

# QUALITY EVALUATION REPORT

Master of Science in Management

University of Gothenburg

2017

Kajsa Haag

Jonas Gren

Emmy Österberg

Gabriella Olshammar

# Quality evaluation of the MSc in Management (MAN) University of Gothenburg 2016-2017

## Contents

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

# Quality evaluation of the MSc in Management (MAN) University of Gothenburg 2016-2017

## 1. EVALUATION GROUP

*Kajsa Haag*, PhD, Assistant Professor in Business Administration, Programme Director for Master Programmes in Business Administration and General Management, Jönköping International Business School, chairperson of the evaluation group

*Jonas Gren*, PhD in practical philosophy, faculty programme director with a focus on quality issues at the Faculty of Education, University of Gothenburg.

*Emmy Österberg*, student representative, Master of Science in Business Administration - Strategy and Management in International Organizations, Linköping University

*Gabriella Olshammar*, Research Officer, Faculty of Science, University of Gothenburg. Secretary of the evaluation group at the site visit during the interviews.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

The elected programme for evaluation is the Master of Science in Management (MAN) which is an international two-year (120 credits) programme with a major in general management. The Master of Science in Management is delivered by the School of Business, Economics, and Law at the University of Gothenburg. The school is one among very few triple accredited business schools in the world (AACSB, EQUIS and AMBA) which is in itself a sign of high quality education.

The evaluation is based on detailed assessment of documents, meetings among the evaluation team and a site visit held 2017-04-04.

The report is structured around the eight review criteria provided, followed by a summary of the main findings and suggestions for improvements. The eight review criteria are:

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 bases and proven experience.
4. The number of teachers being in proportion to the scope and content of study courses and programmes, said teachers having up-to-date and adequate competence as regards their subjects, higher education pedagogics and subject didactics.
5. Study courses and programmes being relevant to the needs of the students and society.
6. Students having influence in planning, implementing and monitoring study courses and programmes.

7. There being a study and learning environment that is accessible and purpose-oriented for all students.
8. There being continuous monitoring and development of study courses and programmes.

### 3. ACHIEVED STUDY RESULTS MATCHING INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES AND QUALITATIVE TARGETS.

The programme shows high quality in terms of its attractiveness among students and the very high employability of its graduates. Furthermore, the site visit gave a positive view of the engagement from programme management and faculty to ensure a high-quality education for the students. The interviewed students also described the programme in very positive terms, reinforcing and confirming this impression. A few questions arose from our assessment of the provided documents of which some were clarified during the visit and others remain unsolved. In the following we will discuss four issues identified as in further need of clarification and/or development regarding review criteria one:

1. Entry requirements for broad and deep knowledge of management?

The national learning outcomes on “*broad knowledge in the field*” set by the Swedish Higher Education Authority (SHEA, Sv. UKÄ) is challenging for any specialized MSc programme. The programme specific entry requirements do not require any previous courses within the major (management). The background of the students is in practice mainly BSc in Business Administration but it is not a requirement nor true for all programme students. This poses extra challenges to reach both a broad overview of the field as well as deep knowledge of certain areas of the field for students without any bachelor level courses in the major. It also creates big differences in knowledge and understanding within each cohort which was a weakness expressed by the students we met during the site visit. Problems pertaining to this fact are also raised in course evaluations where several students points to problems related to different levels of knowledge within the student group. Concerns are raised in particular to group assignments. We suggest that the programme specific entry requirements are revised to ensure that a broad and deep knowledge and understanding of management can be secured for all programme students. A suggestion is to require a minimum of 60 HEC in business administration or the equivalent and a minimum of 15 HEC in management or the equivalent.

2. Assessment of learning outcomes

The current assurance of learning process and curriculum mapping seem underdeveloped from an external perspective. Two learning outcomes are marked as “not yet assessed” in the material provided to the assessment group. Other links between programme and course level outcomes are hard to understand. Why is for example the programme outcome on methodologies (no. 2) not measured in the methods course? It is furthermore not clear how the 7 programme goals correspond to the 9 national degree goals set by SHEA for a Master of Science (120 credits). The assessment group has performed a mapping of learning outcomes in the (compulsory) courses against the nationally established learning outcomes expected to be met to earn a master degree. We have identified that one of the nationally established goals

are not addressed explicitly by any of the learning outcomes in the courses, i.e. “*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 it seems like the SHEA outcome “*demonstrating the skills required for participation in research and development work or to work independently in other advanced contexts, including in academic research*” is not explicitly captured in the programme outcomes even if it is included in practice through both the *Foundations* course and the *Thesis* course.

We suggest that the curriculum map is revised based on a faculty meeting led by the programme coordinator where it is discussed in which course each programme outcome is best to be measured. An overview is provided in attachment 1. The current course level learning outcomes are good but can be better connected to the programme level learning outcomes (as well as the nationally established outcomes) to improve the understanding of the AOL map. Moving further in that direction can also help spreading the goal fulfilment over more courses and creating assessment tools also for the currently unassessed learning outcomes (no. 3, 4) which we see as a top priority to ensure that study results match intended learning outcomes. Our site visit did indeed give a reassuring impression that national degree goals and programme specific learning goals are in general well met in practice but what we lack is a robust process for measurement and follow up of improvements that is properly documented. And as mentioned above, the outcome on the possibilities and limitation of research and our responsibility in relation to this seems not to be addressed at all.

### 3. Description of programme uniqueness and progression

The core course syllabi list 12-17 (!) programmes that the course can be a part of. This information in the syllabi raised many questions: How is the deep specialization developed under these circumstances? How can the courses build on each other when new students from other programmes also need to be able to follow the course? What is the composition of the class in practice? How many participants? From how many programmes? The course evaluation of Strategy and Organization show 137 participants – is that a quality problem? We were ensured that the programme is kept much more intact in practice while the syllabi is unnecessarily confusing on this point. Of course, the challenge of handling the different levels of knowledge in these heteronomous student groups is a consequence of this practice.

The electronic course evaluations seem not to separate between different master programmes which yields less useful input to specific programme development.

### 4. Revision of documents

Programme Syllabus: Add an introductory section about the aim and philosophy of the programme. This section can communicate what is unique with this programme compared to all other masters in management. We also suggest that the programme syllabus is extended with a section describing the flow of the programme and the role of each course, outlining how the courses are integrated to ensure a relevant overall experience from the perspective of the students. This section can be a new section placed after the overview section or a development of the section called *Core Courses*.

Course syllabi: The syllabi need revision to reduce confusion. The section called “Position in the educational system” should be adjusted so that it describes actual practices. The prerequisites for the core courses should be reassessed, and possibly adjusted, so that the progression throughout the programme is reflected in the syllabi. Progression can be formally signalled by increasing prerequisites between second, third and fourth semester by demanding an increasing number of credits in management on master level as entry requirement to subsequent courses, changing level from A1N to A1F<sup>1</sup>. We furthermore suggest a revision of course learning outcomes to better reflect the programme learning outcomes.

There is a passage, occurring in several syllabi, that puzzles us:

The Graduate School is obliged to offer the exam five times during the course of each two-year period. Students who have made five unsuccessful attempts to pass an exam have lost the possibility of obtaining the Master of Science Degree.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no legal ground for this rule as it is formulated here. There is a possibility to restrict the number of examinations provided to a student in one course. According to The Higher Educational Ordinance, Chapter 6, Section 21, if the number is restricted, the minimum number of examinations that the university must provide is five times:

If a higher education institution limits the number of sessions in which a student may take an examination in order to complete a course or part of a course, the number of sessions laid down shall be at least five. If satisfactory completion of a course or part of a course requires successful completion by the student of a placement or corresponding training, the number of prescribed periods of placement or corresponding training shall be at least two. Ordinance (2006:1053).

This restriction can only be made with reference to the university’s obligation to efficient resource use. Note that this pertains to examinations of a specific course, not to the possibility of obtaining a degree, e.g. a master’s degree. The formulation is certainly a mistake, but it is important that this mistake is corrected because of the syllabus status as a legally binding document. As it stands, students may come to believe that their rights are less extensive than they actually are.

Study guides: Apart from the syllabus, each course has a more extensive course document with detailed information about course activities, readings, and assignments referred to as “Study guide”. These documents are good but can improve on describing the assessment criteria for each part of the examination in all courses. We suggest including the rubrics (grading templates) in the course guideline document to clarify expectations and grading criteria.

---

<sup>1</sup> Level A1N are second cycle courses with only first-cycle course/s as entry requirements. Level A1F are second cycle courses with second-cycle course/s as entry requirements.

#### 4. TEACHING BEING FOCUSED ON STUDENT ACQUISITION OF KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS

Through the conversations during the site visit with management, faculty, students and support staff we got a positive impression about the teaching and learning philosophy of the programme. Students particularly saw the faculty as one of the major strength of the programme for their engagement and commitment towards student learning. We perceive the pedagogical approach to be of high quality, rooted in a Scandinavian tradition of critical reflection, experience based learning and a low power distance between students and professors which encourages the development of the students critical thinking and personal development.

The disposition of the programme, especially the first course with its heavy workload, is supposed to allow all students, including those without prior knowledge in management to acquire sufficient knowledge within the main field of study to meet the standards of a master degree at the end of the programme. There is a conscious ambition to give the students the necessary theoretical foundation needed to cope with the programme's progression, giving them the tools to handle more and more complicated cases and questions throughout. From the point of view of the formal documents, there are however some questions about progression throughout the programme. There are virtually no thresholds between courses, i.e. courses later on in the programme do not require a pass grade on previous courses, as mentioned above. The teachers put a lot of effort in getting the students to understand their own learning and to become engaged in their own progression. The programme coordinators are aware of there being some issues regarding the way in which the prerequisites of the courses within the programme are construed and this question will be addressed. The first course of the programme, "Foundations" introduces central concepts and tools that are used throughout all of the following courses including the degree project. The course is difficult for everyone, but once the students have passed it they are, according to the teachers, well prepared for the rest of the programme. The goal is that the students shall be able to independently analyse and have insight in the current research frontier.

Students are continuously trained in presentation techniques. Teachers emphasise an analytical approach. The relationship between breadth and depth seems to be adequately handled, although the balance seems to lean rather towards theoretical depth. The programme is analytically heavy, but this is partly compensated by the use of empirical case studies in teaching and in the students' own work.

The teachers have collectively reviewed the progression through the different courses of the programme and the teachers work with the same type of rubrics in order to increase familiarity and comparability.

The teachers stress that writing the degree project in pairs greatly enhances the quality of the work as well as student learning. Even if this in some ways makes it difficult to determine exactly each student's achievement, and the consequent risk of free-riding, the pedagogical benefits outweigh the costs and the students are obliged to account for who made what in the degree project. Throughout the degree project course there are seminars with oppositions and feedback that, according to the teachers, is an extra check that everybody partakes in the work.

## 5. THE CONTENT AND FORM OF TEACHING RESTING ON GOOD SCIENTIFIC AND/OR ARTISTIC BASES AND PROVEN EXPERIENCE.

Our overall view of the programme content and form is that it shows an impressive theoretical depth with excellent connection to current research. At a closer look, it becomes evident that this programme has a much sharper focus other than the mainstream management programme it is described as on the website and in other types of market communications. This focus on a collection of highly relevant theories, interpretative methodologies and qualitative methods is a strength that provides theoretical and analytical depth. The focus does at the moment however lead to a slight unbalance between theory and practice where the connection to research is excellent and the first-hand experience of business practice can be improved. The students get a good insight into practice through course activities making use of the faculty's own empirical material and through guest lecturers and case studies. What can be improved is rather to develop the input from practice into deeper first-hand interaction with practice. There are already some good examples of this such as the strategy labs in the "Strategy and Organization" course but also room for improvement in this regard. In the following, we shortly review each core course of the programme:

### ***Foundations in Management 15 credits***

This course provides a solid theoretical foundation in management and insights to current management research. Reading list shows good mix of classics with current research yet within a specific focus area of management.

The course prepares the students for higher academic enquiry, academic writing and analysis.

The readings and activities are very advanced; resembles a doctoral course (praxeology, becoming ontology, practice philosophy, Wittgensteinian critique of Bourdieu etc. etc.). Considering the course evaluation, this highly demanding course is very well received which is a clear sign of good teaching.

We wonder about the name "foundations" on a master level course. The course content is certainly advanced but the name sounds more fitting for a basic first cycle course. A suggestion for a new name of the course would be *Contemporary Management Studies*. That would also better mirror the selection of theoretical perspectives.

This course (as most of the courses in the programme) has few learning outcomes (2). We suggest adding an initial learning outcome regarding learning of theories in management that more clearly corresponds to the first programme learning outcome. For example: 1. Describe the theoretical foundations of management studies

There could be a risk of overlapping with the research methods course (scientifically analysing field material etc.). This is rather a strength as long as the two courses are closely coordinated.

### ***Managing Markets 7.5 credits***

This course is replacing Consumptions and Markets.

We have only had access to the syllabus and no other documents.

Judging from the sparse information provided, this course seems to address important macro level aspects to the programme yet bridging the micro and macro through practice oriented theories.

The topic of consumption in society (if kept in the new course) could be explicitly linked to sustainability to help strengthen that aspect of the programme.

### ***Strategy and Organization 7.5 credits***

The course takes a Scandinavian perspective on strategy work that is interesting and progressive. It helps to build uniqueness to the programme.

The “strategy labs” are good examples of ensuring a balance between theory and practice.

We wonder if there are problems with conducting an advanced strategy course when the prerequisites do not demand any previous strategy classes.

The corporate connection can be further developed by inviting company representatives to the final presentation or add the task of having the student groups also present at the companies and providing an executive summary.

We suggest giving this course the responsibility for at least one of the two unassessed programme goals. It has all the required components already. To clarify this, the course ILO’s could be rephrased to better show the connection to programme goal 3 and/or 4.

The course evaluation shows 137 participants. This is surprising and need to change in order to implement the suggestions above (unless the programme goals in question also fit for the other programmes).

### ***Corporate Governance and Financial Structure 7.5 credits***

This course provides an important compliment to the other courses by adding finance to the curricula.

The learning outcomes seem relevant and the outline appropriate. The course appears primarily literature based with little input from the corporate world which can be fine if the programme has a good overall balance in that regard.

One question is how well this course can cater to the needs of the MAN programme students at the same time as it is possibly open for 11 other programmes, among them the MSc in Finance?

The results of the course evaluation is quite low; what is the analysis of that and what actions will be taken to improve? The information in the course evaluation does not give much feedback and does not specify which of the students are from the MAN programme. We suggest that more information is gathered to get to grips with the situation.

### ***Change Management 7.5 credits***

This course adds the inevitable management of change to the curriculum. It is structured around four modules that all seem relevant. It includes culture, leadership, technology and practical insights through corporate guests (Volvo, Astra Zeneca).

In particular, the course does fruitfully combine theoretical depth with practical relevance. This was especially appreciated by the students according to the course evaluation.

The MAN programme students have now taken the *Foundations in Management* course and the *Strategy and Organization* course which should enable a good opportunity for progression. How is that progression ensured? Or is that opportunity hampered when the course is open to other programmes?

### ***Research Methods in Management 7.5 credits***

This course provides the students with deep knowledge about various methodological approaches to management studies and skills to use relevant methods for qualitative inquiries. Quantitative methods are also touched upon in the survey module but to a much lesser extent. This is appropriate since it matches the perspective taken in the management courses (practice theory, institutional theory, markets as socially constructed etc.). The focus on composing a coherent research proposal and conducting proper literature reviews are particularly important preparations for high quality master thesis to follow.

The course received a positive evaluation from the students. From the course evaluation, it however became apparent that the course also can be studied as a distance course (for those students that are on exchange). It was not well received by those students and it seems like the course was not properly designed to work as a distance course. If the course must be available as a distance course, development for distance learning is needed.

The ILO's of this course seem to make it ideal to measure the programme goal on methodologies (#2). We suggest doing so.

### ***Preparing for Leadership 7.5 credits***

This course prepares students for future leadership positions.

Very good to explicate the ethical and moral perspective (ILO 2).

Very good to include development of their own leadership abilities and their personal perspective (ILO 3). We suggest this to be mapped towards the programme goal about their *ability to reflect on own learning process and leadership roles and identify their need for further knowledge.*

From the schedule and course evaluation we learned that the course also had guest lectures by leaders from industry. First-hand experience of practice is very important for a course that strives to prepare students for managerial roles. We suggest expanding on the practical components and to include them in the syllabus.

We wonder why an elective course is stated as prerequisites (*Management and Leadership* or the equivalent)? We suggest changing that to minimum x credits of master level courses in management from the core courses (or equivalent) to signal the progression between the first and second year.

### ***Master Degree Project 30 credits***

The programme ends with a traditional master thesis.

The 8 master thesis provided for inspection are all of high quality, also those that were given the grade Pass (without distinction).

It is a very good intention to invite members of the business community to the presentations.

How is the thesis course evaluated? The electronic course evaluations seem not to separate between different master programmes which makes the results less useful to programme specific development.

## **6. THE NUMBER OF TEACHERS BEING IN PROPORTION TO THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF STUDY COURSES AND PROGRAMMES, SAID TEACHERS HAVING UP-TO-DATE AND ADEQUATE COMPETENCE AS REGARDS THEIR SUBJECTS, HIGHER EDUCATION PEDAGOGICS AND SUBJECT DIDACTICS.**

The faculty involved in the programme are academically qualified teachers with a strong research orientation. Based on the site visit and course evaluations, teachers definitely show up-to-date and adequate competences.

At campus, there is also an organized function that provide teachers and students with courses in generic skills. In the interviews, it was pointed out that tutor courses is something that needs further development. Teachers have recurring so-called “master group meetings” where attendance is good. These meetings create a strong feeling of ownership of the programme among teachers.

According to university policy teachers should have the equivalent of 15 HEC in the subject area of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. According to the compilation provided it seems that not all of the teachers meet this criterion. The compilation includes 15 teachers of whom 6 meet the criterion and the rest either do not meet the criterion, or it is unclear if they meet it or not. It is not clear if this is due to lack of correct documentation or if it is an actual shortcoming. Programme coordinators and head of graduate school are advised to look in to this question to determine whether the criterion is met. Teachers listed in the compilation are generally highly academically qualified and most of them are associate or full professors.

## **7. STUDY COURSES AND PROGRAMMES BEING RELEVANT TO THE NEEDS OF THE STUDENTS AND SOCIETY.**

Programme coordinators and head of graduate school stress the importance of a close connection to the surrounding society. To achieve this, guest lecturers and empirical case-studies are used as pedagogical tools. A large proportion of the students, 80%, get employments in relevant sectors after graduation. The business community is interested in the programme's students with their analytical ability. In each course, business contacts are introduced through contact with companies even if it does not include internships. Students can also build business contacts as they write their essays. Almost everybody conducts interviews at different companies.

One important task of a business school is to provide society with capable and responsible managers. This management programme constitutes a good example of training its students in analytical thinking and reflective practice. The programme certainly provides a very good preparation for doctoral studies. Further development of the student's practical management skills would further improve their preparation for managerial roles.

An area of improvement is to enhance, systematize and explicate the corporate interaction and first-hand experience of actual practice throughout the programme. There are good examples but compared to the excellence of the theoretical depth there is still room for improvement of corporate interaction.

A "self leadership coaching" is mentioned. What is that and why is it not described in the programme syllabus? Is it mandatory for all programme students? If so, include it in the programme syllabus.

One step to strengthen the practical relevance is to further develop the descriptions of the programme in that regard. Describe the programme philosophy in the programme syllabus so as to convey the thoughts on the balance of theoretical depth and practical relevance throughout the programme. Clarify how you work to bridge the dichotomy of theory and practice through the theories and approaches carefully selected (practice theory, institutional work, inductive research etc.).

## **8. STUDENTS HAVING INFLUENCE IN PLANNING, IMPLEMENTING AND MONITORING STUDY COURSES AND PROGRAMMES.**

Results from course evaluations are systematically collected and are made accessible to students and students to be. At the site visit the assessment group was informed that there is plans for further development to include a report based on the results of the evaluations, by the teachers responsible for the course, where suggestions on course improvements are being listed and prioritised. The assessor group thinks that this is a very good idea, the reasons being better continuity over time due to better documentation and the fact that students can be expected to be more engaged in answering course evaluation forms if measures taken as a consequence of such evaluations are clearly documented and monitored. There is a "Programme Advisory Committee" (PAC) for the programme where the students are represented and where these reports can be discussed and analysed. PAC meetings are held

two times a year and there are minutes taken from the meetings. This is an important place for enabling student to influence the development of programme and the PAC should also be a place where upcoming suggested revisions of the syllabi can be discussed.

#### **9. THERE BEING A STUDY AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT THAT IS ACCESSIBLE AND PURPOSE-ORIENTED FOR ALL STUDENTS.**

There are no indications of there being an unsatisfactory student environment. According to the students there are sometimes a shortage of study places, but this is not considered a big problem. Determining the degree to which the programme meets this criterion is rather difficult given the form of assessment, particularly due to the kind of material (interviews and the available documentation) that were available.

The programme structure has a weakness in the placement of the elective courses that does not facilitate the students' possibility to study abroad and enhance their international learning experience. Students that wish to go abroad for a full semester (apparently less than 20% for the moment) must take the methods course as a distance course, which is not working well according to students and support staff.

The teachers comment in the interview that there is an acknowledged risk in this practice that students taking the method course as a distance learning course does not get the same amount of experience from common discussions on method and theory at seminars. Hence, they are encouraged to write the degree project with a fellow student who attended the course on campus in order to compensate for this. Although this seems to be a practical solution, and with the current disposition of the programme, perhaps a necessary solution, the assessment group concludes that this is not an entirely optimal situation.

#### **10. THERE BEING CONTINUOUS MONITORING AND DEVELOPMENT OF STUDY COURSES AND PROGRAMMES.**

The School of Business, Economics and Law is working with an ambitious project called the "Data project" where different data concerning students, e.g. retention, grades and degrees are systematically collected with the aim of understanding and improving on student performances and goal fulfilment.

There is continuous development of courses and of the programme syllabus. There is however a possibility of giving the monitoring process a more structured and systematic design. The assessment group suggests that a praxis of writing an annual programme report can be implemented. In this way, the programmes strengths and weaknesses can be documented and tracked over time. The report can include suggested modifications of the programme due to identified areas of improvement. This also gives the programme a documented structured history which is useful for future monitoring and follow-up of the development of the programme. A programme advisory board can play an important part in working with these reports and the development of the programme that they suggest.

As mentioned, there is a problem that the response rate in course- and programme evaluations are low. A further issue is that the evaluations does not separate MAN-students from other students in a way that makes it possible to draw conclusions about how these particular students evaluates the course. It is important to know how these students perceive the course as a course within their particular programme.

In the interview the programme coordinators and head of graduate school states that they are considering having the teachers responsible for courses within the programme write a short course report after every completed course. The assessor group strongly support that idea for much of the same reasons as for the programme report. The assessment group recommends that the possibility of having a programme advisory board with representatives from different users and industry is considered.

## 11. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

The Master of Science in Management is delivered by the School of Business, Economics and Law at the University of Gothenburg. The business school is one among very few triple accredited business schools in the world which suggests that the programme is of highest quality but also that we should evaluate it with the highest expectations. According to our overall opinion, the programme is of high quality. Theoretical depth, connection to research and pedagogy seem particularly well developed. Student satisfaction is high, in particular regarding the engagement and competence of faculty.

In relation to the 8 assessment criteria provided, the programme seems to meet criteria 2-7 to a satisfactory degree. As for criteria 1 and 8 (although relatively well met), it is the opinion of the assessment group that the suggested developments (or the equivalent) accounted for above in relation to these criteria ought to be implemented in order for the programme to meet the criteria to a satisfactory degree.

In addition to this, we have identified four areas where we see further potential for improvement:

### *Assurance of Learning process*

The current assurance of learning process seems underdeveloped. The programme probably fulfils the learning outcomes in practice but can improve the process for how to systematically measure all programme outcomes and capture the process with proper documentation. We suggest starting from a revision of the curriculum mapping through a joint faculty effort. The current course level learning outcomes are good but can be better connected to the programme level learning goals to improve the understanding of the AOL map.

Secure broad and deep knowledge in the field of management by adding programme specific entry requirements on courses within the major (management).

Progression can be formally signalled by increasing prerequisites between second, third and fourth semester by demanding an increasing number of credits in management on master level as entry requirement to the subsequent courses (from A1N to A1F).

### ***International outlook***

The majority of the programme students are Swedish, did their bachelor at University of Gothenburg and carry on with a career in Sweden. This necessitates working actively to provide an international learning experience for all students of the programme through international content and context.

Only 20 % of the students currently go on international exchange studies. We would like to see this opportunity utilized to a much larger extent. We therefore suggest changing the programme structure so that the elective courses are gathered in one full semester instead of being spread over two semesters. This can be achieved by making the entire third semester elective and place *Preparing for Leadership* and *Research Methods* in the spring of the first year, period 3+4.

### ***Ethics, Responsibility and Sustainability (ERS)***

Improve the knowledge and skills related to ERS topics for all students of the programme.

One suggestion along this line would be to turn the elective course in *Business Ethics and Sustainability* into a core course. If so, one could make it mandatory for students going on international exchange to select minimum 7.5 credit in ERS-topics at the partner university to compensate.

We would also like to see you strengthen and explicate the existing components on ERS-issues in current core courses. For example, by adding such learning outcomes when suitable. A good example of this is ILO 2 in the Corporate Governance course and ILO 2 in the Preparing for Leadership course explicitly including an ethical perspective. At the moment, ethics is quite well covered and formally assessed but room for improvements remain regarding responsibility and sustainability that is not systematically treated and followed up.

We suggest that it is decided on a programme level (through faculty dialogues) how and where to deepen the students' knowledge of ERS-topics and formalize this through course activities, course literature and learning goals specified in the relevant course syllabi.

### ***Corporate Connections***

How is the relevance for practice ensured?

The programme content takes advanced perspectives on management and ensures a deep theoretical understanding. This should make students well prepared for an academic career continuing with doctoral studies. Are they equally well prepared for managerial positions in the business community?

We suggest creating an advisory board of corporate contacts representing current or aspired employers of the graduates. The business practitioners can give input on how to equip the students with the knowledge and skills desired from the perspective of the employers. Their wishes must of course be balanced with the academic expectations on a MSc degree but will contribute a valuable perspective to the curriculum development process.

How much are the students experiencing real practice? Some examples are mentioned in the material like the guest lectures turned into live cases in the Change Management course but the on-site exposure seem modest. It is common through the thesis work but not obligatory for all students.

We suggest that an internship course can be offered as elective where students are placed at relevant organizations for qualified work tasks and write a report about their experience (granting them academic credits).

## Appendix

### Program: External evaluation of MSc in Management 2017

Committee:	Kajsa Haag	PhD, Senior lecturer, Program Director at Jönköping International Business School
	Jonas Gren	PhD, Program Director, Faculty of Education at University of Gothenburg
	Emmy Österberg	Student, MSc in Business Administration – Strategy and Management in International Organisations at Linköping University
Secretary:	Gabriella Olshammar	PhD, Research officer at the Faculty Office of Science at University of Gothenburg

#### April 3

Prior 16:00	Check-in hotel			Flora
16:00	Pre-meeting external evaluation team	Carina Gråbacke Lena Viding	Welcome	CIP-room
18:00	Dinner external evaluation team			Swea Hof

#### April 4

08:30-09:30	Program coordinators and head of Graduate School	Petra Adolfsson Elena Raviola Roger Schweizer	Ass. Professor, Senior lecturer, Program coordinator Ass. Professor, Senior lecturer, Deputy Program coordinator Ass. Professor, Senior lecturer, Head of Graduate School	CIP-room
09:45-11:15	Teachers of the program	Andreas Diedrich Fredrik Lavén Conny Overland Kajsa Lindberg or Lars Walter	Ass. Professor, Senior lecturer PhD, Senior lecturer PhD, Senior lecturer Ass. Professor, Senior lecturer	CIP-room
11:30-12:30	Student representatives	Veronica Jansson Marieke Mey Lina Parling Felix Werner	Student, Semester 2 Student, Semester 4 Student, Semester 4 Student, Semester 2	CIP-room
12:30-13:30	Lunch with School representatives	Ola Bergström Kristina Jonäll	Professor, Management & Organisation PhD, Senior lecturer, Deputy Head of the Department of Business Administration	Dean's office
13:45-14:45	Staff members of Graduate School	Linda Knape Marcus Lange Anna Elgersson Ellen Morris Karin Storm	Administrative coordinator Exchange Study Student Counsellor Student Counsellor Administrative Coordinator	CIP-room
14:45-16:15	The external evaluation team meeting on their own			CIP-room
16:15-17:00	Meeting with and feedback to the management of the School and GS	Jan Marton Roger Schweizer Petra Adolfsson Elena Raviola Carina Gråbacke	Vice Dean	CIP-room