



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, ECONOMICS AND LAW

Action Plan Regarding Quality Evaluation of the MSc Programme in Management (MAN), University of Gothenburg 2016–2017

Preface

In 2016–2017, the MSc programme in Management (MAN) was evaluated in an external quality evaluation pilot project initiated by the University of Gothenburg as part of the quality improvement work of the organization.

The external evaluation committee consisted of:

Kajsa Haag, PhD, senior lecturer, programme director at Jönköping International Business School

Jonas Gren, PhD, programme director, Faculty of Education at the University of Gothenburg

Emmy Österberg, student, MSc in Business Administration – Strategy and Management in International Organisations at Linköping University

Gabriella Olshammar PhD, research officer at the Faculty Office of Science at the University of Gothenburg, acted as secretary.

Based on the quality evaluation report provided by the committee (spring 2017), this action plan report is written by the former and present coordinators of the programme, Petra Adolfsson and Elena Raviola.

/Petra Adolfsson and Elena Raviola
26 September 2017

Criteria and the evaluation process

The quality evaluation of the MSc programme in management (MAN) was based on document reviews and a site visit on 4 April 2017. The quality evaluation report is structured around the following eight review criteria provided by the University of Gothenburg:

1. Achieved study results matching intended learning outcomes and qualitative targets.
2. Teaching being focused on student acquisition of knowledge/skills.
3. The content and form of teaching resting on good scientific and/or artistic basis and proven experience.
4. The number of teachers proportional to the scope and content of courses and study programmes; teachers having up-to-date and adequate competence as regards their subjects, teaching and learning in higher education and subject didactics.
5. Study courses and programmes being relevant to the needs of the students and society.
6. Students having influence in the planning, implementing and monitoring of courses and study programmes.
7. Presence of a study and learning environment that is accessible to and purpose-oriented for all students.
8. Presence of continuous monitoring and development of courses and study programmes.

This action plan is based on the critique and suggestions for improvements described in the quality evaluation report.

How the programme meets the criteria and suggestions for improvements

In relation to the eight assessment criteria provided by the University of Gothenburg, the committee concludes that the programme appears to meet criteria 2–7 to a satisfactory degree. Criteria 1 and 8 are relatively well met according to the assessment group, but further developments are suggested in relation to these criteria in order for the programme to meet them to a satisfactory degree.

Below is a short list of these suggested developments related to criteria 1 and 8 as well as the general areas stated by the committee as potential areas of improvements. To some extent, the areas of improvements are interrelated and/or overlapping. In the appendix, an action plan is presented in relation to these suggestions for improvement. The areas of improvements marked grey in the table in the appendix are changes that we identify as must-do actions.

Short list of suggested improvements:

Criterion 1 – four areas of improvements have been identified by the committee: entry requirements, assessment of learning outcomes, description of programme uniqueness and progression, and revision of documents.

Criterion 8 – the continuous development of courses and of the programme syllabus can be improved by giving the monitoring process a more structured and systematic design. A suggestion is to introduce the writing of an annual programme report (strengths and weaknesses being documented and tracked over time).

Four general areas of potential improvements: assurance of learning, international outlook, ethics, responsibility and sustainability and corporate connections.

Progress review of action plan

The issues related to criteria 1 and 8, marked grey in the appendix, will be followed up on programme meetings in spring or autumn 2018 to ensure that necessary actions have been taken. At these meetings (PAC), students, the programme coordinator and the Graduate School are represented. These are the issues in the action plan that we find most important to follow up on in order to ensure good quality and to be well prepared for future evaluations of the programme.

The rest of the issues listed in the action plan will also be followed up on at PAC meetings no later than in spring 2018. To some extent, these issues are dependent on the overall strategy of the Graduate School and how the programme fits into its programme portfolio. Thus, these issues will be evaluated. However, changes might not be relevant or possible at programme level.

In general, the External Evaluation Committee finds the programme to be of good quality. However, the documentation of activities, such as initiated improvements, needs to be improved. The documentation provided to the committee largely reflected the status of the School in 2015/2016. Therefore, some courses have already undergone changes in terms of content and/or teaching activities, and additionally, improvements of the programme that are in line with the action plan have been initiated.

APPENDIX Action plan: Area of improvements

Area of improvement	Suggestion by the committee	Action plan	Actors involved	Time frame/progress review
Criterion 1 – Entry requirements (too broad)	Change requirement to a minimum of 60 credits in business administration or equivalent and a minimum of 15 credits in management or equivalent.	Dialogue on the uniqueness of the programme and the intended target group of the programme in general	Graduate School and programme coordinator	2017/2018 (and as part of the continuous improvement activities of the programme).
Criterion 1 – Assessment of learning outcomes (national goals)	Two nationally established goals not covered well enough in courses: ‘The student shall demonstrate insight into the possibilities and limitations of research, its role in society and the responsibility of the individual for how it is used’, and ‘[demonstrate] the skills required for participation in research and development work or to work independently in other advanced contexts, including in academic research’.	Assessment of learning outcomes at course level in order to ensure that nationally established goals are covered not only in practice but also in documents. Changes of learning outcomes/documents.	Programme coordinator and course coordinator	2017/2018 Review of actions at programme meeting (PAC) spring 2018.
Criterion 1 – Assessment of learning outcomes (AOL)	Unassessed learning outcomes (3, 4 in AOL plan) must be assessed.	Assessments at course level have been made and reported to the Graduate School according to the GS AOL plan. An improved follow-up documentation tool has been discussed (coordinators, teachers and Graduate School).	Programme coordinator and course coordinators	2017/2018 Review at programme meeting (PAC) spring 2018 of whether the programme continues its AOL work according to plan.
Criterion 1 – Programme uniqueness and progression - description	Revision of documents (syllabus is unnecessarily confusing).	Revision of documents.	Programme coordinator and Graduate School	2017/2018
Criterion 1 – Programme uniqueness and progression - evaluation	Electronic course evaluations seem not to separate between different Master’s programmes, which yields less useful input to specific programme development.	Evaluate the possibility of having programme-specific evaluation of courses. Dialogue about the use of electronic evaluations.	Programme coordinator and Graduate School	2017/2018
Criterion 1 – Revision of documents – programme syllabus	Add aim and philosophy/ uniqueness.	Evaluate the possibility of changing syllabus and/or change other communication material (e.g., websites).	Programme coordinator and Graduate School	2017/2018
Criterion 1 – Revision of documents – course syllabi	The syllabi need revision to reduce confusion, e.g., section titled ‘Position in the educational system’.	Ongoing work at GS to change texts on position in the education system and number of examinations.	Graduate School	2017/2018
Criterion 1 – Revision of	Can improve the description of the assessment criteria for each	Evaluate how assessment criteria and	Programme coordinator and	2017/2018

documents – Study guides	part of the examinations e.g. by including the assignment rubrics.	rubrics can be presented in a clear and informative way.	course coordinators	
Criterion 8 – monitoring process	The continuous development of courses and of the programme syllabus can be improved by giving the monitoring process a more structured and systematic design. A suggestion is to implement an annual programme report (strengths and weaknesses being documented and tracked over time).	Evaluate the documentation routine for programme meetings and other activities connected to the programme. New types of programme documentation will be implemented by GS (programme report).	Graduate school and programme coordinator	2017/2018 Review of actions at programme meeting (PAC) autumn 2018.
Assurance of Learning process – a general area of improvement	Improve the process for how to systematically measure all programme outcomes and properly document the process.	AOL review of activities initiated by the Graduate School and continuous monitoring of course learning outcomes. Improved documentation of various meetings. Better documentation of changes made to courses etc. is also under evaluation.	Programme coordinator and course coordinators	2017/2018
Assurance of learning process – a general area of improvement	Entry requirements can be more specific in the field of management.	A dialogue with the Graduate School will be initiated in order to evaluate the potential positive/negative effects of such actions. This issue requires a dialogue with the Graduate School and the departments since the target group of the programme would change.	Programme coordinator and Graduate School	2017/2018
Assurance of Learning process – a general area of improvement	Progression can be formally implemented by increasing prerequisites between second, third and fourth semester by demanding an increasing number of credits in management at Master's level as entry requirement for subsequent courses.	A dialogue with the Graduate School will be initiated in order to evaluate the potential positive and negative effects of such actions.	Programme coordinator and Graduate School	2017/2018
International outlook – a general area of improvement	As majority of the programme students are Swedish and only 20 % currently go on international exchanges, the international approach can be improved (e.g. make the third semester elective and place Autumn core courses the second year in the Spring of the first year, period 3+4).	A dialogue with the Graduate School is needed for these issues since e.g. international exchange and elective courses are connected to agreements and decisions that influence other programmes as well.	Programme coordinator and Graduate School.	2017/2018
Ethics,	Sustainability needs to be	Sustainability will be in	Programme	2017/2018

Responsibility and Sustainability – a general area of improvement	systematically treated and followed up (e.g. turn the elective course in Business Ethics and Sustainability into a core course).	focus next year. The Graduate School has an ongoing project related to sustainability in the courses in general.	coordinator, course coordinators and Graduate School	
Corporate Connections – a general area of improvement	Creating an advisory board of corporate contacts representing current or potential employers of graduates.	The Graduate School has initiated a project related to corporate connections. Work has been initiated by coordinators and the goal is to have an advisory board in place in 2018.	Programme coordinator	2017/2018