



# ROLE AND FUNCTIONING OF THE EQUIS ACCREDITATION BOARD



The EQUIS Accreditation Board is composed of highly respected individuals with significant experience of management education. It evaluates the Peer Review Reports on institutions that are applying for EQUIS accreditation and based on their recommendations, makes the final decision to confer EQUIS Accreditation upon those management institutions that have demonstrated excellence at an international level.

## 1. Membership

The Accreditation Board should have not less than 12 and not more than 20 members.

Nominations for membership of the Accreditation Board are sought via an annual announcement to the EFMD community and are presented to the EFMD Board for final selection. The EQUIS Director or another member of the Quality Services Leadership may attend the meeting of the EFMD Board as an advisor. Members of the Accreditation Board are appointed by the EFMD Board for a three-year term renewable once. Renewal of membership is determined by common accord within the Accreditation Board.

The Accreditation Board membership consists of the following representation:

- Current or former Deans and Directors of representative management education institutions (8 to 12 members)
- Corporate representatives (4 to 6 members)
- The EFMD President or his representative
- The EQUIS Director or his representative
- An EFMD Board member (ex officio)
- In addition, the EQUIS Committee will designate two voting members for each meeting.

An additional member of the Quality Services Leadership (as appropriate) attends the meetings with a non-voting status.

A Chair of the Accreditation Board is appointed by the EFMD Board for a three-year term, renewable once.

## 2. Role and Responsibilities

- Evaluation of the Peer Review Reports on the institutions that are applying for EQUIS accreditation or re-accreditation.
- Final decision on accreditation or re-accreditation.
- Decision will be either Accreditation for 5 years or for 3 years or Non-Accreditation

## 3. Meetings

- The Accreditation Board meets at least four times a year at the request of the EQUIS Director. Two are face-to-face meetings in Brussels, one of which may be partly held as a joint meeting with the EQUIS Committee. The other meetings are organised as videoconferences. The agenda for each meeting is prepared jointly by the Chair of the Accreditation Board and the EQUIS Director.
- After three consecutive absences, membership will lapse.

#### 4. Voting procedures for accreditation decisions

- The quorum for any decision to be put to the vote is eight.
- The voting procedure is confidential. A simple majority of those present will be required for any decision to be adopted.
- Abstention should only take place very exceptionally and for very strong reasons, usually relating to conflict of interest. It must be remembered that an abstention has the effect of a negative vote. Any member opting for abstention may be requested to explain their reasons for doing so to the remaining members attending.
- When a member is considered to have or declares a conflict of interest for personal or institutional reasons, then their institution will be placed last on the agenda. At the time of discussing this institution, the member will leave the videoconference or the room, and the total number of votes will be reduced accordingly. Where a member has participated in a Peer Review Team (current or previous cycle) whose report is being considered by the Accreditation Board, they should not contribute to the discussion of that case unless they are asked to clarify matters of factual accuracy.
- Where a member of the Accreditation Board has acted as an Advisor who supported a School during the Pre-Eligibility or Pre-Review processes, they should not contribute to the discussion of that case.
- The procedure for the vote on each institution seeking accreditation will be as follows:
  - I. The Chair will begin by opening a discussion about the quality of the institution being assessed, based upon the Peer Review Report.
  - II. The recommendation of the Peer Review Team will be taken as the initial formal proposal. The Chair will then ask whether any member wishes to propose an Amendment. Any Amendment must be formally proposed and seconded before it can be put to the vote. In exceptional cases, a motion to postpone voting may be tabled (usually related to insufficient information for a decision to be reached).
  - III. The Chair will ask for a Yes/No vote on the proposals put forward beginning with the most favourable motion tabled. If a motion fails, the next level down will automatically be voted on. If the required majority supports one of these proposals, it is carried, i.e. agreed, and the remaining proposals are not voted on. If no proposal is supported by the required simple majority, the default outcome is Non-Accreditation.
  - IV. If the result of the vote is for Accreditation of the institution for 3 years, the Accreditation Board must clearly specify the, normally three, Areas of Required Improvement. The Chair will propose the Areas of Required Improvement based on the Peer Review Report and these will be voted on using the Amendment procedures if necessary. The institution will be granted Accreditation for 3 years based on the agreed Areas.
  - V. If the decision is either different from the recommendation of the Peer Review Team or for Non-Accreditation, the Accreditation Board shall agree its reasons for that decision which will be sent in writing to the institution.

#### Notes:

1. As is customary with EFMD Committees, members of the EQUIS Accreditation Board are expected to cover their own costs related to participation in the meetings. Members based outside Europe will have their travel costs reimbursed every third attendance of face-to-face meetings (the general EQUIS guidelines on travel arrangements will apply – see EQUIS Process Manual, section 6, item 2.3).
2. In accepting membership of the EQUIS Accreditation Board, members agree to respect the confidential nature of the work undertaken by the Accreditation Board and of the documents related to this work; they are required to sign a Confidentiality Agreement at the start of their mandate.