AACSB

July 1, 2024
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
General	Throughout standards and interpretive guidance	Adjusted all references of a five-year accreditation cycle to six years.
Eligibility Criterion 1	Standards, p. 14	Strengthened language regarding the minimum number of full-time faculty required and clarified that visiting faculty are not included in the minimum count of 16 full-time faculty.
Eligibility Criterion 3	Standards, p. 14	Added language indicating that the majority of the degrees offered by the school must be at the bachelor's level or higher. The school offers at least one baccalaureate and/or graduate degree program (or equivalent) in business administration, management, or accounting independently through their institution, and not in partnership with another institution(s). ***Additionally, the majority of the degrees awarded by the school must be at the bachelor's level or above.***
1-Strategic Planning	Standards, p. 24	Added language to convey the expectation that schools should select a focus area or areas related to societal impact.
1-Strategic Planning	Interpretive Guidance, p. 7	Modified the sample risk register, removing the COVID risks. Deleted the redundant risk that showed quantitative measurement of risk as it was repetitive. Updated the year referenced in the title of the risk register.

3-Faculty and Professional Staff Resources	Standards, p. 29	• Clarified that SA faculty should be producing peer-reviewed journal articles at a minimum. SA faculty are normally expected to produce some peer *or editorial reviewed* publications related to their field of teaching as part of their portfolio of scholarship, **consistent with the faculty member's assigned duties and the mission of the school.**
	Standards, p. 30	• Added language that **SP faculty are normally expected to produce practice, applied, or pedagogical publications related to their field of teaching as part of their portfolio of scholarship. In addition to publications related to their field of teaching, SP faculty may produce other publications outside their field of teaching in support of other mission-related components of the school and reflective of the faculty member's role at the school.**
	Standards, p. 34	• Added language to clarify that schools in the initial accreditation process are expected to fully meet the faculty qualifications and faculty sufficiency ratios of Standard 3. **Schools seeking initial accreditation are expected to substantially meet the faculty qualifications and faculty sufficiency ratios for all of Standard 3, including the 40% SA ratio across disciplines for which a degree, major or concentration (for generalist degrees) are offered and the school overall. Initial schools would not normally be in alignment with Standard 3 by coupling lower SA ratios with high-quality outcomes, as is acceptable for schools that have already attained accreditation.**
	Standards, p. 34	• Clarified for Table 3-2 that schools in the initial accreditation process should meet the 90% SA+PA+SP+IP faculty qualification ratios by degree program level. **For schools seeking initial accreditation, this expectation is especially critical to validate deployment of qualified faculty across degree levels from the very beginning of the granting of accreditation.**

3-Faculty and Professional Staff Resources	Interpretive Guidance, p. 14	• Clarified that administrators classified as PA should be meeting the spirit of PA status for their school's criteria. ***Similarly, administrators classified as PA should sustain their currency and relevance through professional engagement activities. Responsibilities related to the administrative role should not be the basis for SA/PA classification.***
	Interpretive Guidance, p. 16	• Clarified that SP faculty activities are scholarly in nature. ***In addition to producing applied, practice, or pedagogical publications, SP faculty will undertake a variety of scholarly engagement activities consistent with the faculty member's role (e.g., junior or senior faculty) and the school's mission, strategies, and expected outcomes to support maintenance of this status.***
4-Curriculum	Interpretive Guidance, p. 29	Added the expectation that schools should have policies to ensure the responsible use of technology, including the ethical use of artificial intelligence.
5-Assurance of Learning	Standards, p. 45	• Clarified that group projects are normally considered to be indirect measures. ***Normally, assessment of group projects would also be considered an indirect measure where performance cannot be attributed to a specific individual, but rather only to the group as a whole. However, if the group assignment can provide for assessment of competency at the individual level, a group assignment could be assessed directly with a rubric. A key difference between an indirect and direct measure is whether the assessment can be conducted at the individual level in a detailed/specific/granular way (direct assessment) or the group level (indirect assessment).***
	Standards, p. 45	• Added the following additional clarification: ***For AoL purposes, when indirect measures are tied to a specified competency goal, there is the expectation that the loop on that goal will be closed.***
	Standards, p. 46	• Added clarification regarding initial schools and assurance of learning: ***Schools seeking initial accreditation are expected to substantially demonstrate alignment with Standard 5 in terms of having a robust assurance of learning system, including a well-documented system that has both direct and indirect measures, achievement of learning outcomes across degree programs, and evidence of curriculum improvements that have emanated from the assurance of learning process.***

	Standards, p. 49	• Updated the final column of Table 5-1 to collect curriculum changes only vs. curricular and process changes. Process changes should be described in the school's accreditation report, but not reported within the table.
5-Assurance of Learning	Interpretive Guidance, pp. 32–33	Added a new section titled "Indirect Measures" that provides examples of indirect measures and highlights the difference between indirect measures that may be used to "close the loop" vs. indirect measures that lead to broader program improvements.
8-Impact of Scholarship	Interpretive Guidance, pp. 43–44	• Added the following language under Types of Intellectual Contributions: ***All intellectual contributions for Standard 8 purposes should either be within or closely related to the faculty member's discipline or serve other components of the school's mission (e.g., contributions to the school's chosen area of societal impact or thought leadership).***

	Interpretive Guidance, p. 44	• Adjusted the examples under Types of Intellectual Contributions to combine like items and create a more streamlined list, shown below:
		   • ***publications in peer-reviewed journals***
		   • ***publications in editorial-reviewed journals***
		   • ***publications in the popular press***
		   • ***published case studies or other teaching materials***
		   • ***peer-reviewed academic or professional conference proceedings***
		   • ***policy documents***
		   • ***academic or practitioner books and book chapters***
		   • ***reports from research or consulting grants***
		   • ***technologies for practical application in business***
		   • ***patents***