

**Proposed 2020 Business Accreditation Standards  
Summary of Major Changes Between Exposure Drafts 1 and 2**

*Note: Changes to the standards are shown in green boxes with specific changes bolded and italicized.*

| 2020 Standard   | Summary of Change(s) Made Based on Member Input   |
|---|---|
| <b>Global Changes</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced aesthetics by adding design elements to better align with AACSB brand.</li> <li>• Created a numbering scheme with corresponding headers to better organize each standard and its supporting language.</li> <li>• Changed references of “global prosperity” to “societal impact” throughout the standards.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Introduction, Philosophy, and Guiding Principles and Expectations for Accredited Schools</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Added reference to AACSB’s Collective Vision and the standards’ role in supporting the vision.</li> <li>• Increased emphasis on societal impact in the AACSB organizational information.</li> <li>• Added language affirming AACSB’s commitment to diversity and inclusion.</li> <li>• Added language to emphasize the context which the school operates is taken into consideration during the peer review process (i.e., cultural, unions, regulatory, etc.).</li> <li>• Added language to clarify the role of peer review judgment in the accreditation process and the goals of a team with respect to peer review team visits.</li> <li>• Added clarifying information on procedural details related to unit and scope of accreditation.</li> <li>• Added a <i>Collaborative Provisions/Transfer Credit</i> section to outline the most common types of partnerships and how each is treated in terms of accreditation (e.g. in scope, out of scope, and the implications for each). Also addresses the treatment of transfer credit into AACSB accredited degree programs.</li> <li>• Renamed <i>Guiding Principles</i> to <i>Guiding Principles and Expectations for Accredited Schools</i>. Enhanced the ten Guiding Principles to clarify expectations of schools with respect to each principle.</li> <li>• Renamed <i>Continuous Improvement in Support of High-Quality Outcomes</i> Guiding Principle to <i>Continuous Improvement</i>. Added financial vitality as a new aspect to this principle.</li> </ul> |
| <b>1-Strategic Planning</b>   | <div style="border: 2px solid green; padding: 5px;"> <p>1.1 The school maintains a <b><i>well</i></b>-documented strategic plan, <b><i>developed through a robust and collaborative planning process</i></b> involving key stakeholder input, that informs the school on resource allocation priorities. <b><i>The strategic plan should also articulate a clear and distinctive mission for the school.</i></b></p> <p>1.3 <b><i>As the school carries out its mission, it embraces innovation as a key element of continuous improvement.</i></b></p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basis for Judgment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.2: Added “<i>The school should maintain an ongoing risk analysis, identifying potential risks that could significantly impair its ability to fulfill the school’s mission, as well as a contingency plan for mitigating these risks.</i>”</li> <li>○ 1.4: Added “<i>The school’s strategic plan clearly identifies the strategies, including the allocation of human and financial capital, through which it will make a positive impact on society, the practice of business, the diversity of people and ideas, and the success of graduates.</i>”</li> <li>○ Added language: “<i>Schools should complete a risk analysis, identifying potential risks that could significantly impair their ability to fulfill the mission of the school. Included should be a contingency plan for mitigating these risks.</i>”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested Documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.2: Added <i>“Describe the risks that could impede the school’s ability to fulfill its mission and the plan to mitigate these risks.”</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |
| <b>2-Physical, Virtual and Financial Resources</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removed Table 2-1 (kept Table 2-2 which now becomes 2-1).</li> </ul>   |
| <b>3-Faculty and Professional Staff Resources</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Added definition for research master’s degrees.</li> <li>• Added language to convey the expectation that current and relevant intellectual capital <i>“in the area of teaching”</i> is expected for faculty to maintain their qualification status.</li> <li>• 3.1 Basis for Judgment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Added language regarding disciplines in the context of the standards: <i>“Disciplines are defined by the school in the context of their mission. Normally, the disciplines should align with the degree programs and/or majors offered by the school. However, not every degree program must have an identified discipline.”</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• 3.2 Basis for Judgment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clarified that 40% SA ratio is not expected to be met at the discipline level in cases where the school does not offer a degree or major (or concentration, where the school treats concentrations synonymously with majors). Added checkboxes to Table 3-1 for schools to indicate whether degree programs/majors are offered in the discipline to reinforce the point that the discipline ratios are intended to be met where a critical mass of faculty should exist (i.e., there is a degree/major/concentration rooted in that discipline).</li> <li>○ Added explicit language that the SA/PA/SP/IP ratios are not required at the program level.</li> <li>○ Added language regarding completion of Table 3-2: <i>“Table 3-2 is prepared at a macro-level across all degree programs, locations, and modalities; however, peer review teams may request supplemental breakout of Table 3-2 by a particular location or modality, where appropriate, as determined by the team. It is recognized that blended modalities are becoming increasingly common; therefore, modality in and of itself is often not a necessary breakout. Nevertheless, if the peer review team deems it appropriate to view Table 3-2 by modality, it is within their discretion to request the table for a particular location or by modality.”</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

## 4-Curriculum

4.1 The school delivers content that is current, relevant, forward-looking, globally-oriented, aligned with program competency goals, **and consistent with its mission, strategies, and expected outcomes. The** curriculum content cultivates agility with current and emerging technologies.

4.2 The school manages its curriculum through assessment and other systematic review processes to ensure currency, relevancy, and competency **goals are met.**

4.3 **The school's curriculum promotes and fosters innovation,** experiential learning, and a lifelong learning mindset. **Program elements promoting positive societal impact are included within the curriculum.**

- Removed Table 4-1. Requested that schools provide a narrative describing the current and emerging technologies which students should be proficient in for each degree level offered (undergraduate, MBA, specialized master's, doctoral).
- Moved the language regarding transfer credit and the majority of credit being earned at the home institution to Standard 6, as it aligns better with that standard.
- Basis for Judgment:
  - 4.1: Added list of business disciplines (economics, finance, legal studies, management, management information systems, marketing, and quantitative methods).
  - 4.2: Added "*Curriculum management fosters and promotes innovation.*"
  - 4.3: Added:
    - "*The school has an innovative approach to curriculum, whether related to content, pedagogy, or delivery method, that demonstrates currency, creativity, and forward-thinking.*"
    - "*The school promotes a lifelong learning mindset in learners, including creativity, intellectual curiosity, and critical and analytical thinking.*"
    - "*The school has a portfolio of curricular elements within formal coursework that promote a positive societal impact.*"
- Suggested Documentation:
  - 4.2: Added "*Describe how governance and processes, practices, or activities ensure curricular currency and foster innovation.*"
  - 4.3: Added:
    - "*Describe innovations in curriculum, as they have occurred, with respect to content, pedagogy, or delivery. Explain how these innovations demonstrate currency, creativity, and forward-looking curricula.*"
    - "*Describe how the school encourages students to take responsibility for their learning and promotes characteristics of a lifelong learning mindset.*"

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
|                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>“Document curricular elements within formal coursework that foster and support students’ ability to have a positive impact on society.”</i></li> <li>○ 4.4: Added <i>“Describe how students have succeeded and excelled through curricular and co-curricular engagement with faculty and the business community.”</i></li> </ul>  |
| <b>5-Assurance of Learning</b> | <p>5.1 The school uses well-documented assurance of learning (AoL) processes that include direct and indirect measures for ensuring the quality of all degree programs that are deemed in scope for accreditation purposes. <b><i>The results of the school’s AoL work leads to curricular and process improvements.</i></b></p> <p>5.4 Non-degree executive education that <b><i>generates greater than five percent of a school’s total annual resources</i></b> should include processes to ensure high quality and continuous improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Added definitions for executive education and microlearning credentials.</li> <li>• Basis for Judgment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 5.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Clarified that competencies are measured and reported at the degree program level, not the major level.</li> <li>▪ Added language <i>“Both direct and indirect measures are employed; normally a school would include both types of measures across the entire portfolio of assessment of all its degree programs. The proportion of direct versus indirect measures by degree program is determined by each school, consistent with its mission and strategic initiatives. It is acceptable for some programs to be assessed only through direct measures, while other programs may be assessed through only indirect measures. The school should provide its rationale for determining which programs are measured through direct measures and which programs are measured through indirect measures.”</i></li> <li>▪ Added language <i>“Programs launched since the last review should have a robust AoL plan in place, including a timeline for gathering and analyzing data. Depending on how long the program has been offered, some data may or may not have yet been gathered. A program that has been offered for five years would be expected to have gathered sufficient data to demonstrate a systematic and effective process for the program; however, a program just launched one or two years before a normal peer review visit may not have yet gathered sufficient data to demonstrate a systematic and effective process. The standards intend that, in the case of a newly launched degree program, schools should be given sufficient time to establish a systematic assessment process that adequately demonstrates student learning; in such a case, a robust assessment plan is of paramount importance.”</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggested Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 5.1: Added language <i>“Complete Table 5-1 for each degree program, showing curricular and process improvements resulting from the school’s AoL system. Provide a portfolio of evidence across degree programs that includes direct and indirect assessment of learning, showing learner progress in meeting competency goals</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
|                                      | <p><i>for each business degree program. The proportion of direct versus indirect measures within each degree program is determined by each school, consistent with its mission and strategic initiatives. Examples of programs that lend themselves to indirect measurement only are programs that are newer, smaller, niche, specialized, and interdisciplinary programs, or programs very closely tied to professional fields. Indirect evidence should be relative to the competencies stated for the degree program to which indirect evidence is applied.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarified in the Interpretive Guidance what principles are necessary for direct substitution of AoL performed for another accrediting organization. This requires consultation with the AACSB Chief Accreditation Officer.</li> <li>• Revised examples of Table 5-1 to include an example of a degree program assessed solely using indirect measures.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>6- Learner Progression</b></p> | <p>6.1 The school has policies and procedures for admissions, <b>acceptance of transfer credit</b>, academic progression toward degree completion, and supporting career development that are clear, effective, consistently applied, and aligned with the school's mission, strategies, and expected outcomes.</p> <p>6.2 “Post-graduation success is consistent with the school’s mission, <b>strategies, and expected outcomes. Public disclosure of academic program quality supporting learner progression and post-graduation success occurs on a current and consistent basis.</b>”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basis for Judgment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 6.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Modified to “<i>In addition to public disclosure information required by national or regional accreditors, schools provide readably accessible, reliable, and easily understandable information to the public on their performance of their business students including learner achievement information and overall program quality as determined by the school.</i>”</li> <li>▪ Added “<i>Strategies to identify and provide intervention and support for learners, including underrepresented or otherwise at-risk populations, who are not progressing adequately are employed.</i>”</li> <li>▪ Added “<i>High-quality advising services are available to students on a consistent and timely basis.</i>”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggested Documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 6.1: Added “<i>Describe processes in place to support career development activities such as career counseling, career days, workshops, career fairs, etc.</i>”</li> <li>○ 6.2: Added “<i>Schools provide relevant and timely public disclosure data documenting overall academic program quality. This information should be available and reasonably prominently displayed on the accredited unit’s website and distinguishable from university amalgamated data. Disclosures are not prescriptive, but are informed by the school’s mission, expected, strategies, and outcomes, and may include post-graduate learner success outcomes described in bullet one of 6.2, admission data, retention and time-to-degree data, diversity</i>”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><i>and inclusion advances, particular program emphases, student learning outcomes, rankings data, experiential learning opportunities, meaningful societal impact, or other mission-specific innovation, engagement, and impactful outcomes.”</i></p>  |
| <p><b>7-Teaching Effectiveness and Impact</b></p> | <div style="border: 2px solid #90EE90; padding: 10px;"> <p>7.2 The school has development activities in place to enhance faculty teaching and ensure that teachers can deliver curriculum that is <b>current, relevant</b>, forward-looking, globally oriented, innovative, and aligned with program competency goals.</p> <p>7.3 Faculty are current in their discipline and pedagogical methods, <b>including teaching diverse perspectives in an inclusive environment. Faculty demonstrate a lifelong learning mindset, as supported and promoted by the school.</b></p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basis for Judgment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 7.2: Added “<i>Faculty demonstrate a lifelong learning mindset with respect to their domain expertise. This means faculty take responsibility for continuing their professional development to maintain currency and relevancy in their field of expertise and embrace the idea that we never stop learning.</i>”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggested Documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 7.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Added “<i>Describe how the school’s process for remediating ineffective teaching when the school deems necessary.</i>”</li> <li>▪ Added “<i>Describe how faculty demonstrate a lifelong learning mindset and how the school supports this lifelong learning goal.</i>”</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ 7.3 Added “<i>Describe how faculty are prepared to teach in an inclusive environment, including workshops or trainings the faculty or school may have participated in.</i>”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <p><b>8- Impact of Scholarship</b></p>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renamed the <i>Thought Leadership</i> section of the standards to <i>Thought Leadership, Engagement, and Societal Impact</i>. This section, comprised of Standards 8 and 9, was revised to more comprehensively cover the societal impact a school may have through its range of activities (not limited to thought leadership).</li> <li>• Standard 8 now emphasizes the societal impact of the school’s intellectual contributions while Standard 9 emphasizes the impact all other school activities (as sponsored or promoted by the school) has on society.</li> </ul>  |

8.1 *The school's faculty **collectively** produce high-quality, impactful intellectual contributions that over time, develop into mission-consistent areas of thought leadership for the school.*

8.2 *The school collaborates with a wide variety of external stakeholders to create and transfer credible, relevant, and timely knowledge that informs the theory, policy, and/or practice of business to develop into mission-consistent areas of thought leadership for the school.*

8.3 *The school's portfolio of intellectual contributions contains exemplars of basic, applied, and/or pedagogical research that have had a positive societal impact, consistent with the school's mission.*

- Changed the typology of Table 8-1 to:
  - *Peer-reviewed journal articles*
  - *Additional peer- and editorial-reviewed intellectual contributions*
  - *All other intellectual contributions*
- Basis for Judgment:
  - 8.2: *Added "The school identifies its area(s) of thought leadership, outlines its goals for these contributions, and describes its achievements over the last five years as well as plans for the next five years. Examples of areas that could evolve into thought leadership include organizing and holding regional, national, or international academic and/or practitioner conferences; holding meetings for academic or professional organizations; publishing working-paper series; publishing academic journals; establishing a case study clearinghouse; or forming research relationships with private-sector, nonprofit, or government organizations."*
- In the Interpretive Guidance added further guidance on the completion of Table 8-1 and in particular, who is included vs. excluded. *"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 who 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 teach<sup>1</sup>*
  - *Visiting/adjuncts whose research is designated to and/or resourced by another school<sup>2</sup>"*

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid with respect to visiting faculty and adjuncts.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>9-Engagement and Societal Impact</b><br/>(formerly Engagement that Impacts Business and Society)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard completely revised to address the societal impact a school makes through all its activities (excluding intellectual contributions which are covered in Standard 8).</li> </ul> <div style="border: 2px solid green; padding: 5px; margin: 5px 0;"> <p><b>9.1 The school demonstrates positive societal impact through internal and external initiatives and/or activities, consistent with the school’s mission, strategies, and expected outcomes.</b></p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More clearly links to Standard 1 (a school’s societal impact aspirations as expressed in its mission statement).</li> <li>• Adjusted Interpretive Guidance to align with the new content.</li> </ul> |
|--|--|