



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

University Libraries Faculty & Staff Publications

University Libraries

2021

AACSB accreditation standards: What they mean for business librarians past, present, and future

LuMarie Guth
Western Michigan University, lumarie.guth@wmich.edu

Ilana Stonebraker
Indiana University - Bloomington, is1@iu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/library_pubs

 Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

WMU ScholarWorks Citation

Guth, LuMarie and Stonebraker, Ilana, "AACSB accreditation standards: What they mean for business librarians past, present, and future" (2021). *University Libraries Faculty & Staff Publications*. 49.
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/library_pubs/49

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by
the University Libraries at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has
been accepted for inclusion in University Libraries Faculty
& Staff Publications by an authorized administrator of
ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please
contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



AACSB Accreditation Standards: What They Mean for Business Librarians Past, Present, and Future

LuMarie Guth, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2737-0776>, lumarie.guth@wmich.edu
Western Michigan University

Ilana Stonebraker, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7348-5489>, is1@iu.edu
Indiana University

Abstract:

The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB International), which accredits over 840 business schools globally, released a new business school accreditation standards document in 2020. In this paper, we briefly give a retrospective of library references in the AACSB standards over time and an overview of the development of the new standards. We then analyze sections of the new standards where business librarians can play an important role and outline how business librarians can use them in their collaboration with business faculty by mapping library information literacy to the programmatic goals of business schools.

Keywords: Information Literacy, Business education, Accreditation, Instruction, Business Librarianship

Introduction

AACSB International (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business)

accreditation is widely viewed as the “gold standard” of accreditation for business schools and it has been shown to “improve student preparedness, faculty quality, job placements, and a business school’s internal operations and strategic planning process” (MacKenzie et al., 2019, pg. 1). According to AACSB, business accreditation “signals to the world that an institution has met the most rigorous standards of excellence in business education” (AACSB International, 2020d).

While librarians often cite the AACSB standards and engage or want to engage in accreditation, very little has been written looking at the relationship libraries have had with the AACSB accreditation process over the last twenty years. This paper examines the adoption of the 2020 AACSB Business Accreditation Standards (hereafter the 2020 Standards) from a multiple decade approach, examining how the AACSB Standards have changed its view of librarians and libraries over time.

This paper takes a journalistic approach, relying heavily on “grey literature” such as YouTube videos from livestreamed AACSB conferences discussing the goals of and approaches to AACSB accreditation, listserv discussions between librarians, and the standards documents themselves to draw findings. It is our hope by writing this paper to give librarians a better understanding of what the AACSB Standards have meant to libraries over the past twenty years, and what they might become in the next twenty.

AACSB Accreditation Standards

Our project intention was to engage in the AACSB accreditation process over the course of 2019 and 2020. As of 2020, there are 840 accredited AACSB business schools in 50 countries

AACSB PAST PRESENT AND FUTURE 3

(AACSB International, 2020c). By some accounts, there are roughly 1600 business schools worldwide. Other accrediting bodies include the Council for Business Schools and Programs, International Accreditation Council for Business Education, Association of MBAs, and the European Foundation of Management, all of which are much smaller in terms of number accredited institutions than AACSB (MacKenzie et al., 2019). AACSB does a full retooling of their accreditation standards for business schools roughly every 10 years.

The intention of the 2020 Standards was to “reimagine business education” (AACSB International, 2019a, 0:23). The process for the revision started with the formulation of the Business Accreditation Task Force, or BATF, in August 2018. BATF was composed of a committee of deans of business schools, who adopted an “emissary” model by going out and soliciting feedback (*ibid*). The first exposure draft was pushed out to AACSB members in September 2019 at the Global Accreditation Conference, followed by a 60-day comment period (Bagronoff et al., 2019). The second exposure draft was unveiled at the AACSB Deans Conference in February 2020, with over 700 business school deans in attendance. This draft was open for comment until March with the expectation of a final vote at ICAM (International Conference and Annual Meeting) in April (Bryant, 2020a). However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, ICAM moved online. The final vote was pushed back, with the release of a third draft of the AACSB Standards at the now virtual ICAM. The third draft was ultimately approved via written consent of AACSB institutions on July 28, 2020 (Bryant, 2020b). Schools with visits between July 2021 and June 2023 can choose between the 2013 and 2020 Standards, but schools with visits scheduled after July 2023 are required to adopt the 2020 Standards (AACSB International, 2020e).

Libraries and the AACSB Standards Over Time

In order to understand the context of the 2020 Standards, we will analyze the changes in conceptions of libraries and library services in the 1991, 2003, 2013, and 2020 versions. The 2020 document was obtained from the AACSB website, the 2003 and 2013 documents were obtained from the AACSB website through use of Internet Archive's Wayback Machine, and the 1994 revision of the 1991 version was obtained from the Florida Gulf Coast College of Business website, where it was published in html, through use of Internet Archive's Wayback Machine. We were unable to find a published copy of the original 1991 document. In researching the changes across time, the authors employed a journalistic approach referencing both primary and secondary sources, including emails, workshop presentations, YouTube videos, and worksheets. Research was conducted over the summer of 2019 through summer of 2020 following the real-time adoption process of the 2020 Standards.

Table 1. Historical References to Libraries in the AACSB Standards

Standards Version	Section	Quote
1991 version 1994 revision	Instructional Resources	“Students should have access to and be required to make use of the library and computing facilities. Schools with heavy emphasis on graduate programs or applied and basic scholarship must augment library resources, databases, and information technology appropriately to support those mission elements. When on-campus resources cannot be duplicated reasonably for off-campus programs, comparable access should be provided through inter-library loans, electronic delivery systems, agreements with other libraries, or by other means” (np)
2003 version	Financial Strategies	“A school with only campus-based undergraduate programs would normally be expected to provide sufficient classroom and computing facilities for students, student advising, faculty development including instructional enhancement, library and other information access, technology assistance, and support for faculty intellectual contributions. With the addition of master's level programs would come expectations for applied research

		support. Doctoral education programs would require information and support sufficient for basic research activity” (29)
--	--	---

Prior to the 1991 Standards, AACSB had detailed guidelines on the number of books and journals indexed, based on the *Business Periodicals Index*, libraries of accredited schools needed (Pagell, 2003, p. 23). The 1991 version shifts the emphasis from ownership to access, but maintains the emphasis on collections. It addresses libraries under instructional resources with special attention to facilities, access to adequate collections, and library usage metrics as seen in Table 1 (AACSB, 1994). The authors endeavored to find specific guidance on the procedures for reporting library metrics. Captures of an FAQ section on their accreditation website between 2000 and 2001 address the question, “What measurement processes are used to assess whether library and information resources meet AACSB International accreditation standards?” with the response, “The unit should have a system in place to do this. The peer review team will review the system, its outcomes (including required usage and accessibility to information), and the unit’s assessment of how this supports its mission and leads to overall high quality” (AACSB International, 2001). By 2003, libraries are listed under Standard 5 (Financial Strategies) under the heading “Adequacy for the Array of Programs” as one of several support services. There is again an emphasis on information access. A 2004 Sample Accreditation Plan provided by AACSB includes a table listing the number of titles and volumes of business books and journals by subtopic (management, marketing, etc.) (AACSB International, 2004, p. 23). The 2013 Standard 3 (Financial Strategies and Allocation of Resources) similarly addresses infrastructure and instructional support, but omits the distinct reference to libraries, a stark difference from the earlier standards which were quick prescriptives about collections (AACSB International, 2013, p. 20).

AACSB PAST PRESENT AND FUTURE 6

Table 2. Selected Historical AACSB Standards Curriculum Requirements Applicable to Library Instruction

Standards Version	Student Group	Requirements
1991 version 1994 revision	Undergraduates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written and oral communication (np)
	Masters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial reporting, analysis, and markets (np)
	Doctoral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of advanced research skills for the area of specialization (np)
2003 version	Undergraduates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytic skills Use of information technology Financial theories, analysis, reporting, and markets Statistical data analysis and management science as they support decision making processes throughout an organization Information technologies as they influence the structure and processes of organizations and economies and as they influence the roles and techniques of management (pp. 18-19)
	Masters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial theories, analysis, reporting, and markets Statistical data analysis and management science as they support decision making processes throughout an organization Information technologies as they influence the structure and processes of organizations and economies and as they influence the roles and techniques of management (pp. 18-19) Capacity to critically analyze and question knowledge claims in the specialized discipline (p. 20)
	Doctoral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advanced theoretical or practical research skills in their area of specialization (p. 20)
2013 version	Undergraduates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical thinking (able to analyze and frame problems) Information technology (able to use current technologies in business and management contexts) Financial theories, analysis, reporting, and markets Information technology and statistics/quantitative methods impacts on business practices to include data creation, data sharing, data analytics, data mining, data reporting, and storage between and across organizations including related ethical issues (pp. 30-31)
	Masters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applying specialized knowledge in a global context or

AACSB PAST PRESENT AND FUTURE 7

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conducting high-quality research (p. 31)
	Doctoral	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advanced research skills for the areas of specialization leading to an original substantive research project• Deep knowledge of scholarly literature in areas of specialization or• Understanding the scholarly literature across a range of business and management disciplines (p. 32)

Business librarians also find language relevant to their roles under the sections on curriculum, with focus on writing skills, analytical thinking, decision-making, and research, as seen in Table 2. Detailed outlines of outcomes by student group were removed from the 2020 Standards (AACSB International, 2020f). Some notable changes in the section on curriculum include the expansion of the undergraduate curriculum requirements in 2003 to include analytical skills, previously confined to Masters programs, and the emergence of an emphasis on data in undergraduate programs in 2013 (AACSB, 2003; AACSB International, 2013). The rise of the internet over two decades is reflected in the increasing emphasis on information technology, financial analysis, and data.

White (1999) surveyed librarians at AACSB institutions and found that 71% of librarians in the study felt that library holdings and services were either of somewhat high or very high importance to the accreditation process, 73% were involved in the AACSB accreditation process, and 46% of those that were involved took part in site visits (p. 434-35). However, the removal of language around library collections from the standards starting in 2003 has likewise removed librarians from the accreditation review process as the emphasis shifted to mission-driven learning outcomes (Sullivan, 2003).

The loss of collections language in the document is a loss to librarians who want clear guidelines, however this may have been inevitable with the expansion of AACSB as an

AACSB PAST PRESENT AND FUTURE 8

international accrediting agency. International business schools use different types of resources from the context of their home country and a universal list would not be relevant. In addition to the shifts within AACSB, the change in emphasis from collections to services can also be attributed to changes in librarianship including the serials crisis (Lougee, 2002), automation of collections management (Veaner, 1985), acceptance instruction as part of reference work formulated ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education (Johnson, 2019), among other factors. As mentions of library collections disappeared from the 2003 Standards librarians began looking to the curriculum. Librarians have incorporated AACSB curriculum goals into their instruction (Taylor, 2008; Huber, 2013; Whitesell and Helms, 2013). This shift was accelerated as librarians and libraries were not mentioned at all in the 2013 standards. We tracked this shift in two ways: 1) analysis of BUSLIB-L, a popular and long-running list serv used by business librarians primarily in the United States and Canada, and 2) analysis of subject terms for articles published in the Journal of Business and Finance Librarianship.

Mentions of the strings “AACSB standards” and “AACSB accreditation” in the BUSLIB-L archive show that from 1998 to 2006 there were multiple discussions of library involvement in the accreditation process, including site visits (Bhatt, 2000; Boettcher, 2006; Dimattia, 1998; Hayworth, 2006; Klein, 2001, 2006; Lavin, 1998; Lee, 2006; Radcliff, 2005; Spurling, 1998; Taylor, 2006). The discussion reappears in 2013, the same year explicit mention of librarians and librarianship were omitted entirely from AACSB Standards, with a survey from Ann Fiegen and Charles Allan for a workshop on librarian experiences with the accreditation process (Allan, 2013a; Fiegen, 2013). Although no experiences are shared on the listserv, review of the presentations from the workshop indicates that survey responses focused on how libraries can

support student learning outcomes (Allan, 2013b). Interestingly, the presentation from the AACSB representative at the workshop does not reference libraries but instead includes a general overview of the standards (LeClair, 2013). In 2015 and 2016 there are several emails regarding requests from business schools for reports on faculty research and lists of high quality journals that faculty should publish in for AACSB accreditation (Campbell, 2015; Dennis, 2016; Elebro, 2015; Lowry, 2016).

Table 3. Top 20 Subject Term Mentions

Subject Term Category	1990-1999	2000-2009	2010-2020
Collections	8	5	2
Instruction	1	1	3

We conducted an analysis of the most frequently used subject terms in all Journal of Business and Finance Librarianship citations within the database *Library and Information Science Technology Abstracts* from 1990 to 2020. As noted in Table 3, over this time span collections subjects lost prominence in the top 20 most mentioned terms, and instruction terms rose to the top, dovetailing with the shift from collections to instruction over the same period in the AACSB Standards. Examples of top 20 terms coded under collections are “Databases”, “Websites”, and “Information Resources”. Examples of top 20 terms coded under instruction are “Database Searching”, “Business Education”, and “Information Literacy”. The emergence of instruction as a dominating force in business librarianship can also be seen from the movement of the subject terms “Library Orientation,” “Information Literacy,” and “Curriculum.” Only Library Orientation was present in the 1990s list of terms, ranked at 23rd. In the 2000s, the terms “Information Literacy” and “Curriculum” emerged at 23rd and 59th respectively. Library

AACSB PAST PRESENT AND FUTURE 10

Orientation had dropped to 49th. In the 2010s Information Literacy shot up to 4th, Curriculum stayed relatively stable at 24th, and Library Orientation rose to 42nd.

Looking Forward: Analysis the 2020 Standards

As described in the analysis of the shift of emphasis away from collections towards curriculum of past AACSB standards, business school accreditation has often affected libraries in direct and indirect ways. The rollout of new standards is a good opportunity for libraries to show that they are listening to business school conversations and that they create value using a language that holds power for their stakeholders. Next, we will present our analysis of sections of the 2020 Standards that libraries can incorporate into their services to build value for their business schools. For this analysis we will rely on our six month engagement with the standards, including reading each of the drafts of the 2020 Standards, as well as watching videos and reading other contemporary grey literature.

“Libraries” and “Librarian” have returned to AACSB Standards

After being greatly diminished in 2003 and explicitly omitted in 2013, libraries and librarians returned to the 2020 Standards in two places; first under Standard 2: Physical, Virtual, and Financial Resources:

The school manages its (2.1) physical, (2.2) virtual, and (2.3) financial resources to sustain the school on an ongoing basis and to promote a high-quality environment that fosters success of all participants in support of the school’s mission, strategies, and expected outcomes. Physical resources include buildings, furniture and fixtures, technology labs, collaboration space, libraries (including virtual), and any other physical infrastructure directly used by the school (AACSB International, 2020f, p. 24)

Libraries are also mentioned in Standard 3: Faculty and Professional Staff Resources under the Basis for Judgement for Professional Staff Sufficiency,

Describe the professional staff structure with respect to advising, career placement, IT support, faculty instructional support, library support, and faculty research support.

Identify which resources are centralized and supported at the university level and which are maintained and supported within the school. (AACSB International, 2020f, p. 33)

It is interesting to note that the term “librarian” and “libraries” were missing in Draft 1 and 2 of the 2020 Standards, and added in Draft 3. This was not surprising as Draft 1 and 2 did not mention many academic staff explicitly, neglecting to call out important departments like career services and advising, which also were explicitly called out in Draft 3 (AACSB International, 2020f). The authors do not know the exact reason for the change, but we did request a meeting with the BATF between Draft 2 and 3 to discuss the implications of the 2020 Standards for library services. In addition, we learned that at least one business librarian contributed formal feedback to AACSB, suggesting the adoption of library language.

New Buzzwords: “Learners” “Lifelong Learning” “Societal Impact” “Mission-Driven”

Our analysis found several new “buzzwords” that could be useful concepts for business librarians. We are highlighting these words because we think they will be especially helpful for business librarians when discussing information literacy and collection development with the business school that they support.

“Learners” in the 2020 Standards is the new word for students. “Learners” is mentioned 35 times in the 2020 Standards (AACSB International, 2020f). The rationale for the terminology change is that learners is a more inclusive term and may include people in non-degree or professional programs. As University of Richmond Dean Bagranoff explained at the 2020 AACSB Deans Conference: “We’ve changed our terminology. For instance, students study. Learners learn. We think this is a much more modern and comprehensive approach” (AACSB International, 2020a, 13:10).

AACSB PAST PRESENT AND FUTURE 12

“Societal Impact” is mentioned 47 times in the 2020 Standards. It is in the heading for two of the nine proposed standards and it is also listed as one of the ten guiding principles. Societal Impact is defined by AACSB as “how a school makes a positive impact on the betterment of society, as defined in the school’s mission and strategic plan. Societal impact can be at a local, regional, national or international level” (AACSB International, 2020f, p. 22). In this new set of standards, “societal impact” replaces the concept of “corporate social responsibility” which was in the 2013 Standards but is omitted from the 2020 Standards in favor of this new term (AACSB International, 2013). Societal impact is much larger in both scope and emphasis than corporate social responsibility had been in the previous Standards. Whereas corporate social responsibility in 2013 needed to be demonstrated in the classroom, societal impact includes faculty professional development.

“Lifelong learning” is mentioned twelve times in the 2020 Standards including in this callout in Standard 4.3: “The school promotes a lifelong learning mindset in learners, including creativity, intellectual curiosity, and critical and analytical thinking” (AACSB International, 2020f, pg. 39). This lifelong learning mindset is an excellent avenue for librarians that are interested in discussing information literacy with the business schools that they support. Interestingly, faculty must now also demonstrate a lifelong learning mindset, at least in terms of teaching diverse perspectives in an inclusive environment, as instructed in Standard 7.3 (AACSB International, 2020f, p. 47). Lifelong learning is a concept with which many librarians are familiar. The definition of lifelong learning as “intellectual curiosity” as well as “critical and analytic thinking” is especially ripe for business librarians. “Intellectual curiosity” could be evaluated by showing the robustness of collections. The emphasis on critical and analytical

thinking allows library instruction of research methods and critical evaluation of sources to shine.

Emphasis on Storytelling

The 2020 Standards differentiates itself from previous standards as being “principles-based and outcome-focused”. This approach is described by the BATF presentation at ICAM 2020:

Importantly, these standards move us towards a principles-based and outcome-focused set of standards. That is very different from the standards that we've been using, which are much more focused on inputs and quality of inputs. We will still have some of that, but you'll see a much more principles-based focus in this set of standards.” (AACSB International, 2020b, 05:57).

What does this mean for AACSB schools? One element is the concept that each institution must define success in terms of their mission and strategic plan. ”Mission-driven” is a key buzzword from the document. The focus on mission is not new, but the focus on telling your mission and strategic plan’s story is new. A business school is mission-driven if it is evaluated by peers against its stated mission to determine if its activities are aligned with its stated mission. This allows a wide variety of schools to maintain AACSB accreditation (AACSB International, 2020f, p. 15).

In this way, AACSB can have the flexibility to have general principles of what a business school be but does not have to feel burdened to describe what excellence looks like for every school. The 2020 Standards focuses on having robust strategic planning documents which provide the outline of how the business school should be evaluated. If your institution mentions data literacy or information literacy in their strategic plan, there are accreditation storytelling opportunities. The benchmarking possibilities of this approach are quite exciting. Previous AACSB standards had heavily relied upon tables of prescribed information. Since each institution can make a case that the ways in which they fulfill their mission are consistent with their vision and approach,

there is a new flexibility through storytelling. Here is an example as described by the BATF at the same conference:

There are many ways that your institution might provide societal impact and this part of the standard allows you to tell that story; forgive me for being enthusiastic about these standards but I think this is an exciting thing, for us to be able to look at our programs and see what we're doing. You might be surprised you have more than you thought on this standard (AACSB International, 2020b, 29:09).

This new approach allows the institution to describe what measures they think are important to meeting a specific need.

We consider storytelling a real opportunity for librarians and library services. Libraries are very collaborative and are participants in many strategic objectives of the school. In the previous standards, if a data point was not in the table, it wouldn't be going on the report. Now the focus is on general principles and outcomes, and librarians have the opportunity to control the narrative through telling stories that fit into the mission of the institution. For example, Liu (2020a) mapped information literacy components of Westchester's 2016 AACSB Continuous Review report to course learning outcomes and library interventions, discovering direct possibilities for storytelling. If information literacy is not addressed directly, relevancy can be found in business missions that evoke "evidence-based decision-making" or "data driven decision-making", as well as access to competitive research collections. They could alternatively tell a story incorporating information literacy outcomes using the language in the definition of lifelong learning. A librarian could describe how they work to address social inequalities by seeking out diverse collections, and that story could fit in the societal impact narrative.

The formalization of optional and stackable learning experiences

Something new in the 2020 Standards is the formalization of “stackable” or microlearning processes into the curriculum. Standard 5.3 states “Microlearning credentials that are ‘stackable’ or otherwise able to be combined into an AACSB-accredited degree program should include processes to ensure high quality and continuous improvement” (AACSB International, 2020f, p. 41). This defines badges and certificate programs as in-scope for accreditation, meaning the learning that happens in these programs needs to be assessed like other things in their program.

We consider the formalization of optional and stackable experiences to be good news for librarians, as librarians may find the traditional curriculum limiting in opportunities to address information literacy concepts in-depth. Librarians often offer very popular badges, optional courses, or workshops. Business librarians that are less interested in engaging with the core curriculum due to issues of scale may be more interested in teaching new content for smaller electives.

Parallels between the ACRL Framework and the 2020 Standards

As librarians reading the 2020 Standards, we were very struck by how similar the conversations about the 2020 Standards were to conversations that we saw in librarianship during the development of ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education. The shift in the 2020 Standards to principles parallels the shift in librarianship towards more theoretical threshold concepts. Both documents adopt the more inclusive “learners” term over student or patron. We were also struck by an observation from the chair of the BATF at the AACSB Dean Conference “The minute you show someone a principle, they want to create a rule” (AACSB International, 2020a, 08:54). This reminded us, in a general way, of the efforts librarians have made to make the more principles-based Framework into something more

stringent. For the authors of this paper, this was a reminder that the conflict of structure versus freedom at the heart of many guiding governance documents is not only present in librarianship, but in higher education as a whole.

Implications and Future Work

Traditionally, AACSB as an organization has been a place for business school administrators to talk to each other, but it is increasingly opening up for communities of practice around business education. It is our hope that librarians continue to join in AACSB discussions. One option for librarians to engage would be to attend the AACSB conference, as Annette Buckley of University of California Irvine did at ICAM in 2017. However, AACSB conferences carry much higher price tags than librarian conferences (Buckley, 2017).

A more accessible option would be to join in the online conversation. Any member of an AACSB accredited institution is allowed to make an account on the AACSB community site, the Exchange. In May 2019, Laura Leavitt Walesby from Michigan State University started the “Business Libraries & Research Centers Virtual Community” through ACCSB’s networking website. This group provided a location inside of AACSB where librarians could come together to discuss things like accreditation. During the course of 2020, there were several proactive discussions of the 2020 Standards in this community, particularly involving the importance of libraries being represented. An interesting aspect of having such a conversation on the AACSB’s site was that some business school practitioners also joined the group.

While the revision of the business accreditation Standards happens roughly every ten years, this is by no means the only time that AACSB makes changes to their documentation. The Standards often undergo minor tweaks every two to three years, and the Interpretive Guidance (a longer clarifying document that accompanies the Standards) is updated on an almost yearly basis

AACSB PAST PRESENT AND FUTURE 17

without necessitating a vote from the membership. Librarians can build upon the reintroduction of libraries in the 2020 Standards by further incorporating specific library guidance in the Interpretive Guidance. Many librarians who may be dismayed by the brief mentions of libraries in the Standards will find that many other aspects of the Standards that are similarly cursory are often detailed in the Interpretive Guidance.

One thing that becomes clear about AACSB from this process is that AACSB is very cyclical in terms of its renewal of its Standards. Therefore, we can be fairly confident that Standards will come up for full revision before 2029. It is good to be thinking now of how librarians might respond the next time. Liu (2020b) suggests that “business librarians need more support from professional organizations to advocate their value among business faculty and education leaders through AACSB and its accreditation standards” (p. 2). Professional business librarian organizations including the Business and References Services Section (BRASS) of the American Library Association, SLA Business & Finance, and the Academic Business Library Directors (ABLD) could strategize ways to engage formally, such as by participating in online town halls, monitoring the AACSB blog, watching videos posted by AACSB of conference discussions, and giving feedback during the drafting process. It is especially important to understand that this is a cyclical process, and there is a formal committee charged with just this process. A potential model could be in BRASS, which has in the past charged the Business Reference in Academic Libraries Committee with tracking AACSB accreditation. After several years of limited opportunities for engagement, BRASS assigned the committee to focus on other things. However, with the creation of the Exchange community, the AACSB blog, and the AACSB International YouTube channel, new opportunities for engagement are now available. With renewed attention on lobbying, particularly by groups such as the Capital Area Business

Academic Librarians (CABAL), it may behoove us to play closer attention, particularly as we approach 2029 and the process for revision starts again (Waters & Gass, 2019).

Conclusion

In this paper, we endeavored to give librarians a better understanding of what the AACSB Standards have been to libraries over the past twenty years to help librarians assess what they might become in the next twenty. Over the 1991, 2003, 2013, and 2020 AACSB Standards, the relationship of libraries to business schools evolved from being largely collection-focused, to omission of explicit mention, to supporting faculty research and learner success. During that time, librarianship itself changed dramatically in response to the rise of the digital age and the increasing focus on business information literacy. By examining the AACSB Standards, we found places where librarians could tell their stories, promote lifelong learning, formalize stackable experiences, and make parallels with the ACRL Framework. Where does the future lead? It is hard to tell, but it is clear that business educators and librarians are all going there together, focused on shared goals of learning success, adherence to mission, and societal impact.

References

American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). (1994). Achieving quality and continuous improvement through self-evaluation and peer review: Standards for accreditation business administration (Rev. ed.).

<https://web.archive.org/web/20010104100500/http://www.fgcu.edu/cob/aacsb/stds.htm>

AACSB International. (2001). Frequently asked questions about the accreditation process.

https://web.archive.org/web/20011224053934/http://www.aacsb.edu/Accred/Business/faq_process.htm

AACSB International. (2003). Eligibility procedures and standards for business accreditation.

<https://web.archive.org/web/20030623112555/http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/brc/standards-4-25.pdf>

AACSB International. (2004). Sample accreditation plan.

<https://web.archive.org/web/20040630063334/http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/eligibility/accreditation-plan.DOC>

AACSB International. (2013). Eligibility procedures and accreditation standards for business accreditation.

<https://web.archive.org/web/20140428051825/http://www.aacsb.edu/~media/AACSB/DOCS/Accreditation/Standards/2013-business-standards.ashx>

AACSB International. (2019a, January 14). *AACSB Business Accreditation Task Force: Reimagining business accreditation* [Video]. YouTube.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cOqZKpT738k&t=1s>

AACSB International. (2020a, February 3). *AACSB deans conference: Reimagining accreditation* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qn5L2blTh2Q>

AACSB International. (2020b, April 27). *AACSB accreditation standards: Proposed changes – ICAM 2020* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ofttPiVurfc>

AACSB International. About- AACSB International. (2020c). Retrieved September 15, 2020, from <https://aacsb.edu/about>

AACSB International. Business accreditation. (2020d). Retrieved September 21, 2020, from <https://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/journey/business>

AACSB PAST PRESENT AND FUTURE 20

AACSB International. Business standards. (2020e). Retrieved September 21, 2020, from <https://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards/business>

AACSB International. (2020f). 2020 Guiding principles and standards for business accreditation. <https://www.aacsb.edu/-/media/aacsb/docs/accreditation/business/standards-and-tables/2020%20business%20accreditation%20standards.ashx?la=en&hash=E4B7D8348A6860B3AA9804567F02C68960281DA2>

Allan, C. (2013a, May 7). *Please share your accreditation experiences!* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind1305A&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R2640>

Allan, C. (2013b, June 28). *Sharing effective practices in supporting quality management education and research* [BRASS Preconference]. American Library Association Annual Conference, Chicago, IL, United States.

Bagronoff, N., Bryant, S., & Perry, G. (2019, September 15-17). *Reimaging AACSB business accreditation: Exposure draft #1* [Conference session]. AACSB Global Accreditation Conference, San Antonio, Texas. https://www.aacsb.edu/-/media/aacsb/docs/accreditation/business/standards-and-tables/plenary%20ii_reimagining%20accreditation.ashx?la=en&hash=7FB970AF4874DB926E1312E067413E72CB4E42BE

Bhatt, A. (2000, October 5). *Re: Request for materials – AACSB accreditation* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0010A&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R3753>

Boettcher, J. (2006, August 1). *Re: AACSB Accreditation and business library support* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0608A&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R593>

Buckley, A. (2017). A business librarian's review of the AACSB International Conference and Annual Meeting (ICAM). *Academic BRASS*. 12(2).
http://www.ala.org/rusa/sites/ala.org.rusa/files/content/sections/brass/Publications/Acad_BRASS/2017_fall_buckley.pdf

Bryant, S. (2020a, February 18). Exposure draft 2 of 2020 standards—Finishing strong. *AACSB Blog*. <https://www.aacsb.edu/blog/2020/february/exposure-draft-2-of-2020-standards-finishing-strong>

Bryant, S. (2020b, July 28). The 2020 business accreditation standards are approved!. AACSB Blog. <https://www.aacsb.edu/blog/2020/july/2020-business-accreditation-standards-approved>

Campbell, D.K. (2015, March 27). *Practitioner journals welcoming to faculty authors* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind1503D&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R3601>

Dennis, N. (2016, February 11). *Faculty journal lists for AACSB accreditation* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind1602B&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R946>

Dimattia, S. (1998, March 26). Re: AACSB accreditation [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9803D&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R3024>

Elebro, S. (2015, January 27). *Research evaluation EQUIS/AACSB* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind1501D&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R1293>

Fiegen, A. (2013, April 25). *BRASS/RUSA EMERALD AACSB workshop on business school accreditation at ALA Annual 2013.* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind1304D&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R2089>

Hayworth, G. (2006, August 9). *Summary of responses to questions regarding business school accreditation and the business library* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0608B&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R813>

Huber, R. (2013). Reinventing the library's message through the alignment of research and instruction. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 18(3), 233-250.

Johnson, A. M. (2019). Connections, conversations, and visibility: How the work of academic reference and liaison librarians is evolving. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 58(2), 91-102.

Klein, G. (2001, February 22). *Accreditation guidelines versus standards* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0102D&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R1178>

Klein, G. (2006, August 2). *Re. AACSB Accreditation and business library support* [Electronic

mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0608A&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R844>

Lavin, M.R. (1998, March 26). *Re: AACSB accreditation* [Electronic mailing message].
BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9803D&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R3661>

LeClair, D. (2013, June 28). *Shaping the Future of Management Education: 2013 AACSB Business Accreditation Standards* [BRASS Preconference]. American Library Association Annual Conference, Chicago, IL, United States.

Lee, D.O. (2006, August 3). *Re: AACSB Accreditation and business library support* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0608A&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R1414>

Liu, G. (2020a). Information literacy: Conversations with business faculty. *Academic BRASS*, 15(1).
http://www.ala.org/rusa/sites/ala.org.rusa/files/content/sections/brass/Publications/Acad_BRASS/2020_spring_liu.pdf

Liu, G. (2020b). The future of BRASS. *Academic BRASS*, 15(2).
http://www.ala.org/rusa/sites/ala.org.rusa/files/content/sections/brass/Publications/Acad_BRASS/2020_fall_%20liu.pdf

Lougee, W. P. (2002). *Diffuse Libraries: Emergent Roles for the Research Library in the Digital Age. Perspectives on the Evolving Library*. Council on Library and Information Resources, 1755 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20036.

Lowry, L. (2016, May 27). *Assessing the quality of a journal (AACSB-accreditation)* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind1605D&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R1516>

MacKenzie Jr, W. I., Scherer, R. F., Wilkinson, T. J., & Solomon, N. A. (2019). A systematic review of AACSB International accreditation quality and value research. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 36(1), 1-15.

Pagell, R. (2003). Academic business librarians. In Drake, M. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of library and information science* (2nd ed., Vol.1, pp. 22-34). Marcel Dekker.

Radcliff, S. (2005, April 23). *Re: AACSB accreditation responses* [Electronic mailing message].
BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0504D&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R573>

- Sullivan, P. (2003, May). AACSB – New standards for changing times. *Academic BRASS*, 1(1).
http://www.ala.org/rusa/sites/ala.org.rusa/files/content/sections/brass/Publications/Acad_BRASS/2003_spring_sullivan.pdf
- Spurling, L. (1998, March 26). *Re: AACSB accreditation* [Electronic mailing message].
BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9803D&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R3170>
- Taylor, L. (2006, August 2). *Re: AACSB accreditation and business library support* [Electronic mailing message]. BUSLIB-L. <https://lists.nau.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0608A&L=BUSLIB-L&P=R1086>
- Taylor, L. H. (2008). Information literacy in subject-specific vocabularies: A path to critical thinking. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 15(1-2), 141-158.
- Veaner, A. B. (1985). 1985 to 1995: The Next Decade in Academic Librarianship, Part II. *College & Research Libraries*, 46(4), 295-308.
- Waters, T., & Gass, S. (2019, January 10) *AACSB accreditation & the business librarian* [Presentation]. Capitol Area Business Academic Librarians Meeting. Charlottesville, VA, United States.
- Whitesell, M., & Helms, M. M. (2013). Assessing business students' research skills for the capstone project in the strategic management course. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 18(1), 14-32.