

**Continuous Improvement Peer Review Team Report Guidelines –  
Business – 2013 Standards or Accounting – 2018 Standards**

**CIR1/CIR2/FR1/FR2 Team with Revocation of Accreditation Recommendation**

**I: The peer review team should document the following under the Peer Review Team tab in myAccreditation when recommending revocation of accreditation.**

**II: Accreditation Standards Issues**

**1. Identified by the prior Peer Review Team**

Describe how the school addressed the accreditation standards-related issues identified by the last peer review team as reflected in the AACSB decision letter.

**III: Peer Review Team Observations and Feedback that Form the Basis for Judgment for the Recommendation**

**1. Strategic Management and Innovation, including:**

- a. the mission and strategic planning process utilized by the school;
- b. the quality and demonstrated impact of the faculty intellectual portfolio and alignment with the school's mission; and
- c. the financial strategies, financial model and sustainability and alignment with the school's mission and strategic goals.

**2. Participants, including:**

- a. how are faculty and staff supported and set up for success in their positions?
- b. are there adequate participating faculty to support the mission of the school?
- c. where an alternative instructional delivery method is used by the school, discuss how the team considered the quality of this model and its impact on high quality outcomes.
- d. discuss the appropriateness of the school's definitions for participating and supporting faculty.

**3. Learning and Teaching, including:**

- a. is the curriculum current, relevant, and innovative? It is forward-looking?
- b. is technology embedded within the curriculum sufficient to prepare students for work-preparedness expectations in their field of study?
- c. does the school have a systematic process, appropriate to their cultural context and school's mission, in place for assessing student learning? Are students demonstrating success in their learning outcomes? Does the curriculum demonstrate continuous improvement?
- d. is teaching quality adequately demonstrated and are faculty current in their respective fields of expertise?
- e. how is the school demonstrating overall student success, including adequacy of degree progression?
- f. is there an appropriate level of student-faculty interaction? Are faculty available to students at times other than within the classroom?

**4. Academic and Professional Engagement, including:**

- a. an assessment of how engaged the students are with the business or accounting community;
- b. an assessment of how engaged the faculty are with the business or accounting community;
- c. where deviations in percentages from the faculty qualifications guidelines are noted, the peer review team should note this and provide a discussion that supports its recommendation;
- d. the appropriateness and consistency with the school's mission of the school's definitions for its faculty qualifications.

**The following information is system generated and is included in the draft and final team reports under the Reporting tab.**

- General School Information
- Date of Visit
- Committee Meeting Date
- Peer Review Team Members
- Comparison Groups
- Included in Scope Programs
- Education Level - Degree Title - Major Emphasis
- Excluded from Scope Programs
- Education Level - Degree Title - Major Emphasis
- Additional information the team received outside of the Continuous Improvement Review Report that would benefit the committee in their review process.
- Visit Schedule (ensure most recent agenda is uploaded under the Visit tab)

View Only