



## Summary of Key Changes between 2020 Standards and AACSB Global Standards for Business Education™

The table below reflects material changes between AACSB’s 2020 Guiding Principles and Standards for Accreditation and the 2026 AACSB Global Standards for Business Education™.

Standard	Summary of Key Changes
<b>General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moved all definitions within each standard to a Glossary of Terms section at the end of the document.</li> <li>Reorganized the flow of the standards to clearly distinguish between global standards and accreditation standards.</li> <li>Reorganized the framework so that Standards 7-9 fall under a newly titled section, Pathways to Impact, emphasizing scholarship, teaching, and societal impact as complementary ways schools demonstrate value.</li> <li>Added a brief rationale and background summary following each standard.</li> </ul>
<b>Preamble</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added language and visualizations introducing the Global Standards for Business Education as a universal framework for quality and improvement, expanding AACSB’s role from accreditor to global standard setter.</li> <li>Added a Global Standards with Local Application section, with enhancements to existing language.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard 1 (Strategic Planning)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard 1.1: Now focuses on a “well-documented plan” clarifying expectations that strategic plans include goals, strategic initiatives, and measures of success, and that they align with the university’s strategic direction.</li> <li>Standard 1.2: Clarified that the mission should address the school’s essential identity (e.g., degree levels offered, populations served, and types of intellectual contributions produced) and embrace innovation as a key element of continuous improvement.</li> <li>Standard 1.4: Created a new section that solely focuses on risk expectations, with Suggested Documentation including strategic, financial, operational, compliance/reputational, and emerging risks as areas to be addressed in the risk analysis.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard 2 (Physical, Digital, and Financial Resources – renamed)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard 2.2: Renamed to Digital Resources (formerly Virtual)</li> <li>Standard 2.3: Removed risk assessment, as all risk is now addressed in Standard 1.4. Clarified that Table 2-1 must align with the strategic plan timeframe and added a column documenting the timeframe for each strategic initiative.</li> <li>Reframed resource sufficiency as mission- and model-relative rather than absolute by: (a) clarifying that resource evaluation should be considered in relation to mission, learner populations, pedagogy, and delivery modality; (b) using non-prescriptive language regarding technologies, platforms, and vendors; and (c) emphasizing sustainability and resilience rather than overall budget size.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard 3 (Faculty and Professional Staff Resources)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard 3.2: Added language clarifying that criteria across all four faculty categories include expectations for maintaining disciplinary currency and demonstrating a commitment to high-quality teaching. Faculty with teaching responsibilities that do not meet the school’s criteria for teaching effectiveness would be classified as “Additional.” <b>Note, schools will be given a three-year ramp-up period to align with the teaching effectiveness addition to Standard 3.</b></li> </ul>

Standard	Summary of Key Changes
<b>Standard 4 (Curriculum)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard 4.1: Clarified expectations that curriculum reflects current and emerging business theories, technologies, and practices and demonstrates innovation in design and delivery.</li> <li>Standard 4.3: Introduced a new section focused on digital agility and ethical technology use.</li> <li>Moved current 4.3 regarding societal impact to Standard 9.2.</li> <li>Standard 4.5: Added a new section requiring curriculum to be informed by current research and scholarship.</li> <li>Standard 4.6: Strengthened language related to engagement among learners, between learners and faculty, and with the practice of business.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard 5 (Assurance of Learning)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard 5.1: Clarified that direct and indirect measures must be tied to specific competency goals, rather than satisfaction measures alone.</li> <li>Standard 5.4: Clarified that executive education should include processes to ensure high quality/continuous improvement if it generates more than five percent of the school's annual revenues (vs. resources).</li> </ul>
<b>Standard 6 (Learner Progression)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard 6.1: Added references to non-traditional students to Basis for Judgment and Suggested Documentation.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard 7 (Teaching Effectiveness and Impact)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moved the Standard 7.3 (faculty currency in discipline and pedagogy) to Standard 3.2.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard 8 (Impact of Scholarship)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moved current 8.3 regarding societal impact to Standard 9.3.</li> <li>Removed the final column of Table 8-1 (percentage of total FTE producing intellectual contributions) and removed societal impact exemplars from Part D(ii) of Table 8-1.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard 9 (Societal Impact and Engagement- <i>renamed</i>)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consolidated all societal impact expectations related to curriculum, intellectual contributions, and engagement into Standard 9 to eliminate fragmentation.</li> <li>Standard 9.1: Clarified that schools should select one or more societal impact focus areas, articulate them within the strategic plan, and demonstrate alignment of resources and activities.</li> <li>Standard 9.2 expects curricula to include program elements related to the school's chosen focus area(s), 9.3 addresses the expectation that scholarly work should be linked to at least one area, and 9.4 expects internal and external engagement activities to align with a focus area.</li> <li>Modified Table 9-1 to be more narrative in nature.</li> </ul>



<b>Introduction to AACSB Accreditation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Modified language regarding standards governance and procedures for updating the standards to align with AACSB's new governance model.</li></ul>
<b>Philosophy, Programmatic Scope</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Added language requiring disclosure, through a substantive change submission, of degree programs introduced between accreditation visits at locations outside the accredited entity's home country that have not previously been quality assured for content and/or faculty. Such disclosures will be reviewed by the relevant committee to determine accreditation status and timing of the next visit.</li></ul>
<b>Accreditation Eligibility Criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Added a section titled Overview of the Accreditation Journey, providing an overview of the initial accreditation process.</li><li>• Revised the eligibility criteria to better support the Eligibility Review Committee in assessing whether a school is realistically positioned to achieve accreditation within seven years, addressing factors such as research productivity, terminal degree expectations, and financial resources.</li></ul>
<b>Guiding Principles and Expectations for Accredited Schools</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Added a reference to AACSB's Complaint Policy and related procedures to Guiding Principle 1: Ethics and Integrity.</li><li>• Removed Continued Adherence to AACSB's Guiding Principles and Business Standards (Guiding Principle 10) as elements are now addressed in Eligibility Criteria and Guiding Principle 4.</li></ul>