%	Established new mandatory communications class for juniors (C) (Year 2)
Communication Skills—Written	75%	Research memo	MG 400	Years 2,4	Year 2: 52% Year 4: 60%	Established writing lab (C) (Year 3) Updated rubric to provide additional detail to ensure consistent measurement across faculty (P) (Year 3)
Technical Business Knowledge	Scores at or above the national average in each discipline	Standardized test	Online, supervised	Annually in senior year	Scores above the national average in each discipline except marketing (see separate summary)	Added modules in logistics and supply chain in year 2, as that is where the weaknesses were observed in our marketing learners. Scores improved in years 3 and 4. We are continuing to monitor (C)
Indirect Measures - none						

Table 5-1
Master of Cybersecurity
Assessment Plan and Results for Most Recently Completed Accreditation
Cycle

Competency	Performance Target	How Assessed	Where Assessed	When Assessed	Results	Improvements Identify whether process (P) or curriculum (C) (Date changes were made)
Direct Measures - none						
Indirect Measures						
Technical knowledge in cybersecurity, including demonstrated success in post-graduate employment	An average of 6 on a 7-point Likert scale on employer satisfaction survey	Employer satisfaction survey	With all employers who have hired our cybersecurity graduates in the past five years	Survey is conducted every other year; Last measured in year 3 of our accreditation cycle	6.6/7.0	Two areas of deficiency were noted in our survey: the area of digital forensics was noted as a weakness, as well as issues regarding cloud computing security. As a result of this feedback, we added these topics into the curriculum and are currently focusing on this area more heavily. (C)
<p>The primary competency goal is the technical proficiency of our learners who graduate with this degree. To measure the technical proficiency of our learners, we conduct a survey of our Master of Cybersecurity employers every three years to determine satisfaction measures with those who hire our learners. We last conducted this survey in year 3 of this accreditation cycle. Satisfaction was measured at a 6.6 on a 7-point Likert scale. Of the 30 people who have graduated with this degree, 90% are employed in the field of cybersecurity. Complete survey results are available upon request.</p>						

Standard 6: Learner Progression

I. Rationale

The desired outcome from a business school's degree and non-degree programs is learner success, broadly defined. Positive outcomes are dependent on inputs and processes apart from the curriculum. Admissions processes should be in place that ensure a learner population with diversity of all kinds, consistent with the school's mission, that is capable of academic progress toward completion with the potential to obtain desired outcomes such as further graduate studies or career placement. Professional development programs and extracurricular programs are also highly valued components in learner progression.

II. Clarifying Guidance

Admissions, Progress, Degree Completion, and Career Development Support

Institutions generally collect, monitor, and report data regarding demographic composition of incoming learner populations, learner retention, and graduation rates. In many cases, these data will be available at an institution level, though the accredited unit may also collect, monitor, and report these data. If learners are admitted to the university and there are no separate admission requirements for the AACSB accreditation unit, these data will be appropriate. If there are policies and procedures at the unit level, they should be documented. The criteria for admission should be compatible with the school's mission and consistently applied. Information about admission requirements should be publicly available.

Programs, policies, and practices should be in place to support learners as they advance toward degree completion. The mission of schools may vary widely with respect to the learners they admit. The peer review team will want to know that the school appreciates the composition of their learner population and supports them in their journey toward graduation. Demographic data that should be reviewed normally include the following for the incoming class, for learners at various levels of degree completion where appropriate, and for graduates:

- Diversity statistics
- Age ranges and mean/median
- Proportion of first-generation learners (if available)
- Average standardized test scores
- High school or preparatory school GPA
- Professional experience

Data about attrition and degree completion are useful but should be supplemented with information about support services, such as those available for learners with disabilities or remedial needs. A school that accepts learners with lower GPAs and test scores might be expected to assist those learners in transitioning to college or university study. Schools that accept a large percentage of first-generation learners may need orientation programming to prepare the learners for their course of study. Graduate programs might include learner coaching and professional development. Counseling and advising are an important part of learner progression to ensure that learners are directed toward programs that best reflect their interests and talents. In addition to maintaining policies and programs intended to attract a diverse set of learners, the school should have programs and policies in place to ensure that learners from underrepresented populations thrive and succeed. Such programs may take a variety of forms, and a best practice is to evaluate the effectiveness of such programs over time.

Ultimately, the rate of degree completion and the successful placement of graduates, whether in a career or program of further study, can validate that the appropriate admissions and processes are in place to ensure learner success.

Academic Program Quality Post-Graduation Success

The most common metric of post-graduation success is the attainment of a job in the field of study; however, AACSB recognizes that the world is changing, and many learners pursue alternative paths following graduation. A school is encouraged to provide metrics that capture the range of activities in which learners are engaging post-graduation that position them for success. Care should be taken by the peer review team to align these activities with the school's mission and the abilities of the learner population. Accreditation is concerned with the *difference* or added value the school makes in the learner's educational transformation. As an example, a school that has highly selective admissions standards might expect to place those learners in careers or graduate schools that are similarly highly selective and of high rank in quality; however, another school focused on first-generation learners as a vital part of its mission may have a completely different placement strategy that showcases the transformation of their learners.

There are always nuances around successful outcomes and placement, which the peer review team should consider. As an example, examination of average graduate salaries will vary depending on whether most learners enter top-tier finance or consulting firms or go to work for nonprofit organizations or entrepreneurial startups. Schools may prefer to analyze and report any employment outcomes by categories, reflecting different career paths and/or types of learners, such as first-generation learners.

The standard recognizes that some institutions do not collect or are unable to collect data regarding post-graduate career placement. As an example, some schools have a high percentage of international learners. While data on these learners may be difficult to collect, the school should demonstrate that these learners have acquired added value from their business degree programs. Schools may provide evidence such as job

acceptance rates and case examples of successful graduates; however, schools should report outcomes that represent typical graduates, not just the most successful. The expectation of evidence should be aligned with mission and country or regional norms on data availability.

Standard 7: Teaching Effectiveness and Impact

I. Rationale

Business school faculty produce three primary outputs: teaching, scholarship, and service. Standard 7 concerns impactful teaching. The direct outcome from teaching is successful learners, which are covered elsewhere in standards related to learner success. However, that success is dependent on teachers who are prepared, current, and pedagogically astute. This standard is meant to ensure that the school provides development activities and has evaluation systems to promote teaching effectiveness.

II. Clarifying Guidance

Teaching Effectiveness and Faculty Preparedness

The peer review team will typically review materials and policies related to hiring, promoting, and maintaining qualified educators. The school should describe the current teaching and learning strategy, together with major initiatives to maintain and improve performance and impact. The school should demonstrate that resources to maintain effective pedagogy in the relevant discipline are available to all faculty. The peer review team would, for example, expect to see formal evaluation policies for both participating and supporting faculty, as well as orientation programs available to ensure effective teaching for all faculty. Institutions frequently anchor on just one teaching evaluation metric. This standard expects the use of a broad array of measures and sources to assess teaching quality and effectiveness. Such examples may include, but are not limited to, peer review of teaching, learner evaluation, and faculty professional development.

Specific documents, governance, resources, or processes related to teaching effectiveness that may be reviewed are:

- Hiring policies that demonstrate that new faculty are qualified to teach
- Hiring policies and practices that seek to attract a diverse faculty
- Faculty orientation programs that include teaching
- Availability of teaching mentoring
- School or university center for teaching and/or access to other programs designed to enhance teaching
- Teaching evaluation policies and procedures (multi-measure)
- Promotion and tenure standards related to teaching

- Teaching development activities (e.g., pedagogy workshops, pedagogy grants, sending faculty to teaching conferences, classroom visitation and feedback)
- Policies and practices to ensure faculty employ inclusive pedagogy
- Policies, practices, development activities, and dedicated resources to ensure faculty are current with appropriate technologies
- Resources available to faculty to maintain discipline expertise
- Recognition practices for outstanding teachers (e.g., awards)
- Examples of professional engagement of faculty
- Office hour policies and any other policies or practices promoting learner-faculty engagement
- Opportunities for faculty to participate in high-quality international conferences of disciplines or in highly regarded global academic organizations

Faculty currency may be assessed through analysis of curricular offerings and inspection of select course syllabi. For example, does the school offer courses in current or potential future topics such as disruptive technologies, cybersecurity, design thinking, artificial intelligence, or data analytics? The peer review team may review the composition of faculty teaching some of these forward-thinking courses to determine if they are full-time faculty or if the more current topic courses are staffed with primarily supporting faculty. While supporting faculty may be effective in their delivery of highly relevant current or emerging topics and technologies, the school should take care not to rely solely on supporting faculty to do so. Core permanent faculty are charged with remaining current in their field, as well. Traditional courses and syllabi should also be current and may be reviewed to assess currency and relevancy of assigned readings, for example.

Teaching Impact

The impact of outstanding teaching can be difficult to assess, though there can be output signals of teaching effectiveness. Many schools offer graduation or outcome surveys that assess learner satisfaction. The ability of a school to attract highly qualified learners and boast of robust enrollment might be an input measure of teaching impact to the extent that the school has a reputation for high-quality teaching. Alumni are an excellent source of input regarding teaching impact. Talented teachers often disseminate their teaching knowledge and skills at seminars, through blogs and other social media outlets, by writing textbooks, and in workshops. The peer review team can look for these types of outputs as a reference for teaching impact. There may be examples of thought leadership through the scholarship of teaching and learning, which also reflect teaching impact.

THOUGHT LEADERSHIP, ENGAGEMENT, AND SOCIETAL IMPACT

The two standards comprising Thought Leadership, Engagement, and Societal Impact are designed to ensure the school is making a significant difference through its thought leadership and engagement with external stakeholders.

Standard 8: Impact of Scholarship

I. Rationale

All business schools are expected to engage in the creation and dissemination of high-quality impactful knowledge that is aligned with their missions. The outcome sought from these intellectual contributions is to impact the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business. The standards seek to elevate impact of intellectual contributions over a simple count of, for example, peer reviewed journal articles, and we encourage schools to incorporate a demonstration of impact into their assessments of quality of intellectual contributions for all faculty. This is the case whether the school is teaching- or research-intensive, with the difference being the types and volume of intellectual contributions, the stakeholders for whom they are intended, and the degree of impact that results. Schools are also expected to have a societal impact through their intellectual contributions and engagement in thought leadership with external non-academic stakeholders.

II. Clarifying Guidance

Overview

In this standard the aim is for the school to describe its research strategy, how research is organized and supported, and the outputs and outcomes that result. Recognizing the heterogeneity of schools, the importance of alignment of the intellectual portfolio with the mission, expected outcomes, and strategy of the school is emphasized. The standard also requires an assessment of the quality and impact of the school's scholarship, including societal impact. Schools are also required to outline their area(s) of thought leadership and how they are progressing against their impact aspiration.

Aspiration

The movement to explicitly focus on thought leadership and societal impact is new in these standards. Further, schools have different missions, are in different contexts, and are at different stages in their development. Recognizing these factors, the standards require the school to identify its thought leadership aspiration appropriate to its mission and context, to evaluate its progress toward achieving its aspiration, and to identify its plans in this arena for the next five years. The same guidelines exist for societal impact. In Standard 1 the school identifies its aspiration for having a positive impact on society.

In this standard the school analyzes and evaluates how it is progressing against the aspiration through its intellectual contributions, as well as its plans for the next five years.

Completion of Table 8-1

The intention is that, while the school is required to present data based on aggregating intellectual contributions of individual faculty in Table 8-1 (A), it has the flexibility to present further information on its intellectual contributions in the manner that best suits the school and provides the most clarity for a peer review team, accreditation committee, or other AACSB volunteers involved in accreditation review. As an example, schools can provide details on intellectual contributions supplied by units within the school or by the school itself. There may be a situation where a department in the school runs regional, national, or international academic conferences or industry/academic colloquiums. The school may produce a peer-reviewed academic journal or have a case study clearinghouse. These represent intellectual contributions and can be outlined in a table or narrative format.

Table 8-1 should present the intellectual contributions of faculty for the five years leading up to and including the self-study year. For example, if School A's visit is in February 2025 and its normal academic year runs from September to June, Table 8-1 will capture the intellectual contributions of faculty for the period of September 2019 to June 2024, including and ending with the self-study year. Publications after this date would be counted in the next accreditation cycle.

In Table 8-1 the school should provide a count of the number of intellectual contributions produced by the faculty members employed in the most recently completed regular academic year and aggregated by discipline. The counts in the "portfolio" section should be the same as the counts in the "types" section of the table. The number of contributions must represent a non-duplicated count for co-authored publications. The count identifies the intellectual contributions for the most recently completed regular accreditation cycle, produced by faculty who were employed in the most recently completed regular academic year; therefore, as a general rule, it is the faculty included in Table 3-1 whose intellectual contributions are included in Table 8-1, with the following notable exceptions, which are not included in Table 8-1:

- Contract lecturers who are employed only to teach⁶
- Visiting faculty/adjuncts whose research is designated to and/or resourced by another school⁷

⁶ While the intellectual contributions of contract lecturers who are employed only to teach are not included in Table 8-1, their intellectual contributions are "countable" for purposes of faculty qualification status in Table 3-1.

⁷ Ibid with respect to visiting faculty and adjuncts.

Table 8-1 (A) Intellectual Contributions

Table 8.1 (A) has three main components for counting intellectual contributions: category of intellectual contributions, types of intellectual contributions, and percentage of faculty producing intellectual contributions. All columns for each component are required to be completed.

- *Portfolio of Intellectual Contributions*

The school is to categorize intellectual contributions based on whether they are basic or discovery scholarship, applied or integrative/application scholarship, or teaching and learning scholarship. This categorization provides summary measures that are useful for the school when discussing alignment of intellectual contributions with mission, expected outcomes, and strategy.

- *Types of Intellectual Contributions*

The standard requires intellectual contributions to also be categorized according to level of peer review or subject matter expert review that occurs for the given item. A wide variety of examples exist and could include, but are not limited to, the following (note that these are shown alphabetically, not in order of importance):

- articles in newspapers
- articles in peer-reviewed journals
- articles in professional publications
- books
- case studies
- competitive research grant awards
- contributions arising from membership of review panels for national or international research organizations
- contributions as an editorial board member
- editorial contributions
- invited presentations
- invited showcase or keynote
- oversight contributions for discipline or professional organizations
- peer-reviewed academic proceedings
- peer-reviewed professional proceedings
- policy documents
- practitioner books
- reports from consulting and projects
- research grants
- scholarly books
- technologies for utilization
- textbooks

- *Percentage of Faculty Producing Intellectual Contributions*

The final two columns of Table 8-1 provide measures of the degree to which participating and full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty are involved in the production of intellectual contributions. The first is the percentage of participating faculty producing intellectual contributions. This is measured as a percentage of head count. The second is the percentage of total FTE producing intellectual contributions. Both columns must be completed.

- *Sample Calculation of Percentage of Faculty Producing Intellectual Contributions*

<u>Head Count</u>	<u>Faculty Member</u>	<u>P or S</u>	<u>ICs</u>	<u>FTE</u>
<u>1</u>	<u>Faculty A</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>1.0</u>
<u>2</u>	<u>Faculty B</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>1.0</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>Faculty C</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>1.0</u>
<u>4</u>	<u>Faculty D</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>1.0</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>Faculty E</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>.8</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>Faculty F</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>.8</u>
<u>7</u>	<u>Faculty G</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>.8</u>
<u>8</u>	<u>Faculty H</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>.2</u>
<u>9</u>	<u>Faculty I</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>.2</u>
<u>10</u>	<u>Faculty J</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>.2</u>

Percentage of participating faculty producing ICs=85.7% (6/7)

Percentage of total full time equivalent producing ICs=82.9% (5.8/7)

Table 8-1 (B) Alignment with Mission

The school should describe how its intellectual contributions connect to and support the mission of the school. For example, a school with a very applied mission may produce a large quantity of white papers that are of value for business or policymakers. Here the school may also identify intellectual contributions produced by units within the school or by the school itself.

Table 8-1 (C) Quality of Intellectual Contributions

The school should describe and justify the measures it uses to analyze the quality of its intellectual contributions. These can be quantitative measures (e.g., number or percentage of publications in highly ranked journals or number of opinion pieces in high-quality newspapers or social media outlets) and can incorporate trend analysis as well as overall measures. There can also be qualitative measures that identify some significant exemplars of quality from within the portfolio. Validation of the quality of intellectual contributions includes the traditional academic or professional pre-publication peer review, but may also encompass other forms of validation, such as online post-publication peer reviews, ratings, surveys of or feedback from users, research or publication awards, fellowships, media citations, etc. A school is expected to have quality intellectual contributions produced by all of its disciplines. The school

should evaluate to what extent the quality of the portfolio is at the level it seeks and identify the plans in place for developing or augmenting the quality of the portfolio in the next five years.

Table 8.1 (D) Impact of Intellectual Contributions

The impact of intellectual contributions is separated into two parts.

The first part (i) of impact is concerned with the difference made or innovations fostered by intellectual contributions, for example what has been changed, accomplished, or improved relative to the theory, practice and/or teaching of business. The school should describe and justify the measures that it uses to analyze the impact of its intellectual contributions. These should be both quantitative and qualitative to provide the peer review team with evidence of the impact. Impact may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, the following:

- 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

The second area (ii) of impact is exemplars of the societal impact of a school's intellectual contributions. Possible impacts from these include:

- Contributions to major world issues, such as those identified by the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals
- Effects on business development

- Improved financial performance of organizations
- Contribution to business creation
- Improved health and safety outcomes
- Improvement in the brand and/or image of an organization, industry, or profession
- Examples of co-creation of knowledge with external stakeholders
- Examples of commercialization outcomes
- Examples of involvement in new venture creation
- Contributions through membership on boards and government bodies
- Examples of shaping community debate on issues of importance
- Examples of contributions to policy development for local, regional, national, or international public-sector organizations
- Outline of “pathways to impact” developed and the anticipated results from these
- Projects initiated or leading with external non-academic stakeholders
- Contract research or consultancy projects with private and public sector
- Examples of changes to business practice arising from thought leadership engagement
- Examples of public-sector policy changed or impacted by engagement with the school

It is important to note that, while addressing societal issues can be achieved by business school researchers alone, there are also many occasions where impact in this area results from collaboration between business researchers and those from other disciplines. This interdisciplinary work is highly encouraged and should be reported, with the contribution of the business school, and/or its researchers, clearly identified.

The school makes explicit the connection between an intellectual contribution, or a set of intellectual contributions, and the impact that activity has on society. This requires presentation of exemplars demonstrating the impact of specific contributions or groups of contributions. The school also undertakes an evaluation of progress over the previous five years against its aspiration for societal impact to date and its plans for the next five years.

Thought Leadership

All AACSB-accredited schools are expected to be thought leaders in an area consistent with their missions. Thought leadership can emanate from the scholarship produced by a school and/or its engagement activities with external stakeholders. The standards recognize that thought leadership is an evolutionary state and that schools grow and develop their reputation of thought leadership over time.

Below are some examples of the thought leadership orientation of business schools. They are drawn from each of the three AACSB regions—Americas; Asia Pacific (AP); and

Europe, Middle East, and Africa (EMEA)—but are not intended to be representative. The names of the schools have been removed, and a brief comment on the type of institution each is in as well as their general location is provided. These examples are not intended to be followed or copied by schools; rather, they provide insight as to what “thought leadership” for a business school may entail.

1. Top-ranked European business school with undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral offerings and a global-scale focus (EMEA)

While the school has many research centers, there are two areas of thought leadership that stand out. The first area is “customer insight,” where the school focuses on purchasing behavior and purchasing decisions. Topics range from behavioral branding, design, and product development to brand and emotion. The second area is “entrepreneurship and innovation,” where the school researches and provides advice to firms on managing the corporate cycle from startup to business model development and innovation, as well as succession planning and corporate exit.

2. Graduate School in Asia with a strong Asian focus (AP)

“Analytics, computing, and complex systems” is a key area of thought leadership for the school. The focus is on helping industry, government, and business innovate by providing capabilities in artificial intelligence and complex systems modeling in various research and development models. This is facilitated by bringing together cross-disciplinary teams of data scientists and data engineers alongside business academics.

3. A medium-sized business school, drawing learners from throughout the U.S., with an equal emphasis on teaching and research built on a foundation of experiential learning (Americas)

The school’s main area of thought leadership expertise is “launching, supporting, and growing small business.” It is sought after by business, the local community, and local government, and contributes research in the startup and entrepreneurship areas.

4. A school in a research-intensive comprehensive university with undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral offerings (AP)

The school has two key areas of thought leadership. The first is “predictive analytics” to inform social policy. The emphasis here is on using data to provide insights and recommendations for policymakers and policy implementers around the world. The second is “work and the future of work,” which focuses on high-quality research and consultancy with policymakers, business, and employee groups mainly at the local, regional, and national level, utilizing cross-disciplinary teams of academics.

5. The school is in a faith-based comprehensive private university with a liberal arts core and emphasizes developing principled business leaders (Americas)

The school’s areas of thought leadership are “sustainable communities” and “addressing social inequities.” There are many projects, initiatives, and funded research opportunities that the school uses to make a difference in these areas.

6. A medium-sized business school in a comprehensive public university with undergraduate and postgraduate offerings (Americas)

The school's thought leadership expertise, "innovation and entrepreneurship," aligns with the bent of the university as a whole. The focus is on creation and development of sustainable social and commercial small ventures and the associated pedagogy.

“Predatory” Journals

Journals in which publication prioritizes self-interest above quality scholarship practices and/or aim to mislead and provide false information are often referred to as “predatory journals” due to their perceived exploitative nature. Online resources are available to assist schools in identifying potential predatory journals. AACSB does not endorse or validate any such journal list. It is the school’s responsibility to identify journals that may be considered exploitative or predatory in nature, and to have processes in place to safeguard against publication in such journals.

Future Direction

The school evaluates the overall success of its scholarship. This may require the school to develop policies, practices, and/or guidance for faculty that target outlets aligned with the school’s strategies for intellectual contributions and encourage high quality.

Not Intended by the Standard

It is noteworthy that in the standard AACSB does **not** specify:

- A prescribed distribution of intellectual contributions across the categories. This is not the case, as the actual distribution will depend on the mission of the school.
- A prescribed percentage of intellectual contributions in peer-reviewed journals either by individual or by discipline. This is not the case. The types of intellectual contributions and the percentage that are in peer-reviewed journals are decided by the school based on its mission, strategies and expected outcomes, and overall academic portfolio.
- A required set of measures of quality or impact of intellectual contributions. This is not the case. A range of measures exist for both quality and impact, and schools identify the ones that are appropriate for them based on their mission.

III. Sample Table (Part A Only)

**Table 8-1
Intellectual Contributions**

Part A: Summary of Intellectual Contributions Over the Most Recently Completed Accreditation Cycle										
Aggregate and summarize data by discipline. Do not list by individual faculty member.	Portfolio of Intellectual Contributions				Types of Intellectual Contributions				% of Faculty Producing Intellectual Contributions	
	Basic or Discovery Scholarship	Applied or Integration/Application Scholarship	Teaching and Learning Scholarship	Total	Peer-reviewed Journal Articles	Additional Peer- or Editorial-Reviewed Intellectual Contributions	All Other Intellectual Contributions	Total	Percent of Participating Faculty Producing ICs	Percentage of Total Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Faculty Producing ICs
Accounting	116	88.5	90	294.5	90	62.5	142	294.5	95	91
Finance	174	72.5	19	265.5	61	43.5	161	265.5	99	80
Marketing	300	287	68	655	59	41	555	655	100	98
Total	590	448	177	1215	210	147	858	1215	96.8	90.2

Standard 9: Engagement and Societal Impact

I. Rationale

Business schools and business are a force for good in society. Through their activities, schools have the opportunity to make a difference to society and to address significant issues at a local, national, or international scale. This standard builds on Standard 8, where the impact on society made by business schools' intellectual contributions and thought leadership is covered, by requiring schools to outline the societal impact that their other school activities is having, and their aspirations and plans in this area for the future.

II. Clarifying Guidance

Aspiration

As in Standard 8, it is recognized that because schools have different missions and contexts, their aspirations in the area of societal impact and their progress to date will differ enormously. This variance is considered for this standard, as the school analyzes and evaluates how it is progressing against its aspiration through internal and external activities and initiatives, as well as describes its plans for the next five years. For this reason, AACSB does not prescribe normative benchmarks for societal impact but allows the school to develop aspirational metrics in areas consistent with Standard 1.

Emphasis

The emphasis in this standard is on engagement by schools with external stakeholders that lead to societal impact. This engagement does not include intellectual contributions, as that is covered in Standard 8.

Scale

Business schools operate in different contexts and at different scales. Taking this into account, societal impact can be achieved at a local, regional, national, or international scale. Impacts at each of these scales is recognized by AACSB as having value.

Coverage

It is necessary to determine what kinds of activities would be included in this standard and what would not—in other words what is “in scope.” The underlying principle is that if the activity is facilitated or sponsored by the business school, rather than the broader university, the activity is one that can be considered in scope for the school.

Thus, what is in scope would cover a wide range of activities and initiatives by the school, separated into internal and external. Internal activities are inside the school. Examples include operational aspects that have a societal impact, such as having green certified buildings, setting high standards for energy efficiency in buildings, reducing face-to-face meetings in multi-campus universities, using solar panels for energy, or providing financial assistance for learners who are facing financial hardships, etc.

Business schools undertake a wide range of activities that engage and connect with external stakeholders. These include learner projects with business, nonprofit, and government organizations; service-learning requirements for learners that incorporate external stakeholders; student clubs in the business school that undertake social or environmental service roles; experiential learning opportunities for learners that involve engaging with external stakeholders; the establishment of small business development and advice centers in schools; business consortiums brought together by the school to work on real-world issues; the delivery of executive education programs, etc. All of these instances, and others, have the potential to have societal impact. It is possible that some service-learning or experiential learning activities may be relevant to both Standard 4 on curriculum and this standard. The difference is that the curriculum element is captured in Standard 4, while the impact of the activity is captured in this standard.

Exemplars of Engagement with External Stakeholders

The school should provide exemplars linking an internal or external activity to a societal impact. This involves identifying the activity, the extent to which the activity was promoted or supported by the school, faculty involvement (if any) with the activity, the number of learners involved, and the impact the activity had or continues to have on society.

Possible societal impacts include but are not limited to the following:

- Contributions to major world issues, such as those identified by the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals (“SDGs”)
- Effects on business development
- Provide access to high-quality education leading to graduates who positively contribute to the economic vitality of society
- Improved financial performance of organizations
- Contributing to business creation
- Improved health and safety outcomes
- Effect on human rights
- Examples of impacting community outcomes
- Examples of changes to business practice arising from engagement
- Examples of where business performance has been improved as a result of engagement with the school
- Examples of public-sector policy changed or impacted by engagement with the school
- Outline of positive effects on identified societal issues arising from the school’s research contributions, for example, on the social, economic, or physical environment
- Impact of the school on the local, regional or national economy

Examples of School Activities That Have Societal Impact

Some examples of business school activities having societal impact are below. These examples are not intended to be the “correct” ones. Rather, they illustrate the societal impact activities of some schools in different regions of the world. Additionally, the examples below provide an overview only. Fuller details will be provided by schools.

1. Societal Impact: Climate Change (EMEA)

Face-to-face executive committee meetings between heads of departments on different campuses have been cut from 11 to four per year, with conference calls reducing travel costs by up to 40 percent.

2. Societal Impact: Affordable and Clean Energy (Americas)

The school’s newest building is LEED gold certified by the U.S. Green Building Council and partly powered by solar panels.

3. Societal Impact: Business Innovation and Employment (AP)

The school provides executive education and short courses for local startups and small businesses to innovate and improve the sustainability of their businesses.

4. Societal Impact: Well-Being and Social Inclusion (AP)

The school provides community-wide training to improve financial literacy, adoption of technology, and access to banking and credit for low-income families.

5. Societal Impact: Reduce Inequality (Americas)

Significant hardship grants and scholarships are made available to students from high deprivation index backgrounds.

6. Societal Impact: Life Cycle of Water (EMEA)

Students in the Sustainability and Social Innovation master’s degree were involved in a wide range of projects that, through partnerships with external stakeholders, have had a societal impact. Notable here was a plastics-free project.

Although the examples above are in a narrative format, schools are welcome to provide quantitative measures of their societal impact if they have measured it that way.

Progress Over Time

It is expected that over time the degree of impact by the school will increase; a wider range of the school’s activities will have an impact; the impact will come from a range of departments, centers, programs, and disciplines; and a growing proportion of learners will be involved in initiatives and activities that have a societal impact. Thus, in the report the school is required to address these points and in subsequent reports demonstrate how advances are being made.

Further, the school should explicitly identify how it measures, or intends to measure, its progress toward achieving its aspiration for societal impact. This will make it possible for the peer review teams to assess performance, provide feedback, and track progress over time.

III. Sample Tables

Table 9-1 is optional for all schools, including those pursuing initial accreditation and schools in the continuous improvement review (CIR) process. Table 9-1 is intended to capture all of the school’s societal impact activities, including those pertaining to Standards 1,4,8, and 9. Schools may find this format to be helpful in reporting the outcomes/impact of their societal impact activities and initiatives.

Schools are not expected to work in every area outlined below. However, a school is expected to have some evidence in each of the standards below for its chosen area of focus. Whether presented in this table or some other format, the focus should be on the outcomes/impact of the school’s activities; it should not simply be a list of activities with no associated outcomes. The following example is for illustrative purposes only. It is expected that each school will focus its efforts in a concentrated area for maximum impact, given its missions and available resources.

Example 1
University of Pirsig School of Business
Table 9-1 Outcomes of Societal Impact Activities and Initiatives Across all Areas of the Standards

United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG)	Societal Impact Strategy (Standard 1)	Outcomes Related to Curriculum (Standard 4)	Outcomes Related to Scholarship (Standard 8)	Outcomes Related to Internal and External Initiatives and/or Activities (Standard 9)
1 – No Poverty	The school has chosen reduction of poverty for its area of societal impact. See strategic plan for details.	300 learners in past three years have completed a service learning course in entrepreneurship and microfinance. Many of these learners go on to participate in the KEY Challenge.	Four faculty collaborated to published a widely disseminated monograph on sustainable models, inclusion, and well-being. Also, Dr. Liu published a widely disseminated book that applies business methods to mitigate poverty in developing countries.	During the annual 5-day KEY Challenge, professors, learners, and alumni stayed in a local village and helped people brand, commercialize, and sell their coffee beans, increasing average income by over a quarter.

Example 2
ABC University Business School
Table 9-1 Outcomes of Societal Impact Activities and Initiatives Across all Areas of the Standards

United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG)	Societal Impact Strategy (Standard 1)	Outcomes Related to Curriculum (Standard 4)	Outcomes Related to Scholarship (Standard 8)	Outcomes Related to Internal and External Initiatives and/or Activities (Standard 9)
7 – Affordable and Clean Energy	The school has chosen affordable and clean energy for its area of societal impact. See strategic plan for details.	Added an Energy Business Track in the MBA program. To date, 200 learners have completed this track. Learners may also complete the track as a standalone certificate. To date, 800 learners have completed the certificate.	17 peer-reviewed publications with an energy focus were published in three journals with impact factors greater than three. Awarded a competitive grant in partnership with the engineering school to study fossil fuel supply chains.	A sustainability plan has halved campus greenhouse gas emissions since 2015. Initiatives include seven green roofs to absorb rainfall. Also, new technology monitors heating and cooling systems, which has reduced energy use by 25 percent.

**Example 3
Dryer Business School**

Table 9-1: Outcomes of Societal Impact Activities and Initiatives Across all Areas of the Standards

United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG)	Societal Impact Strategy (Standard 1)	Outcomes Related to Curriculum (Standard 4)	Outcomes Related to Scholarship (Standard 8)	Outcomes Related to Internal and External Initiatives and/or Activities (Standard 9)
5 – Gender Equality	The school has chosen gender equality for its area of societal impact. See strategic plan for details.	Faculty embed within the curriculum cases that employ inclusive pedagogy. As a result, ratings on inclusivity and belonging have increased by 10 percent over the past three years in the annual learner survey.	Three faculty members have published a combined 16 articles on gender inequality in business. Their work has been cited in the Financial Times, the Chronicle of Higher Education, and Newsweek.	Offered 60 women MBA scholarships. Partners with businesses to identify and support women in middle management by providing financial support, and a mentor to help participants address work-life balance and help with career planning. These initiatives have led to a 15 percent increase in female MBA learners.

APPENDIX A

How to Determine Disciplines for Table 3-1

Standard 3 expects schools to present Table 3-1 by discipline. The guidance associated with the standard explains that disciplines are to be defined by the school in the context of their mission. Furthermore, the disciplines will normally align with the degree programs and/or majors offered by the school.

In order to provide further guidance on how a school may approach defining their disciplines, an example is provided below.

Example 1

University A offers the following degree programs in business:

- BS in Accounting
- BS in Management
- BS in Marketing
- BS in Finance
- BS in Entrepreneurship
- BS in Human Resource Management
- Master's in Data Analytics
- MBA, concentrations in accounting, finance, marketing, and data analytics

Based on the programs, majors and concentrations at the school, the school originally identified the following five disciplines:

- Accounting
- Management
- Marketing
- Finance
- Data Analytics

The table below reflects the faculty members at the school and the discipline in which they will appear in Table 3-1.

Name	Department in Which This Individual Is Housed	Degree Program in Which This Individual Teaches	Course(s) Taught	Discipline in Which This Faculty Member Would Appear
Doe, Jane	Accounting	BS Accounting	Principles of Accounting	Accounting
Frank, Tom	Accounting	BS Accounting	Forensic Accounting	Accounting (part time)
Smith, Robert	Accounting	BS Accounting	Intermediate Accounting	Accounting
Xi, Jason	Accounting	MBA (accounting)	Accounting for Managers	Accounting
Dong, Bei	Accounting	MBA (accounting)	Financial Statement Analysis	Accounting (part time)
Scott, Christine	Finance	BS in Finance	Corporate Finance	Finance
Rogers, Daniel	Finance	A required course for all business majors	Business law	Business law
Kline, Phillip	Finance	BS in Finance	Mergers & Acquisitions	Finance

Manuel, Lin	Finance	A required course for all business majors, and MBA (finance)	Economics Financial economics	Economics Finance (Financial economics could logically be in either finance or economics; however, we've put him in finance because he is supporting the finance concentration within the MBA program. Had he been supporting, say, an economics concentration within the MBA program, we would have put him in Economics.) (This faculty member appears in two disciplines)
Lee, Brian	Marketing & Management	BS in Marketing	Principles of Marketing	Marketing
Johnson, Sandy	Marketing & Management	BS in Management	Human Resource Management	Management
Robinson, Justine	Marketing & Management	BS in Marketing	Logistics and Supply Chain	Marketing or Logistics and Supply Chain (this one can go multiple ways – school choice); we've chosen Marketing, but Logistics and Supply Chain would be fine too. (part time)
Jones, Lucas	Marketing &	MBA (marketing)	Social media	Marketing

	Management	and BS in Management	and Strategic Management	Management (This faculty member appears in two disciplines)
Smith, Judy	Marketing & Management	BS in Management and MBA (core course in management, required course for all MBA learners)	Operations Management Strategic management	Management and Management (just show once in Table 3-1)
Perry, James	Marketing & Management	BS in Entrepreneurship	Start-up Strategy	Management
Zhang, Yu	Marketing & Management	BS in Entrepreneurship	Global Social Entrepreneurship	Management
Adams, Cindy	Marketing & Management	BS in Human Resources	Employment and Labor Relations	Management
Bjorn, Robert	Marketing & Management	BS in Human Resources	Compensation, benefits, and Retirement Planning	Management
Chen, Li	Decision Sciences	MS in Data Analytics	Data visualization	Data Analytics
Mayo, Josh	Decision Sciences	MS in Data Analytics and MBA (data analytics)	Python	Data Analytics Data Analytics (just show once in Table 3-1)
Zhao, Xuan	Decision	A required	Statistics for	Statistics (This course is

	Sciences	course for all business majors	Business Majors	taught within the business school by our faculty; had this course been taught in the Math department by non-business school faculty, it would have been omitted from the table)
Murthy, Anol	Decision Sciences	BS in data analytics	Database Management	Data Analytics

Based on the degrees offered and courses taught, School A has settled on the following seven disciplines for the organization of Table 3-1 (note that department is irrelevant for this determination):

- Accounting
- Management
- Marketing
- Finance
- Data Analytics
- Economics
- Business Law
- Statistics

The faculty qualifications portion of School A's Table 3-1 is shown below.

Discipline: Accounting	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Doe, Jane	100				
Frank, Tom		50			
Smith, Robert	100				
Xi, Jason	100				
Dong, Bei				50	
Totals	300	50	0	50	0
Ratios: SA% = $300/400=75\%$ SA+PA+SP+IP%= $400/400=100\%$ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes __X__ No _____					

Discipline: Finance	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Scott, Christine	100				
Kline, Phillip			100		
Manuel, Lin				50	
Totals	100	0	100	50	0
Ratios: SA% = 100/250=40% SA+PA+SP+IP%= _250/250=100%_____					
In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes_X____ No_____					
Discipline: Management	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Johnson, Sandy	100				
Jones, Lucas	50				
Smith, Judy					100
Perry, James				100	
Zhang, Yu				100	
Adams, Cindy		100			
Bjorn, Robert					100
Totals	150	100	0	200	200
Ratios: SA% = _150/650=23%_____					
SA+PA+SP+IP%= _450/650=69%_____					
In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes_____ No_X					

Discipline: Marketing	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Lee, Brian		100			
Robinson, Justine			50		
Jones, Lucas	50				
Totals	50	100	50	0	0
Ratios: SA% = $\frac{50}{200}=25\%$ _____ SA+PA+SP+IP%= $\frac{200}{200}=100\%$ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes _____ No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Discipline: Data Analytics	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Chen, Li	100				
Mayo, Josh				100	
Murthy, Anol				100	
Totals	100	0	0	200	0
Ratios: SA% = $\frac{100}{300}=33\%$ _____ SA+PA+SP+IP%= $\frac{300}{300}=100\%$ _____ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes _____ No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					

Discipline: Economics	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Manuel, Lin				50	
Totals	0	0	0	50	0
Ratios: SA% = 0% SA+PA+SP+IP%= 50/50=100% In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes__X__ No_____					
Discipline: Business Law	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Rogers, Daniel		100			
Totals	0	100	0	0	0
Ratios: SA% = 0% SA+PA+SP+IP%= __100/100=100%_____ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes_X__ No_____					

Discipline: Statistics	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Zhao, Xuan					100
Totals	0	0	0	0	100
Ratios: SA% = 0% SA+PA+SP+IP%= 0/100=0% _____ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes _____ No X					
Overall Ratios:					
Calculation of Global Totals	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Totals across the entire accredited unit	700	350	150	550	300
Ratios: SA% = _700/2050=34.1% _____ SA+PA+SP+IP%= _1750/2050=85.4% _____ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes _____ No X					

Additional notes:

- The decision of whether they are in alignment within a discipline is ultimately up to a peer review team. There is wording in the standards that would allow a school to make its case that they have innovative programs, or have exceptional outcomes (placement, other metrics of success, assurance of learning outcomes, indirect measures).
- Overall ratios are calculated across the accredited unit (including disciplines where degrees/majors are not offered).
- SA ratios do not have to be met in disciplines where no degrees/majors are offered, but the 90% ratio does still have to be met within each discipline to be in alignment (absent exceptional outcomes or innovative programs).
- Note that the BS in Entrepreneurship and BS in Human Resource Management are considered by the school to be part of the discipline of Management.

Example 2

University B offers a single MBA degree without any concentrations or tracks.

The school has faculty in the following disciplines that support the MBA curriculum, which is how they structure Table 3-1:

- Accounting
- Economics
- Finance
- Information Systems
- Management
- Marketing

The table below reflects the faculty members at the school and the discipline in which they will appear in Table 3-1.

Name	Department in Which This Individual Is Housed	Degree Program in Which This Individual Teaches	Course Taught	Discipline in Which This Faculty Member Would Appear
Belrose, Gianna	Accounting & Finance	MBA	Financial Statement Analysis	Accounting
Frank, Alan	Accounting & Finance	MBA	Financial Statement Analysis Financial Accounting	Accounting

Stirling, Noe	Accounting & Finance	MBA	Financial Accounting Managerial Accounting	Accounting
Hudgens, Gene	Economics	MBA	Economic Concepts for Managers	Economics
Martens, Peggy	Economics	MBA	Economic Concepts for Managers	Economics
Clark, Michael	Accounting & Finance	MBA	Corporate Finance Financial Policy	Finance
Jansson, Konstantin	Accounting & Finance	MBA	International Financial Management Advanced Money and Capital Markets	Finance
Paredes, Jason	Accounting & Finance	MBA	Real Estate Decisions	Finance
Schumer, Rebecca	Accounting & Finance	MBA	Financial Options and Futures Financial Modeling	Finance
Lam, Yun	Information Systems	MBA	Systems Analysis and Design	Information Systems
Spears, Paul	Information Systems	MBA	Data Analytics for Business	Information Systems
Van Laren, Nila	Information	MBA	Data Analytics	Information Systems

	Systems		for Business	
Asad, Mohammad	Management	MBA	Managing International Cultural Differences	Management
Berry, Debra	Management	MBA	Social, Ethical, and Legal Systems	Management
Hu, Hong	Management	MBA	Organizational Behavior Decision Making and Problem Solving	Management
Takeuchi, Yohan	Management	MBA	Project Management	Management
Adebayo, Ovidia	Marketing	MBA	Marketing Management Brand Management	Marketing
Krummer, George	Marketing	MBA	Research for Marketing Managers	Marketing
Lowell, Jayden	Marketing	MBA	Marketing Strategy Supply Chain Management	Marketing

The faculty qualifications portion of School B's Table 3-1 is shown below.

Discipline: Accounting	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Belrose, Gianna	100				
Frank, Alan				50	
Stirling, Noe		100			
Totals	100	100	0	50	0
Ratios: SA% = $100/250=40\%$ SA+PA+SP+IP%= $250/250=100\%$ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>					
Discipline: Economics	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Hudgens, Gene					50
Martens, Peggy				50	
Totals	0	0	0	50	50
Ratios: SA% = $0/100=0\%$ SA+PA+SP+IP%= $50/100=50\%$ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					

Discipline: Finance	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Clark, Michael	100				
Jansson, Konstantin	100				
Paredes, Jason				50	
Schumer, Rebecca		100			
Totals	200	100	0	50	0
Ratios: SA% = $\frac{200}{350}=57\%$ _____ SA+PA+SP+IP%= $\frac{350}{350}=100\%$ _____ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No _____					
Discipline: Information Systems	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Lam, Yun	100				
Spears, Paul			50		
Van Laren, Nila				100	
Totals	100	0	50	100	0
Ratios: SA% = $\frac{100}{250}=40\%$ _____ SA+PA+SP+IP%= $\frac{250}{250}=100\%$ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No _____					

Discipline: Management	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Asad, Mohammad		100			
Berry, Debra				50	
Hu, Hong	100				
Takeuchi, Yohan				50	
Totals	100	100	0	100	0
Ratios: SA% = $\frac{100}{300}=33\%$ SA+PA+SP+IP%= $\frac{300}{300}=100\%$ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>					
Discipline: Marketing	Degrees or majors are offered in this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Degrees or majors are not offered in this discipline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Names	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Adebayo, Ovidia	100				
Krummer, George	100				
Lowell, Jayden			100		
Totals	200	0	100	0	0
Ratios: SA% = $\frac{200}{300}=67\%$ SA+PA+SP+IP% = $\frac{300}{300}=100\%$ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>					
Overall Ratios:					
Calculation of Global Totals	SA	PA	SP	IP	A
Totals across the entire accredited unit	700	300	150	350	50
Ratios: SA% = $\frac{700}{1550}=45\%$ SA+PA+SP+IP% = $\frac{1500}{1550}=96.8\%$ In Alignment with Standard 3? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>					