

AACSB Global Standard-Setting Framework

Approved by AACSB Board of Directors
February 2, 2025

Americas

777 South Harbour Island Blvd.
Suite 750
Tampa, Florida 33602-5730 USA
Main +1 813 769 6500

Europe, Middle East, and Africa

UP Building, Piet Heinkade 55
1019 GM Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Main: +31 20 509 1070

Asia Pacific

331 North Bridge Road
#10-04/05 Odeon Towers
Singapore, 188720
Main: +65 6592 5210

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE FRAMEWORK

1.1 Purpose of the Framework	3
1.2 Objectives of the Framework.....	3
1.3 Scope and Applicability	3

2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF STANDARD SETTING

2.1 Transparency.....	4
2.2 Full and Fair Consultation	4
2.3 Accountability.....	4
2.4 Global Context.....	4
2.5 Local Relevance.....	4

3. GOVERNANCE

3.1 Standards vs. Accreditation	4
3.2 Areas of Responsibility.....	5

4. STANDARDS REVIEW AND REVISION DUE PROCESS

4.1 Periodic Review Cycle.....	6
4.2 Criteria for Standards Revisions	6
4.3 BAPC Recommendation.....	6
4.4 Board Approval.....	6
4.5 Standards Task Force.....	6
4.6 Key Stakeholder Input and Research.....	7
4.7 Scope of Revisions.....	7

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

5.1 Exposure Drafts	7
5.2 Finalizing an AACSB Standards Revision	8
5.3 Publication, Implementation, and Communication	8
5.4 Post-Implementation Review and Feedback Loop	8

6. TECHNICAL EDITS

6.1 Annual Technical Edits.....	8
6.2 Stakeholder Input.....	9
6.3 Finalizing Technical Edits	9

7. SUPPORTING CONSISTENT APPLICATION

7.1 Guidance Materials	9
7.2 Volunteer Training.....	9
7.3 Annual Reporting to Membership	9

APPENDIX 1.....	10
-----------------	----

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE FRAMEWORK

1.1 Purpose of the Framework

AACSB International (AACSB) accreditation is recognized as the hallmark of excellence in business education. The accreditation standards ensure that accredited institutions deliver high-quality education, maintain continuous improvement, and stay relevant and impactful in a rapidly changing global business environment. This document represents the entirety of the framework that guides AACSB in developing, revising and maintaining its global standards, including the fundamental principles around standard-setting, and the due process steps involved when revisions occur.

1.2 Objectives of the Framework

The objectives of this framework are to:

- Ensure that standards are developed and revised in a manner that reflects broad stakeholder engagement, transparency in decision making, and accountability to our constituents.
- Maintain confidence in the quality, relevance, and rigor of the AACSB accreditation process.
- Promote fairness and openness in consultation and decision-making procedures.
- Provide a principles-based structure adaptable to diverse global and local contexts.
- Provide decision makers and stakeholders with a consistent, robust process that is well-understood by all stakeholders.

1.3 Scope and Applicability

This framework applies to the development of new AACSB standards, the revision of existing standards, and any interpretations or clarifications of such standards. Additionally, the framework includes the due process followed in revision of the standards and interpretive guidance.

This framework does not include operating principles for the conduct of peer review visits or board or committee activities related to accreditation, as these are contained within the accreditation standards and/or the AACSB policy governance documents such as articles and bylaws and the Policy Governance Manual. This document does not contain the text of the standards themselves, as these are maintained in a separate document, as is the text of the Interpretive Guidance. Both of these documents are published on the AACSB website at <https://www.aacsb.edu/educators/accreditation/business-accreditation>.

2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF STANDARD SETTING

2.1 Transparency

AACSB is committed to transparent governance. All key deliberations involving creation, amendment, or interpretation of standards are documented and communicated openly.

2.2 Full and Fair Consultation

AACSB actively encourages input from accredited schools, prospective member institutions, faculty, students, employers, and other interested parties. Methods of consultation may include email communication, online surveys, open comment periods, focus groups, and live sessions at AACSB conferences. Care is taken to ensure robust global input from the membership.

2.3 Accountability

- The Chief Accreditation Officer is ultimately accountable to the President & CEO to ensure the processes identified in the framework are followed consistently and with full integrity.
- The Business Accreditation Policy Committee (BAPC) and its associated standards task force is accountable to the board for integrity of process contained within this framework.
- The Board of Directors is accountable to the Accreditation Council for the currency and relevance of AACSB standards to ensure high quality business education.

2.4 Global Context

Standards are designed to be robust yet adaptable across diverse contexts—covering a range of institutional missions, geographic settings, and program types. AACSB aims to ensure that any standard changes are appropriately scaled and relevant to the global community.

2.5 Local Relevance

AACSB is committed to recognizing and respecting the diverse contexts in which business schools operate worldwide. While the accreditation standards are designed to promote excellence and consistency on a global scale, AACSB recognizes that schools may face unique cultural, regulatory, and operational challenges. The standards are intentionally adaptable, allowing schools to develop strategies that align with their mission and local environments while adhering to global benchmarks of quality.

Peer review teams play a critical role in applying the standards through an appropriate cultural lens. They consider external factors such as regulatory systems, labor agreements, and regional norms when assessing a school's alignment with the standards. This collaborative and flexible approach ensures that the accreditation process remains equitable and relevant.

3. GOVERNANCE

3.1 Standards vs. Accreditation

It is instructional to consider the difference between standards and accreditation and identify governance implications for each.

Standards outline the criteria and benchmarks for quality and performance. They provide a framework for schools to continuously assess and improve their programs, ensuring that business schools maintain high educational quality. Standards are the foundation upon which accreditation processes are built.

Accreditation is the formal evaluation process by which institutions or programs are assessed against established standards. If they meet or exceed these standards, they receive accreditation. Accreditation based on recognized standards enhances the trust and credibility of institutions or programs. It assures stakeholders, including students, employers, and regulatory bodies, that the accredited entity meets rigorous quality criteria.

Approval of revisions to the standards are under the ultimate purview of the Accreditation Council. The work is carried out by the BAPC (typically supported by a standards task force), who endorses suggested changes to the Board of Directors. The Board, in turn, considers BAPC suggestions and endorses a final revision of the standards to the Accreditation Council. Representatives of the Accreditation Council vote by majority affirmation at a duly called business meeting to approve changes to the standards. Refer to section 6 for special notes on technical edits to the standards.

Accreditation policies, processes and practices are under the purview of the BAPC and normally do not require board approval. This includes oversight of accreditation operating committees and accreditation policy committees. BAPC also is authorized to make changes to the interpretive guidance, which is typically performed annually.

3.2 Areas of Responsibility

Responsible parties for each stage of the process and identified below in the order in which they enter or oversee the process of a standards revision.

- **President and Chief Executive Officer:** Serves as a voting member of the Board of Directors and is accountable to the Board for overall strategy related to standards revisions. Is available for consultation with the standards task force and Chief Accreditation Officer.
- **Chief Accreditation Officer:** Monitors emerging trends and challenges in business education and keeps AACSB board and committees updated on emerging trends that may impact the timing of standards revisions. Has primary responsibility for liaising with task forces and/or committees appointed to oversee a standards revision and providing necessary data to decision-making bodies as requested. Works with the chair of the BAPC to identify and appoint suitable candidates for service on the standards task force. Consults with and keeps the Chief Executive Officer informed of progress on revisions as they occur.
- **Business Accreditation Policy Committee (BAPC):** Reviews and approves technical edits annually to the standards and in the Interpretive Guidance document that accompanies the standards. Normally, every five years the BAPC reviews the standards to determine whether a revision of the official standards is needed. If yes, formally recommends a revision to the board along with rationale for the recommendation.
- **Board of Directors:** Charges the Chief Accreditation Officer upon the recommendation of the BAPC to conduct a standards revision project.

- **Standards Task force:** Examines data and evidence provided by staff and proposes revisions to the standards. Is appointed by the Chief Accreditation Officer and the BAPC chair. The size of the task force is relative to the scope of the revisions expected.
-

4. STANDARDS REVIEW AND REVISION DUE PROCESS

This section outlines the process followed in determining when to make revisions to the standards and how the process unfolds.

4.1 Periodic Review Cycle

The first step in due process is the establishment of a periodic review cycle. AACSB has established a cadence of five years. This means that every five years BAPC enters into a formal conversation to determine if the AACSB standards should be revised.

The BAPC may determine no changes to the standards are needed at that time but may choose to revisit the question at a future agreed-upon time period.

The Board may request a revision outside the normal five-year review cycle if there are significant changes in global business or educational practices needed to ensure relevance and currency of the standards.

4.2 Criteria for Standards Revisions

BAPC will consider the following key questions when determining if a standards revision is needed. The answers to these questions are the foundation for the BAPC's recommendation to the board for a standards revision.

- Is a standards revision needed to align schools with AACSB's vision for the future to be the global standards for business education?
- Is the benefit of revising the standards clearly in the best interest of our schools with respect to quality improvement and quality assurance?
- Can we identify ways to measure impact of the revised standards?

4.3 BAPC Recommendation

The BAPC will prepare a recommendation to the board for consideration at its next full board meeting. The recommendation will include:

- Timetable with key milestones identified
- Key areas of standards expected to be impacted
- Key risks and benefits of a standards revision
- Human and financial resources needed to conduct the project

4.4 Board Approval

If the board agrees with the BAPC recommendation, it charges the Chief Accreditation Officer to commence with the project and authorizes the constitution of a Standards Task Force.

4.5 Standards Task Force

The Standards Task Force may meet virtually or in person to perform the work of reviewing the standards. They receive recommendations and advice from the BAPC as needed. They make recommendations to the BAPC based on their work to advance revisions of the standards. The Chief Accreditation Officer coordinates the work of the Standards Task Force. A chair of the Standards Task Force may be appointed if desired by the chair of the BAPC in consultation with the Chief Accreditation Officer and President & Chief Executive

Officer. Alternatively, the Chief Accreditation Officer may oversee the Standards Task Force if a small task force is appropriate.

4.6 Key Stakeholder Input and Research

The Standards Task Force receives data prepared by the AACSB staff to help inform their recommended revisions to the standards. The AACSB Chief Accreditation Officer oversees the collection and collation of key stakeholder input and provides this information to the Standards Task Force. Such information may include, but is not limited to:

- **Environmental Scans:** Staff may provide information on trends in business education that may point to a need to revise the standards to capture shifts in global business education.
- **Key Stakeholder Input, including Sentiment Analysis:** Staff may gather or otherwise obtain stakeholder insights on specific needs or proposed changes including but not limited to accreditation committees, peer review teams, regional advisory councils, board and board committees, employers and industry leaders, global academic institutions, and students are all important stakeholders. Additionally, member schools globally are a key stakeholder. Input and sentiment analysis may be gathered through focus groups, surveys, conference sessions, or individual conversations.
- **Benchmarking:** Staff may provide benchmarking data relative to key competitors and industry leaders to maintain relevance and competitiveness and promote innovative practices in business education.
- **Other Information:** The Standards Task Force may request additional information to assist them in their evaluation of the currency and relevancy of the standards.

4.7 Scope of Revisions

Revisions may be deemed as major or minor revisions. This typically becomes known as part of the process of reviewing key stakeholder input and helps inform the timeline and workplan, as well as resource allocation necessary for a successful project.

- A **major revision** typically involves substantive changes that significantly alter the intent, expectations, or scope of the standards. This type of revision aims to address shifts in the landscape of business education, respond to broad stakeholder input, or incorporate advancements in knowledge and practices that affect the accreditation framework on a fundamental level. A major revision would normally take two years from start to finish.
- A **minor revision** usually pertains to updates that clarify, simplify, or refine the existing standards without altering the foundational principles. This could include language adjustments, additions of examples or guidance, or minor adjustments to ensure relevance and improve usability. A minor revision would normally be able to be accomplished in one year from start to finish.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

5.1 Exposure Drafts

The Standards Task Force prepares an exposure draft with their recommended revisions for the BAPC's consideration. Once approved by the BAPC, the BAPC considers and ultimately endorses the exposure draft to the Board. Once the board approves, the exposure

draft is publicly posted on behalf of the Board for no less than 30 days. Public comments are summarized and communicated after the 30-day public exposure period. Staff may host webinars or workshops to address key questions from stakeholders if desired. For major revisions the process flow is the same but with two exposure drafts the norm.

5.2 Finalizing an AACSB Standards Revision

- **Draft Revision:** Staff incorporate feedback from the public comment period as advised by the Standards Task Force and submit its final draft of the revised standards to BAPC.
- **Approval:** Once the final draft is complete, BAPC submits the proposed final standards to the Board for endorsement. The final standards are posted on the AACSB website as specified in the AACSB governance policies (currently 20 days in advance of the vote). Representatives of the Accreditation Council vote at a duly called meeting and adopt the revised standards by official vote. A majority of the Accreditation Council present must vote in the affirmative for standards to be adopted. The vote is a vote of the whole document.

5.3 Publication, Implementation, and Communication

After approval, the new or amended standards are published in official AACSB documentation. Implementation timelines (e.g., effective date) are provided to allow schools sufficient time to adapt. A full communication plan will be developed by staff, including various communication channels to ensure transparency of communications occurs. The transition period may be from one to three years, depending on the scope of revisions to the standards and the anticipated time schools and AACSB staff will need to smoothly move schools to revised standards.

5.4 Post-Implementation Review and Feedback Loop

Within a defined period (often 12–24 months after adoption), BAPC conducts a post-implementation review of feedback received to ensure the standard is performing as intended, recommending technical edits if necessary. Guidance documents or FAQs may be issued to clarify any ambiguities. Annual surveys are conducted to gain feedback on how well and impactful the revised standards are received (e.g., how the AACSB accreditation process has improved the school). Significant issues are brought to BAPC for discussion.

6. TECHNICAL EDITS

6.1 Annual Technical Edits

Subsequent to the publication of revised standards, it is within the purview of the BAPC to make any technical edits to the standards document except for to the standards “proper,” which refers to the language for each standard contained within the green box. The standards proper constitute the official standards and may not be changed except by a vote of the Accreditation Council, as outlined in the AACSB governance procedures.

The BAPC also has purview over the entire “Interpretive Guidance” document, which is provided as a help to accredited schools in understanding the rationale behind each standard and to provide examples for clarity.

Both revisions to the standards document (excluding to the standards proper) and the Interpretive Guidance document are considered “technical edits.”

6.2 Stakeholder Input

Technical edits are sourced from peer review teams, accreditation committees, and other key stakeholders during the year and are vetted during a duly called BAPC meeting. The BAPC ensures consistency of such technical edits with the broader application of standards and the global nature of the standards.

6.3 Finalizing Technical Edits

BAPC approves all technical edits and revisions are published on the AACSB website annually. Additionally, member schools receive email correspondence highlighting such revisions.

7. SUPPORTING CONSISTENT APPLICATION

7.1 Guidance Materials

- **Handbooks and Toolkits:** AACSB staff produce detailed guides to help schools implement standards. Accreditation handbooks are maintained within myAccreditation and may be viewed by organizational representatives at accredited and in-process schools or their designees.
- **Webinars, Workshops, and Seminars:** Regular sessions to deepen understanding of new and existing standards are offered and listed on the AACSB website at aacsb.edu.

7.2 Volunteer Training


All accreditation volunteers are required to undertake periodic volunteer training specific to their role within the accreditation process (i.e., committee member, peer review team member, board member, mentor, committee chair).

7.3 Annual Reporting to Membership

An annual accounting to the membership is published detailing accreditation outcomes and best practices at a macro-level.

Appendix 1

Standard Setting Process



*Shaded boxes indicate approval decisions by BAPC or Board.