Copenhagen Business School
Rektor Per Holten-Andersen
Karin Tovborg Jensen

Sendt pr. e-mail:
rektor@cbs.dk, cbs@cbs.dk, ktj@edu.cbs.dk

Positiv institutionsakkreditering af Copenhagen Business School

Akkrediteringsrådet har på rådsmødet 22. juni 2016 behandlet akkrediteringen af Copenhagen Business School (CBS).

Rådet traf på rådsmødet 11. december 2014 afgørelse om betinget positiv akkreditering for CBS.

I har haft en frist på 2 år til at rette op på de forhold, der var udslagsgivende for rådets betinget positive akkreditering og har inden udløbet af denne frist indsendt dokumentation for ændringer af disse. Danmarks Akkrediteringsinstitution har udarbejdet en supplerende akkrediteringsrapport, som er vedlagt.

Rådet har **akkrediteret Copenhagen Business School positivt**, jf. akkrediteringslovens[1] § 8. Rådet har truffet afgørelsen på baggrund af vedlagte supplerende akkrediteringsrapport fra Danmarks Akkrediteringsinstitution, herunder CBS' høringssvar, selvevalueringsrapport og øvrig dokumentation.

Akkrediteringsrådet har truffet afgørelsen ud fra en helhedsvurdering på grundlag af de kriterier, som fremgår af akkrediteringsbekendtgørelsen[2], retningslinjerne i "Vejledning om institutionsakkreditering" af 1. juli 2013 og akkrediteringsrådets notat af 20. juni 2014 "Vurdering af institutionernes kvalitetssikringssystemer".

Rådet er opmærksomt på, at der inden for CBS' i øvrigt velfungerende kvalitetssikringssystem på enkelte punkter stadig kan være indsatser, som det endnu ikke er muligt at se resultaterne af, eller indsatser, som fortsat er under indfasning. Rådet noterer, at akkrediteringspanelet i disse tilfælde har vurderet, at de valgte indsatser er formålstjenlige, og forventer at implementeringen af dem vil sikre, at indsatserne fører til opfyldelse af de definerede mål.

Akkrediteringsrådet har for det første vurderet, at CBS løbende gennemfører de indsatser, som uddybningspunkter til de fem kriterier beskriver. I forhold til de problemer akkrediteringspanelet har konstateret, er der tale om mindre, klart afgrænsede problemstillinger, som CBS' ledelse allerede er opmærksom på, og som efter akkrediteringsrådets vurdering aktuelt adresseres på en tilfredsstillende måde af institutionen.

For det andet har Rådet vurderet, at der er god kvalitet i udmøntningen af kvalitetssikringsarbejdet. Det vil sige, at CBS' indsats er velbeskrevet og bygger på gen-

---

[1] Lov nr. 601 af 12. juni 2013 om Akkrediteringsinstitutionen for videregående uddannelser (akkrediteringsloven).

[2] Bekendtgørelse nr. 745 af 24. juni 2013 om akkreditering af videregående uddannelsesinstitutioner og godkendelse af nye videregående uddannelser (akkrediteringsbekendtgørelsen)

nemprøvet og systematisk praksis. Universitetet har et udbygget informationssystem med relevante data for den enkelte uddannelse, og fastlagte politikker for, hvornår og hvorledes ledelsen vil skride ind overfor en uddannelse, der udviser problemer. Ligeledes er der en god informationsudveksling, både vertikalt og horisontalt, som understøtter velbegrundede indsatser. CBS gennemfører også løbende justeringer i sin kvalitetssikringspraksis, og der er et bredt engagement blandt institutionens ansatte og ledelse, som fører til udvikling og anvendelse af indvundne erfaringer i fremtidige indsatser.

Akkrediteringsrådet henviser i øvrigt til akkrediteringsrapporten for uddybende grundlag for rådets afgørelse.

Det følger af en positiv institutionsakkreditering, jf. akkrediteringslovens § 9, stk. 1, at det er muligt for uddannelsesinstitutionen at foretage justering af eksisterende uddannelser og uddannelsesudbud. Uddannelsesinstitutionen kan derudover oprette nye uddannelser og nye uddannelsesudbud, når disse er prækvalificeret og godkendt, jf. akkrediteringsloven §§ 18 og 21.

Akkrediteringen er gældende til og med 22. juni 2022, jf. akkrediteringslovens § 9.

Akkrediteringsrådet vil underrette ministeren om institutionens positive akkreditering.

I er velkomne til at kontakte direktør Anette Dørge på e-mail: akkr@akkr.dk, hvis I har spørgsmål eller behov for yderligere information.

Med venlig hilsen

Per B. Christensen
Formand
Akkrediteringsrådet

Anette Dørge
Direktør
Danmarks Akkrediteringsinstitution

Bilag:
Kopi af akkrediteringsrapport

Dette brev er også sendt til:
Styrelsen for Videregående Uddannelser, Uddannelses- og Forskningsministeriet

ACCREDITATION REPORT

COPENHAGEN BUSINESS SCHOOL

FOLLOW-UP REPORT ON CONDITIONAL POSITIVE INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION

Contents

Introduction

This accreditation report contains an analysis and an assessment of the quality-assurance system at the higher education institution Copenhagen Business School.

The report assesses whether the educational institution has developed an adequately effective system for quality assurance such that in the coming accreditation period the institution itself can carry out ongoing quality assurance of its own programmes.

Institutional accreditation does not include independent assessment of the relevance and quality of the individual programmes at the educational institution. The aim of accreditation is to identify whether the institution as a whole has established a quality-assurance system that regularly and systematically can ensure and develop the quality and relevance of its programmes. However, sub-aspects of individual programmes can be included in the assessment of whether the quality-assurance system works well in practice.

About institutional accreditation
Institutional accreditation is an assessment of whether the quality-assurance system of the institution is well described and well documented and whether it works in practice. The system is to ensure that the institution has constant focus on quality, develops the system regularly and reacts when something is wrong. This applies before and after institutional accreditation has taken place.

Effective quality-assurance is characterised by being regular and systematic and by living up to the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESGs). Quality assurance must have a clear division of duties and responsibilities and must have a strong foothold at management level. Furthermore, institutions must have an inclusive quality culture and focus on quality-assurance work for all of their programmes, the specific teaching, as well as the special problems, conditions and needs relevant for the individual institution.

On this basis, the accreditation report assesses whether the quality-assurance system of the institution lives up to the requirements placed for institutional accreditation in the Accreditation Act, including particularly the five criteria listed in the associated Executive Order.

Accreditation panel and method
In order to support assessment of the quality-assurance system, the Danish Accreditation Institution has set up an accreditation panel comprising a number of experts. Among other things, members of the panel are skilled within management and quality assurance at institution level, and they are familiar with the higher education sector and with relevant labour market conditions and student conditions.

The accreditation panel has read the documentation material, and together with employees from the Danish Accreditation Institution they have visited the institution to assess its quality-assurance system and practices.

Annex 1 in the report repeats the main features in the method used in the accreditation of the educational institution.

Decision
As an independent body, the Accreditation Council makes a decision on the accreditation of the educational institution. The Council decides whether the quality-assurance system of the institution justifies positive accreditation, conditional positive accreditation or rejection of accreditation.

This report and its assessments form the basis for the decision by the Accreditation Council.

Holistic assessment and recommendation

Since the initial accreditation, CBS has worked to solve the problems addressed in the accreditation report by improving its systematic approach to quality assurance within three main areas:

- monitoring of part-time faculty staff and quality assurance of this group's teaching,
- integration of part-time staff into the programmes and departments,
- increase of full-time staff's teaching hours.

Overall, the Panel is pleased to see that the management at CBS has responded to the criticism by taking a number of initiatives:

- a revised version of the policy paper "Research-based education at CBS",
- a new policy paper "Managing part time faculty at CBS" that specifies that program directors and head of departments must report annually on the use of DVIP and VIP, and the development of a CV-database for part time faculty,
- a revision of all department strategies for the integration of DVIP, and
- a committee to prepare initiatives to increase and optimize VIP teaching hours.

CBS has removed fixed threshold levels for the ratio of full-time/part-time staff within the programmes. Instead, CBS states that it is more focused on how to deal with the large number of part-time teachers that are involved in the courses and programmes at CBS.

It is the Panel's impression that CBS has improved the monitoring system regarding part-time faculty. The Panel has seen tangible improvements in systematic discussions of part-timers at study board/programme director level as well as at department level. The Panel has also seen a more visible follow-up on part-timers by the Dean of Research and the Dean of Education. The Panel finds that guidelines for determining which types of courses must be taught by an academic teacher are not explicitly stated. The Panel suggests making the existing implicit and tacit guidelines much more explicit, and finds that such guidelines would add to the follow-up discussions between programme directors and the Dean of Education on the quality assurance of the individual programme.

The effort to strengthen integration of part-time faculty is an on-going process that is not yet complete. However, the Panel has seen improvements regarding the systematic approach to this challenge: strategies for every department have been formulated and the Panel has seen concrete efforts put into this work by especially the designated academic coordinators and supervisors.

The Panel still finds that the matrix structure is a well-functioning framework for the programme directors with regard to sourcing relevant teachers, and finds that further dialogue between programme directors and heads of department can only improve the quality of the teaching. A CV database for the entire institution is to be established, and competency profiles for every department will be formulated in collaboration with the programme directors.

The Panel finds that this can contribute to a more systematic approach to the recruitment of both relevant and highly qualified staff, and recognises the efforts at department and programme level regarding these developments.

Given the extended use of part-timers in general, the Panel understands that using part-time teachers as supervisors for BA projects and master's theses can be a way of securing more resources for lectures taught by the academic research faculty. However, the Panel also sees a risk that the academic levels of the theses can be challenged, if both the supervisor and the external examiner are practitioners from business life. Therefore, the Panel emphasises the importance of upholding the approval procedures that are in place today as well as continuously ensuring that the part-timers are closely supervised by an academic faculty member.

In 2014, the Accreditation Council noted that CBS could benefit from making more use of employment statistics in the recurrent programme peer review and programme director's reports. Figures and reflections on employment are now included in the recurrent programme peer review concept and in the programme director's reports.

Overall, the Panel still finds that CBS could improve on specific areas regarding the monitoring and the integration of part-time teachers, but the Panel fully acknowledges the initiatives and changes that have already been implemented.

On the basis of the improvements and developments since the initial, conditional positive accreditation in 2014, the Danish Accreditation Institution recommends that CBS be awarded a positive accreditation.

Background information

Description of expert panel

- **Chairman: Gunnar Svedberg**
  Professor emeritus in Energy Technology, The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm. Former Rector at Mid Sweden University, former Rector at the University of Gothenburg.

- **Jan Beyer Schmidt-Sørensen**
  PhD in Labour Economics, Director of Business Development, City of Aarhus, former Rector of Aarhus School of Business.

- **Anne Welle-Strand**
  Professor in Education Management, Department of Leadership and Organizational Behaviour at BI Norwegian Business School

- **Geoffrey Wood**
  Professor in International Business, Dean at Essex Business School, former Associate Dean (Programme Quality) at Warwick Business School, former Director of Research at Middlesex University Business School.

- **Sidsel Gro Holm-Lauritzen**
  Master of Social Sciences from the University of Roskilde, former Student Representative on the Board of University of Roskilde

Members of the team from the Danish Accreditation Institution

A project team from the Danish Accreditation Institution has been responsible for the process and the methodology used in the institutional accreditation:

- Steffen Westergård Andersen, Director of Operations, Universities and Educational Institutions of Arts and Culture (Project Owner)
- Daniel Nørgaard Bachmann, Special Advisor (Project Manager)
- Jacob Frost Szpilman, Accreditation Officer
- Jakob Grandjean Bamberger, Accreditation Officer

Criterion III:
Programme knowledge base

Problems addressed in the initial accreditation in 2014

Given the high proportion of external part-time teaching staff that carry out a significant proportion of lectures at specific programmes, in the initial accreditation in 2014 the Panel was especially concerned about the lack of a continuous monitoring system and the lack of clear and transparent procedures for ensuring that part-time staff have the relevant qualifications and that their skills are upgraded.

Since the accreditation process in 2014, CBS has downsized the number of full-time faculty due to budget constraints. According to CBS, they expect themselves to face further budget constraints due to the downsizing in education funding on the state budget in the coming years.

The latest development contract for 2015-2017 with the Ministry of Higher Education and Science does not contain development objectives for increasing the ratio of full-time faculty (also abbreviated VIP) over part-time faculty (abbreviated DVIP) as it did in the development contract for the period 2012-2014.

The expectations for the period are stated in the development contract – the overall ratio between VIP and DVIP at CBS is expected to develop negatively from 1.18 in 2014 to 0.98 in 2017. In addition, the ratio between students and teachers (both VIP and DVIP) is expected to increase from 17.8 in 2014 to 22.3 in 2017

As the Panel also noted in 2014, the Panel considers the use of external part-time teachers from relevant parts of business life as a strength, and even a necessity, at a business school. At the same time, CBS is expected to provide research-based education. Therefore, the Panel would like to emphasize that the current development at CBS – with an expected increase in the use of part-time faculty in the coming years – only serves to underline the importance of a quality system at CBS that 1) monitors the use of external part-time teachers, 2) ensures their appropriate integration into the institution's academic framework, and 3) ensures that different types of external part-time teachers are used in suitable ways and to an appropriate extent.

Thus, in this follow-up accreditation, the Panel has taken specific interest in how management initiatives regarding the monitoring and integration of part-time staff at CBS are reflected in procedures and practice in the matrix system at CBS.

CBS strategies for dealing with the problems addressed in the accreditation report

In response to the development and the criticism addressed in the conditional positive accreditation, the management at CBS has reflected on the situation.

"Thirty years of steady growth of student numbers and proliferation of programs, combined with a much slower growth in research funding had led to a high rate of employment of DVIP. Both recruitment and management of DVIP has developed in a

decentralized process, with program committees and department Heads initiating and the HR department overseeing the legal and contractual aspect. Academic management and strategic alignment was needed." (Senior management considerations – managing part-time faculty at CBS)

As a consequence, the management has taken the following initiatives:

- a revised version of the policy paper "Research-based education at CBS",
- a new policy paper "Managing part time faculty at CBS" that specifies that program directors and head of departments must report annually on the use of DVIP and VIP, and the development of a CV-database for part time faculty,
- a revision of all department strategies for the integration of DVIP, and
- a committee to prepare initiatives to increase and optimize VIP teaching hours.

Each of the initiatives will be described below.

Research-based education at CBS
CBS has revised its policy paper on research-based education since the initial accreditation. The policy paper was initially issued in 2012 and was revised in February 2016. The policy paper has the outcome of research-based education for students as a point of departure, of which three central outcomes are stated:

- the ability of critical reflection,
- the command of a scientific work process, and
- insight into the research areas of CBS.

The paper defines that programmes should be research-based as a whole. Specific courses in a programme should contribute to this aim, however, not all courses need to be research-based. In addition, the paper also makes a distinction between research-based and research-covered education.

In the policy it is stated that "*The Dean of Education has established a set of measures of research foundation for programs, to be applied by the study boards in their determination of program structure and learning objectives.*" CBS has specified that these measures are found in "Managing part-time faculty at CBS"

In the revision, the previous aim to have 50% researcher coverage for bachelor-level programmes and 70% for master-degree programmes has been abandoned. The Panel notes that these quantitative standards have been substituted by the quality assurance procedures described in the policy "Managing part-time faculty at CBS".

The panel finds that the revised policy "Research-based education at CBS" lays down the overall principles for CBS' understanding of research-based education, whereas more specific guidelines including procedures are mostly dealt with in "Managing part-time faculty at CBS".

Managing part-time faculty at CBS
The policy "Managing part-time faculty at CBS" (issued October 2015) stipulates who is responsible for management of part-time faculty, and establishes procedures and guidelines for management of this group. The policy is the result of a meeting between all programme directors, all heads of department and the Dean of Education in spring 2015.

As mentioned above, the policy substitutes the earlier standards for researcher cover-

age with several guidelines, rules and procedures for managing and monitoring the use of part-time faculty.

Among these are:

- study boards and programme directors in cooperation with heads of department are responsible for ensuring the research base of the programmes;
- programme directors and study boards must report the use of DVIP annually to the Dean of Education;
- guidelines for hiring and managing DVIP in the departments have been prepared. These include:
  - preparing a generic description of the required competences for part-time faculty
  - placing responsibility for the integration and professional development of part-time faculty with heads of department
  - establishing rules for teaching and supervision by part-time faculty
  - establishing a central CV database for all part-time faculty at CBS (from 2016).

As an example, the description of the responsibility and procedures concerning the use of different categories of teaching personnel and the above-mentioned *"measures for research-foundation"* are presented here:

 "Study boards/Program Directors must report annually to the Dean of Education about the assignment of instructors to courses: which categories of instructors were assigned, what were the reasons for choosing either VIP, DVIP or student instructors?

Boards/directors, working with Department Heads, are responsible for ensuring ade-

quate research back-ground for all programs and courses. The maintenance of the research background, its form and extent, will be an issue in the annual dialogues between Deans and the Heads of Department, Program Directors/study boards.

The criteria for employing DVIP in courses and programs are several. Among them, the following may be relevant:
- *The proportion of elementary content going into the program*
- *The proportion of parallel classes to cohort lectures in the program*
- *Programs in certain fields and sectors may find a shortage of available research faculty/VIP that necessitates a larger percentage of DVIP*
- *In exceptional circumstances, programs may have to let DVIP replace research faculty that have left or not arrived*
- *Some DVIP are researchers at other institutions*
- *Programs and courses with a large practical content, such as internships and entrepreneurship, may have to engage practically oriented instructors to fulfill the appropriate learning goals.*
- *Courses with a large technical content, are sometimes more efficiently taught by DVIP*

The Senior Management (Direktionen) monitors the situation with respect to the adequacy of VIP in all fields and sectors at CBS as a whole."
(Managing part-time faculty at CBS)

The Panel finds that the policy clearly defines responsibility and establishes procedures for the monitoring and integration of part-time faculty. When it comes to the criteria for employing DVIP at programme and

course level, as described in the quote above, the policy tends more towards establishing loose guidelines that vary across programmes. The Panel recognises that this, on one hand is in line with the decentralised quality culture and organisation at CBS. On the other hand, this also limits management's possibilities of identifying problems independently of programme directors and department heads.

Revised department strategies

In 2015, the 15 departments at CBS have revised their strategies for 2013-2017. One of the elements in the revision was *"integration of part-time faculty into the department"*. The departments have described their recruitment procedures, plans and activities to integrate part-time faculty. The Panel has received six examples of revised department strategies.

These revised strategies will be described in detail below in the subsection "Integration of part-time faculty".

Committee working on initiatives to increase VIP contact hours

Finally, the management at CBS has established a committee that is working to identify areas and methods for increasing the number of contact hours of academic faculty. A number of these initiatives imply using part-time faculty in new areas.

Among the initiatives are:

- requiring that all full-time faculty members teach the equivalent of one course per year;
- reducing resources spent on examination on some programmes, using the resources on teaching instead;
- involving part-time faculty more in routine examination work, thereby freeing full-time resources;

- lowering the fixed number of hours for supervision of theses, combined with reducing requirements regarding the length of theses;
- standardising groups of two students for the thesis;
- lowering the fixed number of hours for administrative tasks; and
- hiring full-time teaching personnel.

(Additional material 2)

The Panel notes that each initiative will secure between 2,000-15,000 working hours for full-time faculty, most of which are to be used for teaching purposes. At the time of the site visit, these initiatives were approved by the board at CBS, but had not yet been finalised.

The Panel recognises the effort by CBS to increase the number of teaching hours by all full-time faculty staff through these initiatives. However, the Panel also notes that some of the initiatives aimed at increasing the teaching hours for academic full-time staff will in fact decrease the contact hours between students and academic full-time staff, for example by downsizing the fixed number of hours for supervision of theses.

The Panel's assessment of the strategic initiatives

Overall, the Panel finds that management has taken a number of measures to strengthen the monitoring and integration of part-time faculty at CBS. In addition, within the given financial situation, CBS has also taken steps to increase teaching by full-time faculty.

The Panel notes that a clear division of responsibility for the management of part-time faculty by programme directors, heads of department and course coordinators is in place. In addition to this, procedures for monitoring are now in place in the annual

reporting from the programme directors and the heads of department, to the top management at CBS. The policies contain few guidelines or standards to be met by all study programmes. The Panel finds that this is in line with the decentralised organisation of quality assurance at CBS. However, this also places additional importance on clear and consistent reporting from the programme directors and heads of department, as well as on the deans' follow-up procedures.

The Panel also finds that CBS has issued general guidelines for research-based education (in the policy papers "Research-based education at CBS" and "Managing part-time faculty at CBS"). However, the Panel finds that more explicit guidelines for determining which types of courses that must be taught by an academic teacher have not been established, and finds that such guidelines would add to the quality assurance of the individual programme

Procedures and practice

The development at CBS regarding monitoring of part-time staff since the initial accreditation in 2014 has not been focused on establishing a set of entirely new procedures, but rather on the expansion, alteration, systematisation and formalisation of some of the existing procedures and practices.

DVIP are monitored in different ways, most notably through teaching evaluations, through the updating of CVs and through supervision by a designated coordinator (who is a VIP/researcher).

The programme directors, study boards and the heads of department are responsible for the academic quality of the course contents, including the staffing of pro-

grammes and courses with the right blend of VIP and DVIP. (SER, p. 7)

The following subsections present an overview of the CBS monitoring system with a special focus on the monitoring of the teaching by the part-time faculty. Changes and new procedures and practices that have been established since the initial accreditation are emphasised.

The matrix system

At CBS, programmes and teaching are organised in a matrix structure, which means that programmes buy teaching from relevant departments.

The business school has one faculty, and research is organised in 15 departments. The departments are administered by a head of department who is responsible to the president. The educational programmes are not organised in the departments, although the departments deliver teaching within their area of expertise to the various CBS programmes. Each head of department is responsible for hiring adequate and relevant staff. All part-time teachers are thus affiliated with a department that oversees their qualifications and the quality of their teaching.

CBS offers 20 full-time bachelor programmes and 21 full-time master programmes (CBS Facts and Figures 2015).

Each programme is managed by an academic programme director, and a study board has the overall responsibility for the content and quality of the programmes. The study boards and the programme directors are responsible to the Dean of Education.

Each programme has its own study board, except in cases where there is a natural

and direct link between a bachelor pro-
gramme and a master programme, for in-
stance the bachelor programme in Busi-
ness Administration and Psychology (HA
(psyk)) and the master programme in Busi-
ness Administration and Psychology
(cand.merc. (psyk.)).

The programme director has the responsi-
bility for the quality of the individual pro-
gramme. The programme director sources
teaching from the departments.

Quantitative information on the quality of
the teaching, courses and programmes is
available to the programme director and
the heads of department in the annual data
package, which is described below.

Described below are also the programme
director's reports, which are an important
element in the CBS quality assurance sys-
tem, and the role of the departments in the
quality assurance of the courses and pro-
grammes.

Qualitative information on the quality of the
teaching of the courses is available to the
programme directors and heads of depart-
ment mainly via the course coordinators
(see below for more details).

Finally, the supervision of exams and the-
ses is described at the end of this subsec-
tion.

Monitoring of part-time teachers at the programmes

Annual data package
Every year, programme directors and
heads of department receive data packag-
es including data on a number of subjects,
for example:

- enrolment
- drop-out and completion
- grades
- employment
- evaluation scores of courses and
  programmes
- the ratio between full-time faculty and
  part-time teachers for courses and
  programmes.

The data package is used as the point of
departure for the reflections in the Pro-
gramme Director's reports. Since 2014, a
new element has been included in this data
package, namely employment figures that
are used in the monitoring of alumni em-
ployment to a larger extent. This was also
the recommendation from the Accreditation
Council in 2014.

CBS writes: *"The Accreditation Council
noted that employment figures for CBS
graduates were satisfactory and that CBS
had a system that monitored fluctuations.
However, CBS could benefit from making
more use of employment statistics in the
recurrent program peer review. CBS will
redesign the documentation report from
autumn 2016, when the bachelor programs
will undergo review for the second time.
This autumn and in the spring 2016 the
graduate diploma programs and the master
programs (in-career) will undergo review.
These students already hold positions in
business and industry, and we have thus
not had the opportunity to include discus-
sions concerning employment in these re-
views. However, in order to accommodate
the recommendation from the Council al-
ready in 2015 we have changed the format
of the Program Director's report and have
integrated employment figures in the new
format."* (SER, p.5)

No threshold level for the ratio between full-time faculty and part-time teachers for courses and programmes is in place. Instead, programme directors must account for their reflections on the quality of the teaching by part-time teachers to the Dean of Education as described below.

Programme director's reports
Every year in February, the programme directors submit a report to the Dean of Education, in which they address the problems that their programme is facing. These reports are based on the annual data packages and other sources of information such as discussions in the study boards, at teacher meetings, at meetings between programme directors and heads of department, with employer representatives, etc.

In December 2015, the Dean of Education issued a letter to the programme directors stating that, from 2015 and onwards, the programme director's reports must explicitly include reflections on:

1. *"The initiatives that [the programmes] have put into practice in order to integrate part-time faculty"*
2. *"The measures [the programmes] have taken in order to ensure the quality of their teaching"*.

(SER, p. 39)

Furthermore, and also from 2015 and onwards, the programme directors and study boards *"(…) must report annually to the Dean of Education about the assignment of instructors to courses: which categories of instructors were assigned, what were the reasons for choosing either VIP, DVIP or student instructors?"* (SER, p. 9)

The Panel has received six programme director's reports issued in February 2016, and the Panel met with representatives

from the same six programmes during the site visit. The Panel and AI chose three programmes, and requested that CBS chose three other programmes that they themselves see as exemplary regarding the monitoring and integration of part-time faculty.

The Panel received programme director's reports from:

- BSc in Economics and Business Administration
- BSc in Business Administration and Organisational Communication
- MA in International Business Communications - Multicultural Communication in Organisations
- MSc in Social Science
- MSc in Business Administration and Auditing
- MSc in Business Administration and Psychology

(Additional material, pp. 15-54)

All the reports mention the high percentage of lectures taught by part-time teachers as an important challenge. Also, all reports account for the individual programme's initiatives regarding part-time faculty, and all the reports stress that the role of the course coordinator is important with regard to ensuring the quality of the courses and integrating the part-time teachers into the programme.

The Panel notes that all the reports comply with the recently established procedures issued by the Dean of Education. On the basis of this, the Panel finds that this is evidence of an increased awareness and an increasingly systematic approach to ensuring the monitoring of part-time faculty.

The programme director's report is followed up by a visit to the Study Board from the Dean of Education in the autumn. At this meeting, the problems and initiatives at each programme are discussed and further actions are agreed upon (SER, p. 4). Follow-up on the programme director's reports is also on the agenda for annual "triad" meetings, i.e. meetings between the Dean of Education, the Programme Director and the Vice-Chairman of the Study Board (who is a student representative) (Hearing response, p. 2).

In 2014, minutes were not taken from the Dean's visits to the study boards, and therefore it was difficult to establish concrete evidence of a systematic follow-up process after the Programme Director had submitted the report. This has now been changed, and the Panel has received examples of minutes from the Dean's visits to the study boards in autumn 2015.

Below is an overview of the minutes that the Panel has received. These minutes exemplify the discussions between the Dean of Education and the study boards regarding the percentage and integration of DVIP. In some cases, actions are planned. These actions are not, however, aimed at increasing the VIP percentage as such, but are related to initiatives regarding the integration of DVIP and regarding the clarification of the DVIP competencies that the programme needs.

Date	Study Board	Discussion	Actions planned
7 October 2015	Master of Science in Social Sciences (SER, p. 21-22)	"The Dean asked about the integration of part-time teachers, but the program primarily staffs the courses with full-time faculty."	-
20 October 2015	BSc in Economics and Business Administration (SER, p. 22-23)	"In this regard the Program Director emphasized the importance of including DVIPs as they bring practical examples from everyday life into the program. In commercial law it is important to include practitioners who are able to link the theories to concrete examples." "The Dean and the Program Director discussed the importance of including DVIPs in the CBS culture in order to follow up on their teaching methods and to ensure progression in the curriculum. At the BSc in Economics and Business Administration program the course coordinators hold meetings each semester with all teaching staff in order to ensure coherence." "During the last 7 years the use of VIP in relation to DVIP has been rising, as the study board has been aiming at attracting more permanent staff to the program."	"The study board will describe more specifically how and where they will like to make use of DVIP and how they will ensure the adequate level of quality." "The Dean pointed out that we will not enforce a specific guideline across all programs as regards a VIP/DVIP ratio. However, the programs need to be explicit about their priorities and reasons for using DVIP."
27 October 2015	BA in English and Organisational Communication	"The Program Director opened the meeting by commenting on the figures on the VIP/DVIP ratio. She stated that all courses have a VIP as course	"The Program Director also pointed to the fact that many teachers have

	(SER, p. 24-26)	coordinator, and only in exceptional cases an EL is coordinator (if it is not possible to find a VIP within the particular field who is able to take on the task). In order to integrate DVIPs into the BA EOK environment, the Program Director meets with all faculty at the beginning of each semester to discuss current themes. There is a high rate of participation and in general both VIP and DVIP are content with the meetings. The DVIPs get an overall picture of the program and are able to put their teaching into the overall context. One of the themes at the meetings has been "identity", where faculty has discussed the narrative of the program."	accepted a voluntary retirement scheme which would affect the future staffing of the courses. The Dean asked the Program Director to address this issue in the Program Director's report as CBS has financial challenges and it will be difficult to employ new staff. But of course the senior management will have to it into consideration."
28 October 2015	MSc in Advanced Economics and Finance (SER, p. 26-27)	"Special topics that we focus on right now are the integration of DVIP into CBS and the employability of the students." "The Dean mentioned that the program had a high VIP coverage of the courses and a high employability for their students."	-
3 November 2015	BA in Information Management, BSc and MSc in Business Administration and Information Systems (SER, p. 28-30)	"The Dean opened the meeting by asking the Program Director how the study board recruits DVIPs and how they integrate the DVIPs in the program. The Program Director answered that the DVIPs are primarily employed at the HA(it.) program. At the cand.merc. (it.) all courses are staffed by permanent faculty. The study board is interested in recruiting more DVIP to have more inspiration from business. One of the students mentioned that the DVIPs are recruited according to a selection process at the department. And sometimes they share a course with the permanent staff, which is of mutual benefit. The students are satisfied with this solution, and this is also reflected in the evaluations." "A VIP representative mentioned that they do a lot of co-teaching at HA(it.) The cooperation between the VIP and the DVIP works really well, as the DVIP has a different angle. " "The Dean asked if the study board discussed what kind of competencies they needed from the DVIPs. One of the students replied that the dialogue primarily took place between the course coordinator and the Department Head. The study	"The Dean recommended that the study board could discuss how the courses could be organized, whether staffing could be made differently. It might be interesting to discuss what kind of competencies the DVIPs bring into the courses. A VIP representative replied that in relation to the IT project management course they had discussed how the DVIPs could give a practical view on the material, and they had deliberately aimed at hiring DVIPs in order to get a business perspective."

		boards looks at the feedback from students – the evaluation of the courses."	
11 November 2015	BA in Intercultural Market Communication (SER, p. 30-32)	"The Program Director introduced the meeting by commenting on the study board's integration of DVIP into the program. She noted that the courses were primarily coordinated by VIP but in some cases the study board had been forced to employ DVIPs as coordinators due to lack of relevant faculty at CBS. In order to ensure that DVIPs are integrated in the study program, the study board has introduced semester meetings where all VIPs and DVIPs are invited to discuss the handing over from one course to the next and thus ensure progression." "The study board is very content with the contribution from DVIPs as they include practical examples in their teaching and form a link between research and business." "All course coordinators host meetings with the DVIPs that teach at their courses in order to ensure integration. The course coordinators are responsible for alignment between pedagogical tools and learning goals." "Furthermore, at the department level (IBC) they host a teaching day for all VIP and DVIP in order to integrate them in the research environment."	-
11 November 2015	BSc and MSc in International Business and Politics (SER, p. 32-35	"The Dean asked the Program Director to comment on the integration of DVIP into the program. The Program Director replied that the study board works s in conjunction with the DBP department in order to ensure the integration of DVIP into the research environment." "The Dean returned to the discussion of integration of DVIP and asked about the considerations the study boards have in relation to recruitment of DVIP. In what kind of courses are the DVIP an asset and how can they improve teaching? The Dean stressed that this issue is naturally a shared responsibility between Department Heads and the Program Directors. The Program Director replied that at the DBP department they have appointed an academic teaching coordinator who is in close contact with the DVIPs and invite them to both academic and social events." "A VIP member of the study board noted that it is important to ensure continuity in the courses and	"The Dean (…) recommended outlining competency profiles for VIP and DVIP in order to be more specific about staffing the courses."

Follow-up report on conditional
positive institutional accreditation – Copenhagen Business School

| | | be aware of the challenges in relation to handing over one course from one teacher to another. This is particularly important in terms of DVIP who are not part of the daily routines at the department. The Dean replied that one way of ensuring a better integration of part-time teachers is to give them a greater share of responsibility in the planning of courses. The more the DVIPs are affiliated with the department the better job they perform."

"A VIP member of the study board mentioned that at the department level they invite DVIPs to become members of research groups, which is a way of signaling to them that they are welcome to participate in the research environment." | |

(SER, pp. 21-36)

The Panel finds that the discussions between the programme directors and the Dean of Education in the minutes are examples of the increased focus on the use of DVIP since the initial accreditation in 2014. The discussions are carried out in a systematic way, as is seen in that the subject is on the agenda at all the meetings. At the same time, there is still room for decentralised, programme-specific focal points and action plans that are relevant for the specific programme.

The Panel acknowledges that the Dean of Education is very active in the discussions at the visits to the Study Boards. The Panel also acknowledges that follow-up on identified problems can take place in a number of fora, for example triad meetings, meetings between programme directors and meetings between programme directors and heads of department. However, it is not always entirely clear what the outcome of these discussions will be. Therefore, the Panel would still like to see more systematic and transparent follow-up from the Dean of Education on the problems identified and the actions planned.

Monitoring of the part-time teachers at the departments

The departments hire all faculty staff, including the part-time faculty. To ensure that adequate staff is hired for the programmes, the heads of department hold meetings at least once a semester with the programme directors that source teaching from the department. At these meetings, the need for new courses or teachers is discussed. It is also discussed whether specific courses require intervention.

From 2015 and onwards, the departments must report annually to the Dean of Research about their management of DVIP. Departments also monitor the annual update of all CVs for all department staff. CVs for part-time staff must include their participation in academic/professional development. (SER, p. 10)

During the site visit, it was noted that the departments had improved with regard to defining a precise recruitment strategy and with regard to being more precise when formulating the competencies that are required from the part-time teachers. The

programme directors mentioned that the departments had increased their focus on teaching within the recent years, and that the dialogue between programme directors and heads of department on teaching was very fruitful. In short, the departments do not primarily focus on research and staffing issues, but also on the teaching and the quality of the courses.

In "Managing part-time faculty", the CBS policy paper from November 2015 (SER, pp. 7-10), competency profiles for the part-time teacher types "EL" (external lecturer) and "UA" (teaching assistant) are described:

"To be appointed, both UA and EL are required to have Masters Degrees or similar qualifications. The official regulations also specify that:

UA must be qualified to independently assume teaching assignments either on an elementary level or as a supplement to teaching by research faculty. The assessment process requires a documentation of teaching qualifications through either experience or certification (participation in the Academic Teaching programs at CBS or equivalent).

CBS also requires:
- *UA must have relevant professional experience*
- *UA must have a qualified and updated knowledge of the relevant academic field*

For UA already hired, there's a maintenance and development requirement:
- *UA must follow the development of the field, enabling them to contribute to the development of the teaching content.*

- *UA must participate in academic and/or professional activities in their field*

For EL, the same requirements obtain at a higher level; to qualify for being appointed at CBS, EL must have
- *either professional experience at a level that includes either managerial functions or qualified specialist functions, or*
- *a record of contributing to the academic field in question through participation in projects and/or publications, and*
- *qualified and updated knowledge including contributions to the development of the field through professional activities*

And for those already hired, there are maintenance requirements: EL must:
- *follow the development of the field, being able to participate in the development of teaching content and program configuration, and*
- *contribute to academic and/or professional activities in their field*

EL can be either academically or professionally qualified to teach (a requirement from the AACSB accreditation conditions).
- *Those who hold and maintain academic qualifications (typically, EL who are research faculty at other institutions) must participate in academic activities like research projects, publications or similar.*
- *Those who hold and maintain professional qualifications must participate in professional development activities, like consulting, professional development*

events, courses and associations, publishing on professional issues, etc."

As another new initiative, CBS will in 2016 establish a CV database for the entire institution. The responsibility for this project lies with the Dean of Research's Office and the HR department, and departments will be responsible for regularly updating this database. As of now, most departments have their own CV database, and it was mentioned at the meetings that they were very useful for allocating adequate teaching resources to the courses. The prospect of an institution-wide CV database was looked upon as a useful tool, especially for newly appointed programme directors that need to establish an overview of the teaching resources available within the institution.

Heads of department and programme directors/committees will from 2016 and onwards consider the competence profiles for UA and EL as well as the guidelines for employing relevant DVIP, when assigning DVIP to courses in the future (Additional material, p. 2). DVIPs will be asked to account for their participation in various events and thus give the Head of Department an overview of their possible need for further courses/academic development (Additional material, p. 64).

However, CBS notes that: *"…the most important parts of quality assurance and enhancement, that is the on-going dialogue among course coordinator / teaching coordinator and DVIP's, will not be covered in a CV database."* (Additional material, p. 65)

During the site visit and at the meetings with programme directors, the heads of department and the course coordinators, it was confirmed that the course coordinators still play a crucial role in both the monitoring and the integration of part-time teachers.

Course coordinators as a link between teachers, programmes and departments
All courses (including project modules) at CBS must have a faculty member who is academically responsible, normally a full-time faculty member, whose role it is to coordinate teaching and advise on content development. (SER, p. 10) The Panel met with course coordinators to discuss this role further.

In the programmes that the Panel looked further into in this process, all the course coordinators were a member of the research faculty. It was mentioned at several of the meetings during the site visit that the courses within the programmes that rely heavily on part-time teachers are usually staffed in such a way that:

The course coordinator:
- plans the course
- teaches the more theoretical and methodological lectures
- decides which part-time teachers will teach the different subjects
- ensures there is a link to other courses within the programme
- determines the curriculum

The part-time teachers:
- teach the more practical elements of the courses
- include real-life cases to illustrate the theoretical themes of the course
- teach subjects of a more repetitive character

It was also mentioned that an academic full-time teacher usually carries out the lectures at the beginning and at the end of a course.

Since the course coordinators are to ensure the academic quality of the individual course as well as oversee the quality of the part-time teachers, there has to be an on-going dialogue between course coordinators, programme directors and heads of department.

During the site visit, the Panel looked into the quality assurance aspects of the relationship between the course coordinators and the part-time teachers. The course coordinators mentioned that they had several ways of detecting possible problems. Firstly, teachers of all courses are evaluated every semester. Secondly, the course coordinators have an on-going dialogue with every teacher, and they hold 2-3 meetings with the teachers during the semester where the course, the curriculum and theoretical problems are discussed. Thirdly, the impression was that the students are very interested in high standards of teaching, both with regard to the practical and the academic aspects of a course, and that the students are used to voicing their opinions through direct emails to the teachers and programme directors, as well as in the quality boards and the study boards. Both the students and the heads of department that the Panel met during the site visit mentioned incidents where teachers had been removed from a course because of below-par performance.

The programme directors and study boards meet bi-annually with all the course coordinators from the programme. At these meetings student evaluations of the courses and teachers, the coherence of the programme and teaching in general are discussed. This allows for a course- and programme-wide discussion on potential changes and alterations to the courses or the entire programme.

The quality assurance of exams and supervision of theses

Given the extended use of part-time teachers at CBS in general, the Panel was interested in who performs the exams and supervises the theses. The Panel also received new statistics that showed that, in 2015, 57 percent of students working on their master thesis and 36 percent of students working on their bachelor project were supervised by research faculty (VIP). Because a significant share of the BA projects and master's theses are supervised by part-time faculty (DVIP), the Panel looked further into how the academic level in the theses is ensured.

CBS describe the internal approval process that can lead to a part-time teacher supervising theses: *"To supervise Bachelor projects, UA need special approval by their department. To allow UA to supervise master theses, the department must apply to the Dean of Education for permission. EL need approval by the Department for master thesis supervision. Departments must appoint a faculty member to coordinate and supervise thesis supervision by DVIP."* (SER, p. 9)

As an addition to the explicit approval process mentioned above, it is mandatory for supervisors of master theses to take the course "Supervision of Master Theses", which is a 3 ½ hour course that has been held twice in 2015 with 37 participants. (Additional material, p. 80)

The Panel discussed this subject with the participants during the site visit, and several examples of successful supervision of a part-time teacher were given, for example situations where an external lecturer had a close dialogue with the coordinator (who was a member of the research faculty). The external lecturer and coordinator discussed

theories and methodological issues on a regular basis, and the coordinator was available if the external lecturer needed advice. The Panel also acknowledges that it is often an explicit wish from the students to have a part-time teacher as a thesis supervisor, as this can improve the thesis' connection to practical issues in business life. The Panel, however, also stresses the importance of the described measures with regard to ensuring an appropriate academic level in the BA projects and master's theses.

The Panel's assessment of the monitoring of part-time teachers

It is the Panel's impression that CBS has improved the monitoring system regarding part-time faculty. The Panel has seen tangible improvements in the systematic discussions of the use of part-timers at study board/programme director and department level, and has also seen a more visible follow-up on this subject at dean level. The Panel finds that guidelines for determining which type of course must be taught by an academic teacher are not explicitly stated. The Panel suggests making the existing implicit and tacit guidelines much more explicit, and finds that such guidelines would add to the follow-up discussions between programme directors and the Dean of Education regarding the quality assurance of the individual programme.

The Panel still finds that the matrix structure is a well-functioning framework for the programme directors with regard to sourcing relevant teachers. Moreover, the Panel finds that further dialogue between programme directors and heads of department will further improve the quality of the teaching. A CV database for the entire institution is to be established, and competency profiles for every department will be formulated in collaboration with the programme

directors. The Panel finds that this can contribute to a more systematic approach to recruiting both relevant and highly qualified staff, and recognises the efforts at the departments and programmes regarding these developments.

With regard to exams and supervision, the Panel finds that a large number of BA projects and master's theses are supervised by non-academic, part-time faculty members. CBS has procedures for approving a part-time teacher to supervise theses. Furthermore, as a supplement to the formal procedures for approval, it is the Panel's general impression that the academic coordinator's personal responsibility for, and influence on, the part-time teachers has the potential to be a well-functioning way of ensuring the academic level of the theses. Given the extended use of part-timers in general, the Panel understands that using part-time teachers as supervisors for BA projects and master's theses can be a way of securing more resources for lectures taught by the academic research faculty. However, the Panel also sees a risk that the academic levels of the theses can be challenged, if both supervisor and external examiner are practitioners from business life. Moreover, the Panel emphasises the importance of upholding the approval procedures that are in place today, as well as continuously ensuring that the part-timers are closely supervised and guided by an academic faculty member.

Recruitment and integration of part-time staff

The policy paper "Managing part-time faculty at CBS" describes the responsibility of departments and part-time faculty with regard to recruitment, integration and professional development:

"Departments report annually to the Dean of Research about their management of DVIP. When hiring DVIP, their potential contribution to teaching quality must be assessed. When DVIP are employed, they must be provided with opportunities to develop their academic skills and interact with relevant researchers in the department. The Department must ensure that relevant events are arranged and invitations sent. Departments monitor the annual update of all CVs for the whole department staff. UA and EL CVs must list their participation in academic/professional development. DVIP must participate in academic cooperation. They must record their academic activities and/or their participation in professional development activities."

How the department specifically integrates part-time faculty is part of the recently revised department strategy. The documentation received by the Panel includes examples of strategy excerpts regarding the integration of part-time faculty from 6 of the 15 departments at CBS: Department of Finance, Department of Operations Management, Department of Organisation, Department of Auditing and Accounting, Department of International Business Communication, Department of Intercultural Communication and Management.

With the exception of the Department of Auditing and Accounting, all department strategies contain descriptions of recruitment procedures, integration in department life and quality assurance/evaluation of part-time faculty. The Department of Auditing and Accounting has submitted a description of the type of part-time faculty employed by the department.

As an example, the Department of Intercultural Business Communication (IBC) has a plan for the following activities:

"According to overall CBS goals and objectives for inclusion of part-time teachers (DVIP), IBC organizes academic events relevant to DVIP on a regular basis and monitors the participation of teachers in those events. IBC also ensures the annual updating of CVs for DVIP. The updated CVs must list DVIP's participation in academic events at CBS.

In the period from 2015-2017 IBC will take a number of specific initiatives towards integrating DVIP staff further into the academic activities of IBC. IBC will:

- *integrate DVIP into the activities of IBC's three Academic Areas;*

- *collect updated CVs from all DVIP and screen their profiles relative to the programs and courses in which IBC is responsible for providing teachers – the purpose is to ensure the best possible match between teaching resources and teaching needs;*

- *organize two annual 'Teachers' Days' with focus on: a) didactic challenges and b) core research foundations for course curricula;*

- *circulate invitations to academic events such as seminars, conferences, PhD defences and Alumni events (where relevant)."*

Four of the departments have also listed events held in 2015. DVIP participation in the events ranges from 3 to 36, with the Department of Organisation hosting the events with the largest participation of DVIP. The Department of International Business Communication reported the following events:

Department Strategy Seminar
20-21 August 2015
3 DVIP participated

Teachers' Day Seminar
29 January
20 participants, 3 DVIP

Teachers' Day seminar – Open Space
22 September
20 participants, 7 DVIP

Academic Area Intro Seminar
December 2015
Approx. 10 DVIP

During the site visit, the Panel explored integration with senior management, heads of department, part-time faculty, program directors and full-time faculty course coordinators.

The part-time faculty, most of whom had been employed as an external lecturer at CBS for several years, reported that their main contact with their departments was with the course coordinator or supervisor coordinator at the departments. As described, the course coordinators have meetings with the teaching team for a specific course 2-3 times per semester to discuss coordination, evaluation and development of the course.

In addition, the external lecturers reported that they were invited to participate in special events, guest lectures and Ph.D. defences at the department in which they were employed. Participation in these events seemed to vary among the part-time faculty that the Panel met during the visit. Most of the part-time faculty found it difficult to find the time to participate in these events. Some of them had also participated in courses offered by CBS. The course on

supervision of master theses was mentioned positively.

The heads of department commented that they are in contact with the teaching committees at the departments and the programme directors with regard to the competencies needed by the programmes. Usually the Head of Department has a large spreadsheet with CV-like data on the part-time teachers at the department that provides an overview of their competencies. Both the heads of department and the programme directors could see the advantages of the central CV database that is being developed.

In general, the Panel finds that most of the part-time teachers are recruited based on a thorough selection process. Most departments require that the part-timers have received a high mark in their master's thesis, and several departments carry out selection interviews. Two of the part-time teachers that the Panel met during the site visit had contributed to an anthology in cooperation with some of the researchers within the specific subject.

The heads of departments are involved in the recruitment of part-time faculty, monitor evaluations from courses, and take action on critical evaluations when necessary. Non-critical evaluations and feedback are normally handled by the course coordinator. In some departments with a large number of part-time teachers, management has been delegated to part-time coordinators within the department.

The Panel's assessment of the recruitment and integration of part-time teachers

The Panel concludes that CBS has taken active steps to improve the integration of part-time faculty into the departments and

programmes. The Panel got the impression that the general awareness of this issue at CBS has increased considerably. Department strategies have been revised to include initiatives for the recruitment and integration of part-time teachers, and this has been followed up by events aimed at bringing part-time faculty closer to the academic life in the departments.

This is supplemented by a more systematic coordination effort towards part-time faculty by programme directors and course coordinators compared with the accreditation in 2014. However, the integration process is not complete, and the Panel expects that departments, programmes and part-time faculty will improve the integration and participation further in the coming years.

The Panel recognises that several of the initiatives entail a change in the institution's culture, i.e. it is too soon to expect to see the full results of some of the initiatives initiated after the conditional positive accreditation in 2014.

Recommendations by the panel

This section contains the Panel's recommendations to CBS for further improvement of the quality assurance system and practice.

Dialogue between programme directors and heads of department

In the CBS matrix system, the programmes source teaching from a number of departments and the dialogue between the programme directors and the heads of department is important. This dialogue is the basis for a continued quality assurance of courses as well as entire programmes. The dialogue in the matrix system is ensuring that qualified teachers with the right qualifications are hired to the relevant courses and programmes. At the site visit, the Panel met with programme directors who described an increased focus on courses and programmes in the dialogue with the heads of department.

The Panel has seen a systematic dialogue between programmes and departments on the quality of the courses and programmes, and would like to recommend to the institution that this dialogue is upheld and continuously improved, so that the coherence between the qualifications needed at the programmes and the qualifications of the available teachers is assured.

Criteria for lectures that must be taught by academics

CBS has issued policy papers on the management of the part-time teachers and on research based education. In these papers, it is stated that not all courses need to be taught by the academic faculty, and that

several types of courses can be taught by part-time teachers. In some cases, part-time teachers from business life are even more relevant for the course than an academic teacher.

In these papers, CBS has established criteria for when to allocate part-time teachers to courses. However, CBS has, on the other hand not established criteria to determine which courses that must be taught by an academic researcher.

The Panel recommends that CBS to further increase transparency consider the drafting of a guideline that takes the allocation of academic faculty in courses as its point of departure. The Panel thus considers that rather than just having criteria stating which subjects can be taught by a part-time teacher, the institution might find it helpful to establish specific guidelines for the types of courses that must be taught by a relevant academic researcher.

The part-time teachers as supervisors of theses

During the follow-up accreditation process, the panel has taken an interest in the supervision of projects, noting that a large proportion of the supervision of bachelor projects and master theses are supervised by part-time teachers.

CBS has established procedures for approval of part-time teachers as supervisors of projects, and all supervisors must complete a course in thesis supervision. Moreover, every part-time teacher has their own supervisor, who amongst other responsibilities offers feedback on methodological and theoretical issues to the part-time teacher.

The Panel recommends that the institution consider formalising the approval procedures even further, through more specific guidelines for the qualifications needed for being a thesis supervisor. The Panel also recommends that CBS keeps a close eye on ensuring that the well-functioning relations between the part-time teachers and their supervisors are maintained and continuously developed in the years to come.

Annex

I. Methodology used in a follow-up accreditation

The objective of institutional accreditation is to enhance the educational institution's efforts to develop programmes of an ever-increasing academic quality and relevance. The institution can plan its own quality assurance initiatives as long as these initiatives meet the five criteria for quality and relevance stipulated in the Executive Order.

This section introduces the methodology that is used in connection to a follow-up institutional accreditation and that forms the basis for the report's assessments.

Guidelines and criteria listed in the Executive Order

The Accreditation Act and the criteria listed in the Executive Order provide the basis for the assessment of an educational institution's efforts to develop and maintain academic quality and relevance.

The criteria describe what is expected of the institution's policies, strategies and procedures, as well as what is expected of the institution's quality assurance in practice. The Act and the Executive Order comply with the European standards for quality assurance of further and higher education (European Standards and Guidelines). The five criteria are described in more detail in the guidelines for institutional accreditation.

Criteria I and II deal with the overall framework for quality assurance at institution level. Under criterion I, the institution must describe its quality assurance policy and quality assurance strategy, as well as the procedures and processes on which the policy is based. Criterion II focuses on how quality assurance efforts are rooted at management level, and on organisation and allocation of responsibilities in quality assurance work as well as management information and quality culture.

Criteria III, IV and V deal with how the institution in practice ensures that all its programmes possess the appropriate knowledge base, academic content and level, as well as the appropriate pedagogical quality, and are relevant for the labour market and society in general. Documentation for compliance with the five criteria should also describe the link between the different aspects of the quality-assurance system and how it is rooted in the different levels of management and the quality culture.

Only the areas that did not comply with the criteria in the initial accreditation process are documented and assessed in a follow-up accreditation process following a conditional positive accreditation.

Process and documentation

The Danish Accreditation Institution has established an accreditation panel whose function is to assess an institution's quality assurance work. Among other things, members of this panel

are skilled within management and quality assurance at institution level, and are familiar with the higher education sector and with relevant labour market conditions as well as student perspectives.

The institution provides documentation of how the institution has worked to solve the problems addressed in the initial accreditation report in the form of a self-evaluation report, key figures and supplementary material that documents the quality assurance practice at the institution. This documentation, as well as information the panel itself has collected during the visits to the institution form the basis of the assessment of the initiatives that the institution has taken to improve its quality assurance system and practice.

In its self-evaluation report, the institution describes, documents and offers examples of the initiatives taken regarding its quality assurance system and its quality assurance practices.

Based on this self-evaluation report, the accreditation panel pays one or two visits to the institution. During a site-visit, the panel meets with the management, teachers, students, employers and others who can contribute knowledge to the identified problems that in the initial accreditation were deemed to require follow-up.

On the basis of an analysis of all the documentation material, the panel assesses the quality assurance system and how the institution carries out its quality assurance work in practice.

On the basis of the panel's assessments, the Danish Accreditation Institution prepares a draft accreditation report, which is submitted to the institution for consultation. The report includes the panel's assessment of the institutions follow-up on each of the problems which in the initial accreditation where assessed to be in need of improvement, and the panel's overall recommendation. Following the consultation, the final accreditation report is prepared and submitted to the Accreditation Council. Based on the report, the Accreditation Council decides whether to provide the educational institution with an accreditation.

II. Case log

Case process

30 November 2015	Documentation report received
19 February 2016	Received supplementary documentation regarding research based education, department strategies for integration of DVIP, programme director's reports and thesis supervision.
6 March 2016	Received supplementary documentation regarding initiatives for increasing the number of VIP contact hours.
3-4 March 2016	Visit to the institution by the accreditation panel
15 April 2016	Accreditation report submitted for hearing at the institution
29 April 2016	Hearing responses for accreditation report received from the institution
Assessment of criteria changed after hearing responses?	No
23 May 2016	Case processing completed
22 June 2016	Processed by the Accreditation Council at council meeting

III. Programme for visit to the institution

March 3	
Time	**Interview persons**
09.00-09.45	Rector, Dean of Education, Dean of Research and other representatives of the top management of the institution
09.45-10.00	Break
10.00-10.30	Vice-chairmen of the Study Boards of the following programmes: • cand.soc. HRM • MA in International Business Communication (Multicultural Communication in Organisations) • HA (kom.)
10.30-11.00	Vice-chairmen of the Study Boards of the following programmes: • HA Almen • cand.merc. (psyk) • cand.merc. (aud)
11.00-11.15	Break
11.15-12.00	About 4 external lecturers (EL or UA) from the following programmes: • Cand.soc HRM • MA in International Business Communication (Multicultural Communication in Organisations) • HA (kom.)
12.00-12.45	About 4 external lecturers (EL or UA) from the following programmes: • HA Almen • cand.merc. (psyk) • cand.merc. (aud)
12.45-13.45 including lunch	Internal meeting between the panel and AI.
13.45-14.45	About 8 teachers/researchers (VIP) who are either course coordinators at courses with external lecturers (EL or UA) involved or contact persons for external lecturers (EL or UA) at the following programmes: • Cand.soc HRM • MA in International Business Communication (Multicultural Communication in Organisations) • HA (kom.) • HA Almen • cand.merc. (psyk) • cand.merc. (aud)
14.45-15.15	Break
15.15-16.00	Programme Directors for the following programmes: • HA Almen • cand.merc. (psyk) • cand.merc. (aud)
16.00-16.45	Programme Directors for the following programmes: • Cand.soc HRM • MA in International Business Communication (Multicultural Communication in Organisations) • HA (kom.) •
16.45-17.15	Internal meeting between the panel and AI.

Follow-up report on conditional

positive institutional accreditation – Copenhagen Business School

March 4	
Time	**Interview persons**
09.00-09.45	Heads of Department for: • Department of Finance • Department of Operations Management • Department of Organisation
09.45-10.30	Heads of Department for: • Department of International Business Communication • Department of Accounting and Auditing • Department of Intercultural Communication and Management
10.30-12.15	Internal meeting including lunch
12.15-13.15	Rector, Dean of Education, Dean of Research and other representatives of the top management of the institution
13.15-14.30	Internal meeting between the panel and AI..

The Danish
Accreditation Institution