

A “How–To Guide” for Higher Education Institutions  
that are Balancing Requirements From Multiple Accreditation Agencies:

Where the Rubber Hits the Road

Lorin Ritchie

Jeanine Romano

Rob Bateman

Kevin Mitchell

Ahmed Mokhtar

John Mosbo

American University of Sharjah

### Abstract

In addition to the agencies that provide accreditation at the institutional level, several organizations have emerged that offer accreditation for specific programs or collective programs of study. Some of these organizations are more prescriptive than others, but all emphasize assessing the quality of educational experiences and program content; more specifically, they require assessment of student learning as an important aspect of the quality of an institution's effectiveness. Both at the institution and the program levels, the challenge of complying with the standards of several different organizations can be both bewildering and informative. The purpose of this paper is to present an overview of the current methods and standards proposed by different accreditation agencies. We present specific examples from these agencies, comparing and contrasting their methodologies and requirements.

## Introduction

Increasing emphasis on accountability and assessment of student learning, together with growing concern about the quality of education overall, have combined to focus attention on the specific processes and procedures of higher education accreditation at both the program and the institutional levels. In addition to the agencies that provide institutional accreditation, several organizations have emerged that accredit specific or collective programs of study. Some of these reviewing entities are more prescriptive in their requirements than others, but all emphasize assessing the quality of educational experience and academic content; more specifically, they require assessment of student learning as an important aspect of the quality of an institution's effectiveness. The American University of Sharjah (AUS) and its academic programs are currently licensed and/or accredited by several accrediting bodies, which may be considered local, regional and international in scope. These include organizations located in the UAE and the United States. At both the institutional and program levels, the challenge of complying with the standards of several different organizations can be problematic and informative. The purpose of this paper is to present an overview of the current methods and standards proposed by different accreditation agencies, as well as to serve as a "how-to guide" by presenting specific examples from some of these agencies. We will do so by contrasting and comparing their methodologies and requirements.

AUS is licensed by the United Arab Emirates Commission for Academic Accreditation (CAA) through the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MOHESR) and accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). In addition to institutional licensure, MOHESR requires that individual programs (generally, undergraduate majors and graduate degree programs) at private institutions be accredited for graduates to

receive attestation of their degrees. The process includes development of detailed program proposals to determine initial eligibility to offer a program as well as full self-studies for re-accreditation on a five-year cycle. In contrast, MSCHE accredits the institution and not individual programs.

Over the years, other academic agencies have emerged that accredit individual or collective academic programs. These organizations often have a professional or disciplinary focus. Examples include the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology), and the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). Currently at AUS, all undergraduate engineering degree programs are accredited by ABET; the School of Business and Management is in the process of seeking accreditation with AACSB; and the School of Architecture and Design has been admitted as an accreditation candidate with NAAB for its architecture program. Each unit also has its programs accredited by CAA. While AUS is accredited or pursuing accreditation with each of these discipline-specific agencies, this paper will use details related to the AACSB- International process to illustrate how accreditations differ but also intersect at the local (UAE national), US (regional) and disciplinary levels. The standards for all accreditation bodies with which AUS is affiliated are listed in Tables 1 through 5. For each of these accreditations, all stakeholders – faculty, staff, students, alumni, and employers – have important roles and are affected by the process.

### **Brief Description of Accreditation Organizations and Their Processes**

#### *Middle States Commission on Higher Education*

In the United States, a majority of institutions of higher education are required to obtain accreditation by a regional organization, primarily to obtain or maintain credentials for the

acquisition of federal education funding and transferability of student course credits to other institutions. According to The Middle States Commission on Higher Education Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Eligibility Requirements and Standards for Accreditation (2006) documentation, the purpose of the accrediting process is to, "... strengthen and sustain the quality and integrity of higher education making it worthy of confidence and external control" (p. iv). MSCHE is one of six regional accrediting bodies in the United States that oversees this process. Although MSCHE (based in Philadelphia), is the accrediting organization for institutions in the "Middle States" region along the Central Atlantic Coast of the United States, it also is one of the few such bodies that has granted accreditation to institutions outside of the United States. The MSCHE accreditation process, though requisite for access to federal funds, is nonetheless considered voluntary. Given that AUS is not eligible for US government assistance, the institution's participation in the MSCHE accreditation process should be viewed as a means of quality assurance intended to help validate the institution's academic credibility. The accreditation process for MSCHE requires a comprehensive institutional self-study to demonstrate quality of education.

As part of the accreditation process, MSCHE appoints a liaison to the institution applying for review to assist with any refinement or clarification that might be needed for the self-study report. Typically, this liaison makes at least two visits to the campus and meets with the members of the self-study steering committee along with the leadership of the institution. The liaison's primary role is to examine the self-study design prior to and during its implementation to verify that it will indeed meet the requirements of the MSCHE standards.

The design of the self-study is a process in which the institution seeking accreditation determines the methodology and design in a somewhat inductive fashion but is required to

demonstrate that the institution has met the 14 MSCHE accreditation standards (see Table 1) within the framework of the institution's mission and goals. MSCHE allows each institution to choose between four types of models for the self study: The Comprehensive Model, The Comprehensive Self-Study with Special Emphasis Model, The Selected Topics Model, and The Collaborative Model. A description of these various models can be found in the MSCHE Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report (2007) publication. Established institutions previously accredited are required to participate in decennial evaluations (i.e., every 10 years), and can choose one of the four models, but all candidate institutions are required to use the Comprehensive Model for their accreditation self-study. After a candidate institution acquires initial accreditation, MSCHE also requires a second Comprehensive Model self-study after a five year period. After this second review, the institution's accreditation is established and becomes subject to validation through the decennial process using any one of the four models for its report. AUS was first accredited by MSCHE in 2004 based on a self study using the Comprehensive Model. The university is currently in the process of its second review using the same model.

For all models, the institution first appoints a Steering Committee to lead the review process and establishes working groups that represent the campus community. At AUS this was initiated by the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (VCAA), who appointed a faculty member as chair of this committee. The Chancellor then selected 13 additional members of the Self-Study Steering Committee from a list of individuals recommended from among faculty, staff and administrators. The Steering Committee led the self-study process by establishing 15 working groups, each assigned to focus on specific areas of the MSCHE standards. Other members of these working groups were also stakeholders in the AUS community who the VCAA, the

Chancellor and the Steering Committee agreed would bring useful perspectives to the self-study effort. These workgroups developed and refined a set of research questions covering some part of the MSCHE standards. Along with developing research questions that related to their assigned standards, each work group was required to identify the types and sources of data needed to answer them. The workgroups then designed the data collection process required to develop answers to their given research question(s). This effort also included preparing the information in a format that would support the overall process and self-study. The information was not necessarily submitted in the form of individual reports but was assembled as an analytical output in order for the chair of the steering committee to compile the data into a self-study report in which responses to the research questions pointed to specific data and sources. With the help of input from the entire AUS community (including students), this report went through many drafts, iterations and reviews over a two year period.

The institution's self study was then passed along to a site visit team for evaluation. This team is appointed by MSCHE and is made up of individuals from other accredited MSCHE institutions that would be considered peers. A Chair is appointed by Middle States along with the members of the site visit team. After reviewing the self-study report, the team arranges for a four-day site visit, during which its members conduct numerous interviews with administrators, faculty, staff, students, trustees and any other relevant stakeholders, ; the primary purpose of the site visit is to validate the content of the self-study. After the site visit, the Chair of the visiting team works with the other team members to generate a report that reflects the team consensus on the state of the institution's eligibility for accreditation or re-accreditation. This document may include recommendations that must be met in order to affirm accreditation. This report is sent to the institution which, depending on the site-visit team's findings, may respond to MSCHE to

clarify any issues that require additional input. The liaison may also be asked by the MSCHE to obtain any additional information required. MSCHE then delegates to its Committee on Evaluation Reports the discussion of the self-study, the site visit team report, the institution's response to any issues that may have materialized as a result of the site visit team report, and any additional comments from the site visit Chair or MSCHE staff. The institution then either receives full accreditation from MSCHE or is required to produce follow-up activities in order receive full accreditation. While the removal of accreditation is a possibility, the likelihood of such an outcome is rare.

*Commission for Academic Accreditation (CAA), UAE Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research*

Institutions of higher education in the UAE fall into three broad categories with respect to quality assurance. First, national universities and colleges are those owned or controlled by the government of the UAE and which come under the direct supervision of MOHESR. Second, institutions operating in so-called free zones are usually branches of foreign universities to which little local review applies. Third, private institutions, both non-profit and for profit, are licensed to operate and grant degrees by MOHESR, with the CAA responsible for quality assurance processes and oversight of licensure and program accreditation. AUS, as a private, non-profit university belongs to the third of these institution categories. A distinct feature of the UAE accreditation process is that the institution is reviewed as a whole for licensure, and each program the institution offers is reviewed individually for accreditation. Both licensure and accreditation are accomplished in accordance with the guidelines of the CAA Standards for Licensure and Accreditation (2007).

To secure initial licensure, institutions submit detailed documentation covering all aspects of proposed operations, including feasibility studies and operational plans, proposed

educational offerings, student and faculty handbooks, and an institutional effectiveness manual. Once licensed, institutions submit proposals for each program to be offered, and may advertise programs and recruit students only after the programs have received initial accreditation. A program may be defined as an academic major (e.g., Mathematics) within a general degree, such as a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science, or it may be defined as a more focused degree in which a number of majors exist, such as a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration with majors in Accounting, Economics, Finance, and so forth. Within two years of graduating its first students from each program, the institution is expected to apply to the CAA for full program accreditation. Institutions conduct license renewal reviews and program re-accreditation self-studies every five years.

With both the initial licensure review and the institutional re-licensure process, the focus of the self-study is on ensuring that the institution has established and maintains appropriate organizational structures, overall fiscal viability, academic integrity and institutional effectiveness. The institution reviews its mission and the effectiveness with which the mission is fulfilled, ensures that 1) its organization and governance is appropriate, 2) its academic programs are appropriate to its mission and are continuously assessed and improved, and 3) that its programs are delivered by appropriately qualified faculty. The institution also reviews its support services and ensures that fiscal resources, facilities, and technology services provide adequate support for the successful delivery of its programs.

More detailed examination of each program is conducted during the program accreditation process. The institution first establishes that the program is feasible, adheres to a high academic standard, has appropriate program goals and learning outcomes, has appropriate assessment measures in place, and is delivered by suitably qualified faculty. The full

accreditation self-study focuses on the program's ability to demonstrate that it has met its goals and that graduates have achieved the desired learning outcomes of the program. Each program must have direct and indirect measures in place to assess program effectiveness, and show that it has a program improvement process in place to address any shortfalls that might become evident with each review cycle.

Because the CAA both licenses the institution and accredits individual degree programs within the institution, there are two sets of standards to address these areas. While both the licensure and academic program have the same ten areas addressed in the two sets of standards, the criteria within each set of standards are distinct in their relevance to the given level. These standards are listed in Table 3. Although the CAA has specific requirements in terms of format, data and deliverables, there are no specific requirements defining the self-study process. The licensure report can be conducted by all stakeholders or assigned to a small group of individuals. For program accreditation, the process may vary depending on the size of the department and the viewpoint of the college administration. While the responsibility for a degree program accreditation self-study primarily belongs to the department responsible for that program, the institution does play a role in providing guidance and coordination for the process. Unlike MSCHE, CAA does not designate a liaison for each of its licensed institutions. However, CAA representatives make themselves available periodically for consultation and assistance.

As noted earlier, the licensure and program accreditation processes are both on a five-year cycle. Like other accreditation agencies, the CAA conducts site visit reviews for both licensure and program accreditation. A CAA licensure Visiting Committee is made up of the CAA director and commissioners, but the program accreditation Visiting Committees usually consist of one CAA representative and two or three subject matter experts from the program's

given field of study. These subject matter experts are usually faculty from institutions in the United States, but occasionally include faculty from other international higher education institutions. In both the licensure and program accreditation processes, the committee usually receives a self-study report from the institution prior to a site visit. The team is then invited to the campus to meet with the appropriate representatives of the institution and program, including current students, alumni and employers of AUS graduates. This site visit usually lasts three days, and results in a report sent to the institution by the Visiting Committee via the CAA. This document usually consists of recommendations and suggestions. All recommendations must be addressed in order to secure licensure or accreditation, while suggestions are offered as considerations for improvement. Depending on the degree to which initial responses to the report satisfy the Visiting Committee's recommendations, more than one follow-up report and response may be required. Once the Visiting Committee is satisfied that all recommendations have been fully met, the licensure is confirmed or the program receives accreditation.

AUS was initially licensed by the CAA in 1999 and is currently in the process of acquiring re-licensure. Whereas the license has been periodically renewed since the initial licensure, the current renewal process is the first time the institution has been required to conduct a self-study as specified in the revised CAA standards (2007). Programs have also been subject to periodic review by CAA. Initially, programs were required to meet all standards in the prescribed CAA documentation. As the CAA standards have evolved, programs now conduct reflective self-studies and evaluate the extent to which they adhere to the standards. As a part of the current self-study process, programs are encouraged not only to demonstrate their current strengths but also to use the evaluation as a way to discover possible improvements needed and develop plans to address them.

*AACSB International-The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business*

AACSB is a non-governmental organization and member of the Council on Higher Education Accreditation. As with MSCHE, an institution's decision to pursue accreditation with AACSB is voluntary. AACSB-International awards accreditation to an academic institution collectively for its programs in business-related disciplines, including accounting, economics, finance, etc. Because these programs are generally organized into one administrative unit, the focus of accreditation is usually at the "school" level. At AUS, this unit is the School of Business and Management (SBM). All programs within the school are subject to review, unless the institution specifically asks to have a program exempted. Guidelines are provided to support this determination, most importantly based on how much of the program content is within the business curriculum. At AUS, for example, a major in Economics within the BSBA degree program is included in AACSB review, but a Bachelor of Arts in Economics (BAE) is exempted. Other related programs, such as the Bachelor of Arts in Public Administration, are specifically mentioned as exemptible for accreditation purposes, but AUS included this program in the AACSB review because the US organization that oversees such programs does not offer accreditation outside of North America.

Although AACSB recognizes the potential value of diversity in the orientation of business-related programs, it requires clear delineation of a school mission statement that is contributory to the mission of the institution. According to the AACSB- International Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation (2008), the school must essentially demonstrate "an acceptable level of performance consistent with its mission." (p. 1). Specifically required are ongoing development of the faculty, clear patterns of curricular and resource planning, and effective delivery of instruction. Development of conceptual reasoning,

problem-solving skills and life-long learning abilities are considered to be essential outcomes of all programs.

Although AACSB focuses on the school level, it does pay attention to programs to the extent that they are subject to ongoing assessment and improvement. Recognizing the need to address ongoing changes in the business environment and the importance of rising expectations, AACSB hopes to ensure that the school's improvement efforts are institutionalized in the form of established processes leading to iterative cycles of curriculum assessment and enhancement, faculty development, resource planning, and introspection about each program. These processes should be deeply embedded in the institution with broad participation by the faculty.

In many respects, the AACSB standards are demanding but not necessarily prescriptive. AACSB does not specify which courses must be required in an academic major, for example, as long as the courses do have clear objectives which contribute to the expected outcomes of the program. Student admission standards are subject to determination by the school, but the requirements must be consistent with the mission of the institution and be uniformly applied. Maintenance of faculty qualification standards is subject to broad guidelines to be interpreted based on the mission and orientation of the institution. The value of significant industry experience is explicitly recognized in a professional qualification that parallels the more common academic qualification. When making their visits, Peer Review Teams are given explicit authority to exercise flexibility, particularly with respect to program innovation and cultural differences that may not have been envisioned when the standards were written.

The AACSB accreditation process begins with submission of an eligibility application completed by the institution. After this document has been reviewed by the Pre Accreditation Committee, a mentor is assigned. This individual, usually the dean of an accredited business

school, visits the campus to discuss any concerns raised by the Committee and help the institution to develop an appropriate response. He or she will also provide guidance on the preparation of a “gap analysis” that will become the basis for a future accreditation plan. An Accreditation Coordinating Committee reviews the application, as revised, and determines the eligibility of the institution to begin the accreditation process. If accepted, the school begins preparation of a Strategic Plan and an Accreditation Plan. The Pre Accreditation Committee reviews the completed Accreditation Plan and begins a dialogue with the institution to address any concerns. An approved plan is forwarded to the Initial Accreditation Committee (IAC), which then considers the Strategic Plan and interacts with the applicant institution until approval. The school then submits three progress reports to document implementation of the Accreditation Plan.

A leader for the Peer Review Team is appointed approximately two years in advance of the anticipated site visit and reviews the progress reports submitted by the institution. Upon acceptance of the final progress report, the applicant will be given approval to begin the Self-Evaluation Report, a document prepared by the school with the input of the Team Leader. Meanwhile, other members of the Peer Review Team are selected in time to review the completed report. Following a site visit, the team submits a report to the IAC and the applicant, in which it includes a recommended decision. If the IAC concurs with a recommendation to accredit the institution, this approval is forwarded to the AACSB Board of Trustees for ratification. Institutions without major gaps may expect to spend five years in the process.

AACSB places considerable emphasis on direct mechanisms of learning assessment at the program level. Progress reports are expected to include specific examples in which standardized test scores, imbedded assignments or other direct assessment tools are used to

initiate curriculum modifications.

### **Contrast and Comparison of Accrediting Agencies**

These agencies share a common commitment to institutional integrity and academic quality. Each has a set of standards to which institutions must adhere, though the focus and degree of specificity vary. All three organizations value the input of the institutions under review. Each employs some sort of self-study process and all utilize a site visit component in which a team of “peers” reviews or validates the findings of the institution. Each of these agencies values outputs but emphasizes the importance of institutional effectiveness, assessment, and continuous improvement processes. Specifically, student learning outcomes are central to the values of all three accrediting bodies.

As much as these agencies have in common, they differ not only in scope but also in process. An important difference with respect to AUS is that CAA licensure and accreditation processes are mandatory for any institution allowed to grant degrees, whereas accreditation with agencies such as MSCHE, ABET, AACSB-International, and NAAB is considered voluntary. In an emerging and rapidly evolving educational market, CAA plays an essential regulatory role. The scope of the MSCHE accreditation process is designed in such a way that there is a defined structure specifying who will participate and how (i.e. committee structure), but unlike the CAA licensure process the institution can choose one of four relatively flexible formats for the actual report submission. In addition, the MSCHE approach allows for the institution to determine what data is necessary to support the argument that they are worthy of endorsement by the accreditation body. When it comes to the other agencies, there is a stricter set of guidelines as to what must be present in the self-study. For example, the CAA licensure insists that the institution must submit the following documents: 1) a feasibility study, including a statement of financial

resources; 2) a financial guarantee; 3) a site approval and architectural plan; 4) a timed action plan; 5) an organization chart; 6) a policies and procedures manual comprising all institutional policies; 7) an institutional effectiveness manual; 8) the catalog(s); 9) a student handbook; and 10) a faculty/staff handbook. Organizations like AACSB-international and ABET also require specific information about assessment design and even have specific standards that must be met in order to receive their endorsement, though the former will discuss how these guidelines may be best applied in specific situations.

Another difference is the perception of how faculty is defined and evaluated. For the MSCHE, an institution's faculty is required to be "...consistent with expected academic outcome reflecting both appropriate standards of quality and the institutional mission" (p 37), which leaves considerable scope for interpretation of faculty credentials. However, the CAA is much more prescriptive to the extent that its standards strictly define qualifications and experience required to teach courses in varying levels of programs (e.g. remedial, certificate, baccalaureate degree, and graduate degree programs). Also, the CAA has a strict policy for faculty workloads that limits teaching loads, depending on the program level. AACSB –International actually defines expected ratios for faculty qualification and activity. Its standards clearly state that "..at least 90 percent of faculty resources are either academically or professionally qualified"(p. 43). This is verified by specific descriptions of academic qualifications suitable for specific areas of teaching responsibility. For example, a faculty member who possesses a doctoral degree in the area in which s/he teaches would be considered as qualified. A faculty member with a doctoral degree in a field outside of business, but in the field of primary teaching responsibility (e.g., law) would need to meet essentially the same standard. A faculty member with a doctorate in a related area, however, might be required to show additional preparation if teaching in a traditional

business discipline. In addition, AACSB requires that all academically or professionally qualified faculty members maintain their qualification through peer-reviewed research, publications or other scholarly activity, as evaluated on a five-year rolling basis.

The greatest distinction may be evident in the site visit, both with respect to its design and the structure of the evaluation teams. Each agency appoints qualified individuals to serve on the Visiting Committees, but MSCHE, ABET, AACSB-International, and NAAB select individuals from institutions that have obtained accreditation with the individual agencies. However, the CAA uses only its own commissioners for the licensure review. It selects individuals knowledgeable in the field for program reviews such that most such visitors are from US universities, but some come from institutions located in the United Kingdom, Europe, and other countries.

### **Conclusions and Observation**

Our experience at AUS with seeking accreditation or licensure with all of these organizations has been a rather arduous endeavor. Each of these licensures and accreditations individually is important and in a number of ways they complement each other; in others, they are repetitive and overlapping.

MSCHE accreditation and CAA licensure processes focus on broad institutional issues. They help ensure that we are mindful of the bigger picture and continuous evolution of the institution. Having MSCHE accreditation affirms to ourselves, as well to students and parents that we are providing an education of comparable quality to US institutions – a part of what defines who we are. Accreditation from organizations such as ABET, NAAB, and AACSB further affirms that. Although some business employers might not ask whether AUS has AACSB accreditation, it is a question to which many MBA and doctoral programs outside of the

UAE seek the answer when evaluating graduates of SBM.

In contrast to MSCHE accreditation and CAA licensure, AACSB concentrates on the business school or college and its programs, though generally not in a prescriptive fashion. ABET and NAAB review programs in detail and are quite prescriptive, but also examine the school or college in which the programs are administered. CAA program accreditation scrutinizes individual programs in detail and is very prescriptive in its approaches. Though program reviews by these different organizations and agencies are similar in terms of the extent of scrutiny of program goals, learning outcomes, assessment measures, they differ in their detail and approaches, and occasionally conflict. CAA site visit teams have encouraged programs to limit program goals and learning outcomes to 5 to 6 items, consistent with AACSB's 4 to 6, and in contrast to ABET 's eleven (A-K learning outcomes). NAAB does not make recommendations regarding learning outcomes but requires that graduates demonstrate *understanding* or *ability* in 34 clearly defined areas (e.g. speaking and writing skills, fundamental design skills, life safety, etc.).

Program scrutiny by AACSB, CAA, ABET, and NAAB has resulted in stronger AUS program offerings and has strengthened the spirit of continuous improvement. CAA encourages institutions to benchmark themselves with American universities, and we believe that the seriousness with which AUS approaches CAA program reviews assists the CAA in ensuring that higher education in the UAE is held to high standards.

Independent of the affirmations accreditation and licensure provide, we value what we learn about ourselves and our programs through the process of preparing the self-studies and the feedback we receive from the visiting teams. Were it not for the pressure of these accrediting organizations, we suspect we would not be as diligent about evaluating what we do.

When these various accreditations are taken together, however, the cumulative effort required is onerous at best. Coordinating them requires a great deal of time and resources. We sometimes feel that we are self-studying ourselves to death, a phenomenon that some consultants call “analysis paralysis.” Based on the initial accreditation with MSCHE, AUS is now on a five-year review cycle; we also are on a five-year cycle with CAA. With 22 bachelor-level programs and 13 masters degree, AUS is preparing 6-8 programmatic self-studies per year, plus reviews of discipline-based accrediting agencies. For example, this year we prepared separate self-studies for and have been visited for MOHESR re-licensure, MSCHE reaccreditation, reaccreditation of twelve existing programs and two new programs for MOHESR, and were visited for accreditation-eligible status by NAAAB. We strongly support and are anxious to assist in finding ways that the requirements of multiple accrediting agencies can be dovetailed, such as collaborative accreditations or acceptance of ABET as adequate program review, to streamline the review processes without sacrificing quality of the reviews and outcomes.

Balancing all of these issues is a challenge for AUS, and maintaining consistency is critical to agencies such as the CAA. Balancing and maintaining is “Where the rubber hits the road.”

## References

*Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Eligibility Requirements and Standards for Accreditation.* (2006). Retrieved February 15, 2007 from [http://www.msche.org/publications/CHX06\\_Aug08080728132708.pdf](http://www.msche.org/publications/CHX06_Aug08080728132708.pdf)

*Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs* (2007). Retrieved April 11, 2007 from [http://www.abet.org/Linked%20Documents-UPDATE/ Criteria%20 and%20PP/E001%2007-08%20EAC%20Criteria%2011-15-06.pdf#search="standards"](http://www.abet.org/Linked%20Documents-UPDATE/ Criteria%20 and%20PP/E001%2007-08%20EAC%20Criteria%2011-15-06.pdf#search='standards')

*AACSB-International Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation* (2006). Retrieved December 10, 2008 from <http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/business/STANDARDS.pdf>

*Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report* (2007). Retrieved April 5, 2008 from <http://www.msche.org/publications/SelfStudy07070925104848.pdf>

*Standards for Licensure and Accreditation (4th ed)* (2007). Retrieved March 23, 2007 from <http://www.caa.ae/caaweb/images/standards2007.pdf>

*NAAB Procedures for Accreditation for Professional Degree Programs in Architecture* (2008). Retrieved May 11, 2008 from [http://www.naab.org/accreditation/2008\\_Procedures.aspx](http://www.naab.org/accreditation/2008_Procedures.aspx)

Table 1

*Middle State Commission on Higher Education Standards for Accreditation*

Institutional Context
Standard 1: Mission and Goals
Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
Standard 3: Institutional Resources
Standard 4: Leadership and Governance
Standard 5: Administration
Standard 6: Integrity
Standard 7: Institutional Assessment
Educational Effectiveness
Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention
Standard 9: Student Support Services
Standard 10: Faculty
Standard 11: Educational Offerings
Standard 12: General Education
Standard 13: Related Educational Activities: <i>(Basic Skills; Certificate Programs; Experiential Learning; Non-Credit Offerings; Branch Campuses, Additional Locations, and Other Instructional Sites; Distance or Distributed Learning; Contractual Relationships and Affiliated Providers)</i>
Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

From "Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Eligibility Requirements and Standards for Accreditation" 2006

Table 2

*The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Accreditation Standards*

Strategic Management Standards
Standard 1: Mission Statement
Standard 2: Mission Appropriateness
Standard 3: Student Mission
Standard 4: Continuous Improvement Objectives
Standard 5: Financial Strategies
Participants Standards
Standard 6: Student Admission
Standard 7: Student Retention
Standard 8: Staff Sufficiency Student Support
Standard 9: Faculty Sufficiency
Standard 10: Faculty Qualifications
Standard 11: Faculty Management and Support
Standard 12: Aggregate Faculty and Staff Educational Responsibility
Standard 13: Individual Faculty Educational Responsibility
Standard 14: Student Educational Responsibility
Assurance of Learning Standards
Standard 15: Management of Curricula
Standard 16: Undergraduate Learning Goals
Standard 17: Undergraduate Educational Level
Standard 18: Master's Level General Management Learning Goals
Standard 19: Specialized Master's Degree Learning Goals
Standard 20. Master's Educational Level
Standard 21: Doctoral Learning Goals

From: AACSB-International Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation (2006)

Table 3

*Commission for Academic Accreditation, Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research,  
United Arab Emirates*

Institutional Licensure Standards and Criteria
1. Mission and Institutional Effectiveness
2. Organization, Governance, and Leadership
3. The Academic Program
4. Faculty and Professional Staff
5. Students
6. Library and Other Information Resources
7. Physical and Technology Resources
8. Fiscal Resources
9. Public Disclosure and Integrity
10. Research

  


---

Academic Program Accreditation – Guidelines for the Program Proposal or Program Self-Study: Addressing the Standards
1. Mission and Institutional Effectiveness
2. Organization, Governance, and Leadership
3. The Academic Program
4. Faculty and Professional Staff
5. Students
6. Library and Other Information Resources
7. Physical and Technology Resources
8. Fiscal Resources
9. Public Disclosure and Integrity
10. Research

Table 4

*The National Architectural Accrediting Board*

---

Thirteen Conditions of Accreditation

3.1 Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

- 3.1.1 Architectural Education and the Academic Context
- 3.1.2 Architectural Education and the Academic Context
- 3.1.3 Architectural Education and Registration
- 3.1.4 Architectural Education and the Profession
- 3.1.5 Architectural Education and Society

3.2 Program Self-Assessment Procedures

3.3 Public Information

3.4 Social Equity

3.5 Studio Culture

3.6 Human Resources

3.7 Human Resource Department

3.8 Physical Resources

3.9 Information Resources

3.10 Financial Resources

3.11 Administrative Structure

3.12 Professional Degrees and Curriculum

3.13 Student Performance Criteria

---

From: NAAB Procedures for Accreditation for Professional Degree Programs in Architecture (2008).

Table 5

*Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology*

General Criteria for Baccalaureate Level Programs
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Students</li><li>2. Program Educational Objectives</li><li>3. Program Outcomes (a-k)</li><li>4. Continuous Improvement</li><li>5. Curriculum</li><li>6. Faculty</li><li>7. Facilities</li><li>8. Support</li><li>9. Program Criteria</li></ol>

From: Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs (2007)