

AUDIT OF HANKEN SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Tekijät **Oliver Vettori, Crina Damşa, Hanna Maula, Alexander Myers & Mirella Nordblad. Hanken self-assessment (eds.) Tove Ahlskog-Pursiainen & Katarina Valkama.**

Auditointivuosi **2023**, Karvin julkaisu **19:2023**

Kieli **Englanti**

ISBN **978-952-206-797-5 pdf**

3.3 Functionality and development of the quality system

- Korkeakoulun itsearviointi

The purpose of the quality system is to support the implementation of Hanken's mission, strategy, and action plans building on the principle of continuous improvement. The quality system is a way of describing the management processes and linking strategic goals to concrete actions and their follow-up, supporting the achievement of set objectives by giving input to planning and following up, analysing causal relationships, and evaluating performance. All members of the Hanken community are expected to take responsibility for the quality of their work and be involved in the continuous improvement of operations. The culture at Hanken is influenced by a long tradition of not only internal quality improvement efforts but also external audits.

Hanken aims to be an internationally highly regarded research-driven, stand-alone business school responding to global business and societal challenges innovatively and responsibly. The international accreditations – as part of the quality system – strongly support the objective to be an internationally acknowledged business school and effectively increase the awareness of and focus on the strategy of the university. Hanken's set of internal rules and policies enable faculty and staff to conduct teaching and research as well as administration and services reliably, ethically, efficiently, and with high-quality. The risk-policy document, outlined by the Internal Audit Committee and approved by the board, identifies potential strategic and operational risk categories, and specifies the division of responsibility in risk management. Strategies and goals show the direction and focus areas, and support people in their renewing and developing efforts.

Follow-up and monitoring of indicators are used to ensure the effectiveness and the quality of operations and identify areas of improvement.

Hanken is working to tie the Assurance of Learning (AoL) with the rest of the degree education quality management so that the information that feeds into the planning process is comprehensive and useful for all teachers. Students and external stakeholders are given a systematic role in not only giving feedback through surveys or informal channels, but also to discuss the feedback as well as other insights with the faculty. The Quality handbook promotes the development of the quality culture by helping the Hanken community to grasp the concept of quality assurance and describing the central elements of the organisation and responsibilities. It is revised twice a year to remain up-to-date and the Academic Council is informed about the revisions. Hanken's key support processes are documented in the Integrated Management System (IMS). One of the motives for giving, in connection with an organisational change in 2019, the Academic Council the overall responsibility for coordinating quality assurance regarding education and research was the representativeness of the Council: it serves as a communication channel to all Hanken's subjects, strengthening awareness of and involvement in quality assurance.

Sharing good practices

Sharing good practice has been added as an element of "Act" in Hanken's quality loop a few years ago. Routines of sharing good practices are, however, still not so well developed except when it comes to sharing pedagogical and digital development through the Teaching Lab. The Teaching Lab Information letter, with its Tip of the week, shares good practices in teaching and concrete good advice for the use of functions in various digital systems. The Teacher Mentor programme that was launched in September 2022 after a pilot group shared their experiences during a Peda Café in May, is also a form of sharing best practice. So far 3+3 teachers in the pilot group and 5+5 teachers in the following group have participated in the programme. Peda Cafés or Teach Cafés are arranged around issues of common interest, such as "Best practices in doctoral supervision".

Reaching the highest level of Hanken's Award and incentive pyramid for high-quality teaching, that of the excellent teachers, requires systematic sharing of educational knowledge to improve the quality of teaching in general by

- acting as a teacher mentor, participating in peer-to-peer evaluation, etc.
- having initiated educational seminars, discussions, conferences, research projects, etc.
- having developed teaching materials for common use (e.g. open educational resources).

This is the strongest incentive at Hanken to share one's excellence and good practice.

Thematic days such as the Teaching Day and Research Day include some dissemination of good practices. The Research Information letter shares information on research funding, science communication, Library's resources including journals and databases, Hanken's research database Haris etc. The online course in Research Ethics for PhD students served as inspiration

for the creation of ethics quizzes for the BSc and MSc students. Overall, however, more collaboration between teachers and between subject is desirable to accelerate the dissemination of improvements. An example of an area where a need for more peer support has been identified is in drafting, especially EU, funding applications.

Strengths

Models for sharing good practice in teaching

The Hanken Quality Handbook serves as an introduction to Hanken's organisation, processes and further regulations

Enhancement areas

Collaboration and good practice sharing across subjects and departments

3.3 Functionality and development of the quality system

- Auditointiryhmän arvio

Hanken has a collegiate and well-developed quality culture

Conceptually, Hanken's quality system is oriented at a basic PDCA cycle. At the core of the cycle are Hanken's mission and strategy, which the quality system is intended to support. The system is by far best developed in education, heavily leaning on the Assurance of Learning process. This process also serves as the university's prime example for demonstrating how the quality loop is closed: competence and teaching goals are translated into curricula, teaching formats and assessment, and later assessed based on course-embedded and thesis-based rubrics and artefacts. Various bodies as described above supervise the system and ensure that findings are taken up for further curriculum development. The audit team found no similar loops or the same level of systematism in other areas of operation.

This is not to say that there is no quality system in these other areas. In terms of quality management of research, Hanken has clear principles and policies in place steered by its strategic objectives, which highlight research areas of strength and high potential, ethical and responsible conduct of research, and advancing open science. Research activities are systematically monitored through a research management system, and support structures are in place for research funding and project applications. Hanken also conducts regular research evaluations, the results of which are linked to the research areas of strength policy (see also

Section 2.2 for further discussion on research).

The annual operations planning at the institutional and unit levels, annual dialogues and follow-up of key performance indicators also ensures a relatively systematic process for strategy-linked implementation, follow up and enhancement of education, research, and societal engagement activities. There is still room for clearer goal setting, KPIs and data-driven management as well as further systematisation in the management and quality system processes as discussed elsewhere in this report.

The self-assessment, additional documents and the interviews also brought forward a great number of ad hoc and routine evaluations, and improvement actions that can be traced back to their identification via such evaluations. Overall, with some exceptions, the many anecdotal enhancements appear to be less owed to the effectiveness of a formal system, but rather to the underlying shared values of faculty, staff and students: the audit team saw strong indications of a latent, though potent quality culture, carried by professional, reflective and value driven actors on all levels. The teachers the audit team met were genuinely caring about their students and seemed dedicated to their task, in most cases making the most of their considerable autonomy. Hanken's professional service staff have a good understanding of the realities and needs of their academic colleagues and approach their tasks enthusiastically and with considerable expertise. There is a sense of community and collegiality appreciated by everyone. This includes the impressive array of external stakeholders, albeit rather limited to the world of business, who were particularly positive about their relationships with the institution and who are heavily invested.

On the downside, the quality system thereby has the same "epistemological" limitations as the individual actors carrying the system. The system is very good with regard to first order learning: aiming to identify problems that need fixing and developing ways to fix them. As is the case with such systems, examples of enhancement could be more readily found in the administrative parts of the university. The system in its current status is less effective in supporting second order learning. Means of systematically analysing the university's relevant (operational) environments are comparably underdeveloped and strongly bound to representative systems (boards, advisory groups) and informal exchange (via networks and personal contacts), which makes the system reactive rather than proactive. In simpler words: Whereas the quality system allows the university to mostly identify if things are being done right, there are less possibilities for determining if the institution is doing the right things.

In addition, the audit team saw some indicators of a system where what problems are identified and how they are tackled has been heavily mitigated by the relevance structures of the academic departments or even individual academics. This is not an argument for complete standardisation but ensuring some minimum standards across disciplines will be key for Hanken to live up to its mission on the institutional level.

Developing indicators and processes to assess the effectiveness of the overall system beyond Assurance of Learning and installing regular reflective loops, e.g., by means of a meta or blind-

spot-evaluation, would help the university to overcome some of these issues and further develop and/or integrate existing components. Relatedly, there are some aspects of good practice exchange in place, but the potential for learning from within the institution as much as from outside of it, is far greater than currently realised.

Summing up, the audit team wants to highlight the considerable, collegiate and well-developed quality culture at Hanken, deeply embedded in the different actors' and stakeholders' mindsets and frequently alluded to as the "Hanken spirit".

The audit team identifies the need to further develop the quality system in a direction where it not only helps the university to identify internal shortcomings but supports it in setting priorities and tackling environmental and internal risks and opportunities. Hanken is thus advised to develop instruments and systematic processes for scanning and/or monitoring the institution's operational environment and strategic horizons, and for linking these to the PDCA cycle. Hanken should also devise a mechanism for determining the quality system's effectiveness beyond the regular check-ups via externally driven quality assessments.