



June 30, 2023

Business Accreditation Standards and Interpretive Guidance Technical Edits
 Summary of Notable Changes (*specific changes are bolded and italicized*)

| 2020 Standard | Where | Summary of Change(s) Made |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| 3-Faculty and Professional Staff Resources | Interpretive Guidance document | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added the following clarification with respect to the discipline reporting structure of the tables: <i>“Additionally, if the school offers an interdisciplinary business degree it may combine the disciplines in which the degree is offered in their reports assuming individual degree programs in these areas are not offered.”</i> |
| 4-Curriculum | Interpretive Guidance document | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Removed reference to unconscious bias in the following example: “With respect to pedagogy, innovation can be expressed and documented where faculty are experimenting with different approaches to teaching. Examples would be initiatives to <i>overcome unconscious bias</i> promote inclusive pedagogy and approaches that recognize different learner styles and paces of learning.” |
| 5 -Assurance of Learning | Standards document | <p>5.1 Basis for Judgment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened language around the requirement for schools to include some indirect measures in their assurance of learning system as words like “should” and “normally” were leading to confusion among the membership regarding whether indirect measures are required, which they are. |
| 5 -Assurance of Learning | Interpretive Guidance document | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened language around the requirement for schools to include some indirect measures in their assurance of learning system to align with the updates to the standards document referenced in the row above. |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| <p>7-Teaching Effectiveness and Impact</p> | <p>Standards document</p> | <p>7.1 Basis for Judgment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor edits to wording as some schools interpreted existing language to mean that having multiple student evaluations would be enough and the intent was to have different methods. "The school has a systematic process for evaluating teaching effectiveness as an integral component of the faculty and professional staff performance review process. This process should include a multi-measure-evaluation multiple methods of evaluating teaching as well as expectations for continuous improvement. The school's methods and practices related to teaching effectiveness should be clearly linked to the school's mission, strategies, and expected outcomes." |
| <p>8- Impact of Scholarship</p> | <p>Interpretive Guidance document</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removed the following paragraph because it conflicts with the definition of an intellectual contribution provided in the beginning of Standard 8. <p>"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."</p> |



| | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The above example of a school's academic conference, colloquium or in-house journal being an intellectual contribution is not congruent with the definition of an intellectual contribution provided on page 57 of the standards. |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added similar language to the Thought Leadership section of the Interpretive Guidance: <i>"Thought leadership can be the result of a unit's collective effort. For example, a department in the school may run 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."</i> |
| 9 – Engagement and Societal Impact | Standards document | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modified the Table 9-1 template to align more closely with AACSB's recently released white paper, <i>AACSB and Societal Impact</i>. |
| 9 – Engagement and Societal Impact | Interpretive Guidance document | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjusted the sample Table 9-1 to align with the updated template. |

