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The Higher Education Evaluation Committee’s decision

The University of Helsinki passed the audit 26 January 2022.

The Quality Label is valid until 26 January 2028.

The audit team’s evaluation of the evaluation areas I-III

I: HEI creates competence: good level

II: HEI promotes impact and renewal: good level

III: HEI enhances quality and well-being: good level
HEI as a learning organisation – evaluation area chosen by the University of Helsinki

The concept of international master’s programmes

Theme and partner for benchmarking

Theme: Staff and student well-being

Partner: University of Edinburgh

Key strengths and recommendations

**Strengths**

- The progressive integration of the quality and management systems, serving both the faculty and unit levels and the administrative units.
- The planning of education is a consistent and transparent process.
- The development of the university’s international degree programmes has been based on a bottom-up approach and the natural development in many disciplines.
- Clear importance is attached at the university to the mission of societal engagement and impact, with good structures in place to steer the activities related to that mission.

**Recommendations**

- The integrated management and quality system should be streamlined to make the faculty and university level approaches converge and the system to work more effectively.
- The university should take a more active approach to communication with students and doctoral students, including international students, about available support structures.
- The concept of multilingual programmes is unclear and the conceptual structure of international programmes could be reviewed.
- The societal engagement and impact and its relation with the teaching and research missions could be more clearly defined in order to support high-level leadership in national development.