

Utbildningsutvärdering med extern bedömning
vid Göteborgs universitet

Bedömarutlåtande för utbildning på grund- och avancerad nivå vid Handelshögskolan

Huvudområdena företagsekonomi, nationalekonomi, statistik, ekonomisk geografi, ekonomisk historia och kulturgeografi inklusive programutbildningar

2022-05-24



CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REVIEW PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT - 2020

FOR BUSINESS ACCREDITATION

The AACSB International Peer Review Team has completed its review for:

Organization: School of Business, Economics, and Law, University of Gothenburg

Business School Name:

Box 600

Gothenburg, 405 30

Sweden

Business Degree Level(s) Offered: Undergraduate, Masters, Doctoral

Date of visit: 2022-02-27 to 2022-03-02

I: Peer Review Team Recommendation

The peer review team recommends **Extension of Accreditation** of the degree programs included in the scope of accreditation offered by School of Business, Economics, and Law, University of Gothenburg. This recommendation reflects the opinion of the peer review team only and will be reviewed by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee during the next scheduled meeting on 2022-03-30. The primary role of the Continuous Improvement Review Committee is to ensure consistent application of the AACSB International accreditation standards and processes across peer review teams.

Concurrence by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee and ratification by the Board of Directors are required prior to the confirmation of the accreditation extension. Following ratification by the Board of Directors, the Official Representative of the school will be notified initially via email and subsequently by letter from AACSB. The applicant must wait until the Board of Directors ratifies the recommendation before making any public announcement.

Within ten days following the visit, the team provides the peer review team report to the school and the Continuous Improvement Review Committee Chair. Prior to issuing the final report to the school and the Continuous Improvement Review Committee, the school should be provided a review of the report in order to offer any clarifying comments and corrections related to factual information noted in the report. The school may also submit a response to the Continuous Improvement Review Committee (circ@aacsb.edu) within ten business days of receipt of the final peer review team report.

II: Accreditation Standards Issues

1. Identified by the prior Peer Review Team

I: Peer Review Team Recommendation

The peer review team recommends Extension of Accreditation of the degree programs included in the scope of accreditation offered by School of Business, Economics, and Law, University of Gothenburg. This recommendation reflects the opinion of the peer review team only and will be reviewed by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee during the next scheduled meeting on 2022-03-30. The primary role of the Continuous Improvement

Review Committee is to ensure consistent application of the AACSB International accreditation standards and processes across peer review teams.

Concurrence by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee and ratification by the Board of Directors are required prior to the confirmation of the accreditation extension. Following ratification by the Board of Directors, the Official Representative of the school will be notified initially via email and subsequently by letter from AACSB. The applicant must wait until the Board of Directors ratifies the recommendation before making any public announcement.

Within ten days following the visit, the team provides the peer review team report to the school and the Continuous Improvement Review Committee Chair. Prior to issuing the final report to the school and the Continuous Improvement Review Committee, the school should be provided a review of the report in order to offer any clarifying comments and corrections related to factual information noted in the report.

The school may also submit a response to the Continuous Improvement Review Committee (circ@aacsb.edu)

within ten business days of receipt of the final peer review team report.

II: Accreditation Standards Issues

1. Identified by the prior Peer Review Team

Concern 1: Strategy development and implementation [2013 standard 1, 2020 standard 1]

The previous PRT noted that 'The School has relatively recently set out on a multi-year, socially inclusive journey to transform itself from a predominantly teaching school to a research-intensive school, thus strengthening its position as one of the prominent schools in Scandinavia. The School may want to consider developing for its Strategic Plan 2017-2021 a more pronounced and daring strategy, with a stronger narrative around its strategic ambitions to inspire and rally relevant stakeholders. In addition, the School could develop a set of smart key performance indicators that are followed up and acted upon.

The School has responded vigorously and positively to these observations, crafting, in an inclusive manner, a strategy for 2017-21 and subsequently refining this further, with an even higher level of ambition to guide activities and investment from 2022-26. Both the initial and the updated strategies have strong narratives around stakeholder inclusion, the relationship between Research and Education, driving independent thinking and, the integration of sustainability.

Concern 2: Explicit definition of intellectual contributions objectives [2013 standard 2, 2020 standard 8]

The previous report states that School should more explicitly define its Intellectual Contributions (IC) objectives.

The current PRT finds this has been carried out efficiently and effectively, with a clear enhancement in the standard required for SA. This has been applied for the current accreditation continuous review with good effect and it is clear that Faculty understand the new levels.

Concern 3: Faculty recruitment and promotion [2013 standard 6, 2020 standard 3]

Previously, it was recorded that 'As the School is now in transition from a teaching business school to a research business school, it should develop clear quality enhancing criteria for faculty recruitment and promotion at the departmental level, following the corresponding criteria that have been adopted at School level. Furthermore, it should explicitly incorporate and communicate these IC criteria for tenure and promotion decisions.

The school has adopted the use of the Academic Journal Guide in defining the levels required for ICs in order to promote faculty, which is in line with the Norwegian Register. The specification is alongside the more demanding requirements for Faculty to achieve the status of Scholarly Academic (SA). Whilst this is good progress, it is evident from the written documents guiding promotion that there is a variation across departments, echoed by the comments of faculty in the peer review meeting.

The School has an increased focus on research excellence measured rather classically as AJG level 3 or higher and/or according to the "Norwegian system", thus allowing for a broad range of publication traditions across the School. The impact of research is measured through Google Scholar citations. A focus on other measures of impact (such as SCOPUS) could be considered by the School, however this PRT finds that the clear focus on excellence has supported a transition from a teaching to a research business school. While the School has adopted clear standards of classical research excellence, it is less clear how these standards support the new strategy's ambition to strengthen the link between research and teaching and to improve societal engagement.

Concern 4: Assurance of-Learning [2013 standard 8, 2020 standard 5]

The previous PRV produced the view that the principles of Assurance of Learning (AoL) had been embraced by both the senior leadership team and the faculty, and that the loop had been fully closed for the first set of outcomes. The PRT required, however, that the School must also close the loop for the Assurance of Learning processes for the learning outcomes associated with the local AoL for all degree programmes.

The AoL framework of the School has clearly improved since the previous visit. In the ongoing, third AoL cycle, the School has expanded to include all disciplines, except law. The School has clarified that students who are awarded degrees based on single-subject courses are included in the AoL cycle. In addition, the AoL process has been expanded to include all nine competencies of the Swedish Higher Education Ordinance (SHEO) and there is a feedback loop that ensures that if the learning goal is not met in 90% of the cases, the School will take appropriate remedial action. There is a particular focus on assessing competencies related to the School's mission: "to develop knowledge, educate, and foster independent thinking for a sustainable world". While this PRT found that it is clear that there is a high focus on assessing independent thinking, especially through competencies 3 and 4 of the SHEO (knowledge creation/integration and analysis, and problem solving, respectively), it was less clear that sustainability is always assessed. In principle, the School bases its assessment of sustainability on competencies 7 and 8 of the SHEO (application of relevant disciplinary, social and ethical issues, as well as "responsible use of knowledge"). In conversation with teaching staff and programme directors, this PRT found that in some programmes, sustainability was to be tested in the thesis but that it was not clear that all theses would be expected to include sustainability as learning goals, nor would it always be assessed. This PRT invites the School to clarify the communication around this mission-critical learning and/or make sure that the loop is closed as regards ethics and sustainability as an issue to attend to before the next CIR (see below).

2. Identified by this Peer Review Team that Must Be Addressed Prior to the Next Peer Review Team Visit.

2. Identified by this Peer Review Team that Must Be Addressed Prior to the Next Peer Review Team Visit.

The PRT considers that the progress of the School has been notable and that there is a clear understanding across the School, its leadership, as well as that of the leadership of the University, of the next steps in the evolution of the School. Therefore, the clear majority of recommendations this team is making are under the section on consultative feedback. One area that is required is clarification of the communication around the mission-critical learning and/or make sure that the loop is closed as regards ethics and sustainability.

III: Peer Review Team Observations and Feedback that Form the Basis for Judgment for the Recommendation

III: Peer Review Team Observations and Feedback that Form the Basis for Judgment for the Recommendation

1. Strategic Management and Innovation:

- a. Describe the mission and strategic planning process utilized by the school, and plans in place to mitigate risks identified by the school;
- b. Describe the financial strategies, financial model, sustainability and alignment with the school's mission and strategic goals;
- c. Explain how the faculty and staff are supported and set up for success in their positions;
- d. Address whether the school has adequate participating faculty to support the mission of the school;
- e. Address the appropriateness of the school's definitions for participating and supporting faculty;
- f. In instances where recommended faculty sufficiency and qualification ratios are not met, the peer review team should address whether the school is producing high-quality outcomes for these programs to support this faculty staffing model (e.g. student learning outcomes, placement, employer satisfaction, etc.);
- g. Address the appropriateness and consistency of the school's faculty qualification criteria.

Overall, is the school aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 1-3?

1. Strategic Management and Innovation:

Mission and strategic planning process of the school.

The School's mission "to develop knowledge, educate, and foster independent thinking for a sustainable world" is driving the School and is recognizable for its stakeholders. The degree programmes, the collaborative research projects, the network of international partnerships, and its engagement with societal stakeholders (private and public) are shaping its operations. The School's updated vision "to be an excellent and progressive academic institution in a global context" seems to be guiding many, but perhaps not all, internal stakeholders. The vision begs the question as to what "progressive" entails for the School and how this is balanced against the standards of excellence.

The School has revised its existing strategy with five strategic focus areas: quality in research and education; integration of sustainability in education; strengthening of the link between research and education; strengthening societal engagement, and increased internationalization. Various initiatives support this strategy such as the start of an English- language bachelor in business and economics to attract more foreign students, strengthening the organizational support of the global network for Environment for Development, improved relations with external funders, and large investments in new teaching facilities. The PRT commends the School for a clear strategy. However, in addition to the KPI's mentioned in the strategy document, the PRT would invite the School to articulate 'what success looks like' in terms of a) an clear picture of what the School looks like at the end of the strategy period in 2026, b) a discussion of the hard choices to be made between possibly conflicting goals (e.g. societal relevance/engagement versus research excellence as classically defined) and c) how the strategy is an answer to the three challenges identified in the CIR: strengthening the reputation outside Sweden; ensuring external funding for research, and maintaining societal relevance in research and education.

Financial strategies, financial model, sustainability and alignment with the school's mission and strategic goals

The School has a healthy budget and there have been adjustments to ensure that surplus build up has been put to appropriate use. Whilst there is no need for the School to produce surpluses, the recent decrease in expenditures, due to the effects of the Corona pandemic, have resulted in lower expenditure plans for the ensuing years. The School acknowledges that the levels of expenditure required in relation to international activities in the future are as yet unspecified and will also be tempered by the key ambitions in the field of sustainability where there will be carbon reduction targets.

The School has built its faculty complement well in the last 5 years, however, the percolation of a stated need for new colleagues to an actual opening of a position and the beginning of a recruitment process could be more clearly laid out, as, for example, in budgeting rounds or within the annual planning process. Our discussions with some faculty leaders and faculty themselves did not reveal a focus on the 'size and shape' of the school in the future, with respect to the academic disciplinary footprint of the School. In order for the School to continue its development, specification of such 'workforce planning' and the necessary investment would be helpful.

Similarly, investment in technology, and the associated locus – and therefore level - of decision-making warrants more specific attention. The School's faculty have clearly made great efforts with technological delivery of programs, evident in the documentation, faculty and student meetings and there is undoubted learning that can be exploited to identify where investment can improve future delivery of education and learning at the School.

Finally, the PRT noted that a new building is underway which will increase the quantity and quality of space for researchers, educators and students alike. As is often the case with building projects, there can be unforeseen delays which require a risk assessment covering the nature of the risk (financial, reputational), the mitigations and the revised risk levels if mitigations are required.

Faculty and Staff Support

Three sets of factors are considered with respect to how faculty and staff are prepared for success in their roles. First, in relation to promotion, faculty benefit from documents describing the levels for assistant, associate and full professors, as well as lecturers and assistant lecturers. There is a comprehensive document which gives an overview of the appointment and promotion regulations at the School of Business, Economics and Law', dated April 2018. In addition, there are more detailed criteria for promotion specified at the Department level. The School wide promotion criteria remain very wide. For example, for progression from

Lecturer to Senior Lecturer's required research expertise states: 'The most fundamental eligibility requirement is that the applicant must hold a PhD or equivalent competence. For the 'equivalent competence' requirement to be fulfilled, research expertise must have been demonstrated through research of high quality published in articles, book chapters and/or monographs. The research results must be adequately published, primarily in peer-reviewed journals of relevance in the respective field or by publishers recognised for their publishing of high-quality works.' In addition, the process of evaluation is mapped out and factors beyond research are included, for example, documented active participation in the academic community, demonstrated ability to interact and constructively collaborate with other researchers, completion of courses in teaching, documented extensive experience of high-quality teaching'. The PRT considers this document to be a valuable base upon which to build in the key strategic issues for the school as documented in their strategy 2022-26, and beyond, in order to emphasise and harmonize for all colleagues, in a transparent way, the criteria of importance in considering their academic progression.'

The second is the array of support mechanisms for faculty, including the varying proportions of time allocated to early career faculty to allow them to be established, a departmental support scheme of 25kSEK per calendar year, assigned mentors and access to international visiting professors as well as informal mentoring and support. That said, there is uneven provision due to the delegated nature of the School. In order to bring faculty together in the pursuit of its strategic research objectives, particularly large, inter-disciplinary grant capture, a more harmonised suite of targeted support measures across the school, could be of great value, not only in setting expectation about the nature of research activity that will be encouraged (and therefore supported) but also in ensuring a more equitable distribution of research support to enable more achievement to be focused on the School's priorities across all departments and units. Such an approach could be extremely useful if extended to establish a common project management approach to grant capture, supporting faculty with identification of opportunity, ideation, the actual application and proposal stages as well as administration as and when proposals are successful.

The support staff includes 120 individuals in 2021. These are employed both at school and/or department level. In general, administrative staff may be employed at three levels: the university level, the school level, and the departmental level, since delegation of authority is distributed across all three. Coordination and sharing of information are achieved through networks across the school or across the university. The school has a well-structured organisation of professional staff that sufficiently can support education and students throughout their studies. Research support is mainly done at the level of the department, although support for EU funding is found at the level of the university. It is not clear that the distributed structure chosen for research support is supportive of the strategic ambition to maintain and grow externally funded research, and, as noted above, the establishment of a project management support function at school level could be of particular value in this context.

Overall, the school aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 1-3

2. Learner Success:

- a. Describe how curriculum is current, relevant, forward-looking, globally oriented, aligned with program competency goals and consistent with the school's mission, strategies, and expected outcomes;
- b. Describe how the curriculum content cultivates agility with current and emerging technologies;
- c. Describe how the technology embedded within the curriculum is sufficient to prepare learners for work-preparedness expectations in their field of study;
- d. Address whether the school has a systematic process, appropriate to their cultural context and school's mission, in place for assessing student learning. Provide an overview of learner outcomes that demonstrate success. Describe how the curriculum demonstrates continuous improvement;
- e. Describe how the school demonstrates overall learner success, including adequacy of degree progression;
- f. Summarize how the school supports quality teaching and assesses the impact of teaching on learner success.
- g. Summarize the business school's executive education portfolio including the faculty who are involved, and how it is linked to the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. Describe how the school ensures the quality of executive education and summarize any continuous improvements made as a result of feedback

received.

Overall, is the school aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 4-7?

2. Learner Success:

Currency, relevance, forward and global orientation of the curriculum.

The PRT reviewed the portfolio of programs, the content of modules and assessment and found appropriate variety expected in a contemporary, internationally focused business school. There is a clear hierarchy of learning in the Bachelor programme, building from the base disciplines in business of accounting, economics, finance, management and marketing. International business modules are spread across the program, with topics such as ethics and sustainability finding increasing presence in the third and fourth years of study. The Master's portfolio is equally varied and balanced, with general masters such as Management, Economics, Finance, as well as more specialist options such as Entrepreneurship, Logistics and Transport, and Marketing and Consumption.

The EMBA exhibits a good variety of subjects expected of an Executive Masters with areas that are also distinctive, such as IT Governance, Commercial Law, and Intellectual Property Management.

Across the portfolio, there is evidence of inclusion of digitalisation of subjects in both the pedagogical and workplace contexts, such that graduates will be familiar with common digital operations as well as those and the related skills in each disciplinary area.

The PRT noted that compared to the previous review in 2016, progress has been made in aligning AoL alongside existing Swedish quality assurance procedures. The School has a clear annual cycle that starts with AoL meetings in May/June, proceed to follow-up meetings with faculty in the autumn, discuss changes to curriculum or programs in the Program Advisory Committees with student representation and with the Corporate Advisory Boards. The School convincingly demonstrated how the feedback loop is closed through a well-organized process (Y1 and Y3 AoL cycles).

Overall learner success and adequacy of degree progression;

Learning competencies and learning objectives are established in a Matrix that link a number of competencies modelled on the Swedish Higher Education Ordinance with student learning outcomes. At the programme level, some of these outcomes are assessed at the course level while others – such as ethics and sustainability – will often be assessed through the thesis. It was not always clear to the PRT that all competencies in the Matrix would be systematically assessed at either the course or the program/thesis level and the School is invited to clarify this in the AoL process going forward. It is clear that there is progression in the competencies at the master level compare with the bachelor level.

Quality teaching and assessment of the impact of teaching on learner success.

The PRT observes that student's opinion on teaching quality varies. However, the school has a rigorous quality assurance system for education in order to detect any discrepancies.

The School assesses teaching quality mainly in terms of course feedback, the response rate varying quite a bit (from less than 40% to over 80%). The faculty and staff had taken/considered several measures to improve response rates where needed. Learner success is also evaluated in broader terms by the well-developed AoL-system. The faculty members are keen on listening and discussing the feedback, but it appears there is some variation. Most interviewed students indicated that sessions were arranged where feedback was discussed, and those had been very fruitful. In addition, on some courses previous feedback had been introduced; how the course had been developed based on student feedback. Some students though indicated that, for example, questions regarding exam results were not answered, so getting feedback in that sense was not always found working.

The School supports high quality teaching in several ways ranging from peer discussions/support to on-line teaching support to pedagogical studies by the University. In meetings with the faculty members, it was told that the majority of teachers has taken offered (basic) pedagogical courses. It appears though that there are no

explicit requirements for how many credits, for instance, teaching faculty should take pedagogical studies, and whether taking also advanced courses in addition to the 1-3 mentioned courses is recommended. The feedback from students was two-fold: while some students really applauded for great enthusiasm and good pedagogical skills of teachers, some gave examples of teaching that appeared quite the contrary. One noteworthy practice to improve quality is following the idea of teacher teams, where quality development takes place naturally by peer review and support.

Regarding generic learning goals/program level competencies, the School does good work in ensuring that the students will grow to be responsible and independent/analytical/critical thinkers, although this is not an easy and clear-cut task.

Given the variation in feedback, the PRT observed that perhaps the strong departmental structure may be suboptimal in creating a school wide esprit de corps and higher levels of collaboration across departments, in terms of teaching norms and expectations

Executive Education has distinctive management and governance, with a dedicated managing director offering open and in-company programmes and a newly acquired centre for intellectual property, which is a subscription/partnership model offering access to knowledge and advice as well as priority places on executive programmes. Degree programs such as the Executive MBA are run out of the School when it comes to content and quality assurance while GU Executive Education is responsible for marketing and recruitment of students. Faculty at the School may get remunerated for Exec Ed activities through extra salary (up to 20 per cent) or reduced teaching. However, GU EE may also recruit from other schools which has happened in the past. The PRT also commended the Partnership Programme of collaboration with leading organisations.

Overall, the School is aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 4-7.

3. Thought Leadership, Engagement, and Societal Impact:

- a. Describe the quality and demonstrated impact of the faculty intellectual portfolio and alignment with the school's mission, and how the school supports faculty in the production of high-quality scholarship;
- b. Provide exemplars of the school's research that have made a positive impact on society;
- c. Describe other school-supported activities that demonstrate a positive societal impact.

Overall, is the school aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 8-9?

3. Thought Leadership, Engagement, and Societal Impact:

As an increasingly research-led and professionally focused school promoting collaboration and inter-disciplinarity by both its new and its previous strategy, the School has a strong research and teaching culture, a good support infrastructure and a majority of research-active faculty. This setting has enabled the School to deliver more than 3,000 Intellectual Contributions in the last five years, 40 per cent of which stem from Business Administration, with the rest roughly evenly spread across Economics, Economy and Society, and Law. About 40 per cent of the intellectual contributions take the shape of peer reviewed journal articles, while 35 percent are other peer- or editorial-reviewed intellectual contributions.

The School's efforts since the last peer review in increasing the focus on high quality publication has paid off, not only in terms of the presence of articles by faculty in high quality journals across the salient disciplines but also in the tracking of citations. The publications in journals with CABS 3 and 4 levels have increased by 60% and the citations have increased by 38% over the same period. The School supports faculty in a large variety of ways described above including the generous time allocation to early career faculty for research, departmental support schemes, assigned mentors and access to international visiting professors as well as informal mentoring and support.

The improvement in thought leadership and academic impact was specifically pursued and is in addition to the strong tradition in the School for engagement and focus on societal impact that is associated with the School's initiation in 1923. Good examples of the way in which the work impacts on society can be found in the "Partnership Programme" - a joint and structured approach to collaborate with industry which now includes 25 partner companies. The purpose of the programme is to create a reciprocally-valuable exchange between

companies and the School, regulated by a three-year agreement on two levels, Senior Partnerships and Associate Partnerships. One high profile example is that of Volvo, where the relationship involves School's researchers and various employees within VCG, providing multiple opportunities for students to write essays, take part in guest lectures and work with cases in the programmes. The Partnership Programme offers continuing professional development for employees, a career service, which allows companies to experience the students and soon to be graduates to ensure they recruit graduates with a strong fit; exposure via the School's signposting, and documentation.

In addition, there is the 'Executive Faculty' programme at the School, which includes Executive coaching.

In terms of the impact beyond commercial and academic realms and into wider society, the School has undertaken a mapping exercise which has details of how research touches each of the UN SDGs. It is noteworthy that there is broad coverage by research and impactful activities on all the goals.

Table 9.1 also gives ample evidence of how the 'societal impact strategy' speaks to the 'wicked problems' such as environmental degradation, migratory flows, social exclusion, ageing populations, political and financial volatility, and so on. Multiple examples are given including (but not limited to): presentations at Ministry of Finance, giving new insights among national policy makers that guide decisions on public health policy; a report on valuation of pharmaceuticals and development of a model for valuing Advanced Therapy Medicinal Products (ATMPs) that contributed to improving decision making at the authority; the Dental and Pharmaceutical Benefits Agency; transdisciplinary research funded by the Swedish Energy Agency that has contributed to better understanding of how to structure and organize the installation of solar energy systems; 7 reports to the governmental delegation investigating conditions for older workers; options for more age-inclusive employments and counteracting age discrimination, and research on railbound traffic and regional enlargement, providing increased knowledge for public transportation planning in the region of Västra Götaland.

Overall, the school is aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 8-9.

4. Other noteworthy high-quality outcomes consistent with the school's mission and strategies not included elsewhere in this report.

4. Other noteworthy high-quality outcomes consistent with the school's mission and strategies not included elsewhere in this report.

Of particular note, also cited above is the Environment for Development (EfD), a global network of more than 230 environmental economics research centres hosted by leading local academic research institutions in 13 countries across the Global South: Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, and Vietnam. The network's coordination hub is located at the School, with financial support provided by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), International Research Development Centre, IDRC in Canada, and others. Areas where the network has had notable impact on the Global South include: pioneering the use of 'green nudging' methods to encourage people in a developing world context to adopt pro-environmental behavior in the interest of the common good (South Africa); collaborative work the Chilean Ministry of the Environment to design a wood stove replacement program; the decision by the Global Plastic Action Partnership to use an EfD report (Framework for selecting and designing policies to reduce marine plastic pollution in developing countries) as a roadmap for policy design, in a pilot project with three countries; and, researchers with EfD's Sustainable Energy Transitions Initiative (SETI) have carried out an extensive review of research literature on energy transitions, evaluating nearly 80,000 academic articles related to the social dimensions of energy and development. These are just some of the examples of impact coming from the EfD.

IV: Commendations and Best Practices

Describe any noteworthy best practices or initiatives in which the school engages.

V: Consultative Feedback

V: Consultative Feedback

As consultative feedback, the PRT wants to highlight a few aspects that would benefit the School if addressed:

1. While the AoL framework has clearly improved since the previous visit and did, as noted in the consideration of the prior PRT's concern 4, make sufficient progress, there is still a need for strengthening the framework for

assessment of competencies such as ethics or sustainability, as indicated in section II.2, above. Alternatively, there would be great value in focusing on clear communication of how these issues (central to the vision and mission of the school) are addressed in the educational outcomes of the school, such that students, teachers and assessors know how this assurance of learning should be carried out.

2. Ensure that the HR policies related to recognition and reward of academic performance (for recruitment and promotion) are aligned with the emphasis on societal impact. In particular, it would seem that some departments emphasize traditional scholarly excellence (as e.g. measured by AJG journal publication) which could come into conflict with societal engagement unless such academic activities are also recognized and rewarded. This would also be in line with the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (<https://sfdora.org/>)

3. The PRT further paid attention to certain issues that may be subject to strengthening and systematization with School level actions; to create more coherent guidelines and practices. The discussions with faculty members and students revealed that there is variation between the Departments and disciplines in certain noteworthy respects. First, while most faculty members praised the mentoring and other personnel support practices, it also appeared that further development and systematization of these practices may be needed to secure equal support especially for junior faculty across departments and disciplines. Second, although there are general guidelines for collection of student feedback, there was variation in how the feedback was communicated to the students, i.e. what impact had it had. The PRT found some exemplary practices in this regard that could be utilized broadly at the School as benchmarks of best practices (for example, open discussions between the students and teachers after the course on the feedback and its implications). The PRT also paid attention to the course offering and requirements for teaching faculty regarding pedagogical thinking and skills. The University offers a set of university pedagogy studies for all faculty members and also a commendable amount of peer discussion and mentoring takes place. However, the current requirements for taking offered studies appeared to be more like recommendations and a considerable proportion of teaching faculty has not taken any courses on pedagogy. The School might want to consider developing more systematic requirements in this regard in the future. This idea is further supported by some observations during the visit indicating a variation in the quality of pedagogic skills across the School, as well as, again, lack of consistency in expectation and experience across departments and disciplines.

4. Finally, and as noted previously, the PRT considers that the new building underway will increase the quantity and quality of space for researchers, educators and students alike. That said, as is often the case with building projects, there can be unforeseen delays which require a risk assessment covering the nature of the risk (financial, reputational), the mitigations and the revised risk levels if mitigations are required.

VI: Visit Summary

The peer review team (see below) want to thank Dean Per Cramer and his team for a well-prepared virtual visit, in terms of the documentation, the online resources and the culture of open participation and collaboration they experienced in the interactions with faculty, staff and students throughout the duration of the visit. The collegial (but none the less rigorous) approach was exemplary, characterised by discursive, mutually respectful and lively sessions that allowed the PRT to form an extremely positive view of the strategy and operations of the School and yet offer (we hope) insights on areas for future development.

Date of visit
2022-02-27 to 2022-03-02

Peer Review Team Members
Susan Hart, Chair. Dean, Durham University
Markus Granlund, Member, Dean, University of Turku
Peter Møllgaard, Member, Dean, Maastricht University
Emma Nordberg, Member, Vice President of the JIBS Student Association (JSA), Jönköping International Business School, Jönköping University

VI: Visit Summary

Date of visit

2022-02-27 to 2022-03-02

Peer Review Team Members

Susan Hart, Chair
Dean
Durham University

Markus Granlund, Member
Dean
University of Turku

Peter Møllgaard, Member
Dean
Maastricht University

Emma Nordberg, Member
Vice President of the JIBS Student Association (JSA)
Jönköping International Business School, Jönköping University

Comparison Groups

Comparable Peers - School of Business, Economics, and Law, University of Gothenburg

- Aalto University
- Aarhus University, Aarhus BSS
- Copenhagen Business School
- Lund University
- Maastricht University
- Queen's University
- Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam
- Simon Fraser University
- Singapore Management University
- University of St. Gallen

Competitors - School of Business, Economics, and Law, University of Gothenburg

- Lund University

Aspirants - School of Business, Economics, and Law, University of Gothenburg

- Copenhagen Business School
- The University of Manchester
- University of California, Berkeley
- University of St. Gallen

Included in Scope Programs

Education Level - Degree Title - Major Emphasis

- Doctoral - Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) - Business Administration
- Doctoral - Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) - Economic History
- Doctoral - Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) - Economics
- Doctoral - Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) - Environmental Economics
- Doctoral - Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) - Human Geography
- Doctoral - Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) - Innovation, Entrepreneurship, and Management of Intellectual Assets
- Doctoral - Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) - International Business/Economic Geography
- Masters-Generalist (EMBA) - Executive MBA - N/A
- Masters-Specialist - Master of Science (MS) - Accounting and Financial Management
- Masters-Specialist - Master of Science (MS) - Economics
- Masters-Specialist - Master of Science (MS) - Finance
- Masters-Specialist - Master of Science (MS) - Innovation and Industrial Management
- Masters-Specialist - Master of Science (MS) - International Business and Trade
- Masters-Specialist - Master of Science (MS) - Knowledge-based Entrepreneurship
- Masters-Specialist - Master of Science (MS) - Logistics and Transport Management

- Masters-Specialist - Master of Science (MS) - Management
- Masters-Specialist - Master of Science (MS) - Marketing and Consumption
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Business and Economics
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Economic History and Human Geography
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Environmental Social Science
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Logistics Management

Excluded from Scope Programs

None submitted.

Additional information the team received outside of the Continuous Improvement Review Report that would benefit the committee in their review process.

No files were found.