**CIR Team with CIR2 of Accounting Accreditation Recommendation**

**2018 Standards for Accounting Accreditation-2020 Business Accreditation Standards**

1. **The peer review team should document the following under the Peer Review Team tab in myAccreditation when recommending a Continuous Improvement Review (CIR2) for accounting accreditation.**
2. **Accreditation Standards Issues**
	1. **Identified by the prior Peer Review Team**- Describe how the accounting academic unit addressed the accreditation standards-related issues identified by the last peer review team as reflected in the AACSB decision letter. The CIR peer review team should provide, wherever possible, evidence of demonstrated progress and/or resolution regarding the previous areas to address.
	2. **Identified by this Peer Review Team that Must Be Addressed During the Second Year of Continuous Improvement Review (CIR2)** -- Identify any specific accreditation standard(s) that the school must address and the outcome(s) the school must complete to demonstrate alignment with the standard(s) in the CIR2 year. Provide clear and specific expectations of what outcomes should be accomplished in the CIR2 year. Subsequently, the CIR2 peer review team will assess whether such issues have been satisfactorily addressed. AACSB staff will provide the timeline and reporting deadlines to the school and peer review team.
3. **Peer Review Team Observations and Feedback that Form the Basis for Judgment for the Recommendation**
	1. **Strategic Management and Innovation for Accounting Units, including:**
4. the mission and strategic planning process utilized by the accounting academic unit;
5. the quality and demonstrated impact of the faculty intellectual portfolio and alignment with the accounting academic unit’s mission; and
6. the financial strategies, financial model and sustainability and alignment with the accounting academic unit’s mission and strategic goals.
	1. **Accounting Learning and Teaching**
		* 1. is the curriculum current, relevant, and innovative? It is forward-looking?
			2. is technology embedded within the curriculum sufficient to prepare learners for work-preparedness expectations in their field of study?
			3. does the accounting academic unit have a systematic process, appropriate to their cultural context and accounting academic unit’s mission, in place for assessing learning? Are learners demonstrating success in their learning outcomes? Does the curriculum demonstrate continuous improvement?
			4. is teaching quality adequately demonstrated and are faculty current in their respective fields of expertise?
			5. is there an appropriate level of learner-faculty interaction? Are faculty available to learners at times other than within the classroom?
	2. **Accounting Academic and Professional Engagement and Professional Interactions**
		* 1. how are faculty and staff supported and set up for success in their positions?
			2. are there adequate participating faculty to support the mission of the accounting academic unit?
			3. discuss the appropriateness of the accounting academic unit’s definitions for participating and supporting faculty.
			4. an assessment of how engaged the learners are with the business or accounting community;
			5. an assessment of how engaged the faculty are with the business or accounting community;
			6. 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;
			7. the appropriateness and consistency with the accounting academic unit’s mission of the accounting academic unit’s definitions for its faculty qualifications.
	3. **Other noteworthy high-quality outcomes consistent with the accounting academic unit’s mission and strategies not included elsewhere in this report.**
7. **Describe any noteworthy best practices or initiatives in which the organization engages.**
8. **Provide consultative feedback regarding operational or strategic issues that the peer review team believes would add value to the organization, or about which the organization has requested feedback.**

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)