

Quadrant 2 Environment

- Social/cultural/spiritual – how do we look after all of these aspects with true meaning within existing mission statements?
- Places of light and space – is this still a relevant vision for a business school or is it just a commercial venture?
- Virtuality – where does on-line or blended learning play a role? How does this enhance the environment? If our students want access 24/7 but not on campus how do we provide this?
- Permeable institutions – do we welcome outsiders? Or preserve exclusivity to ‘manage’ quality?
- Look and feel – what appeals to students/parents, old buildings, library facilities, SU areas etc.? Image is important.

Quadrant 3 Elegance

- Supportive regulations – are regulations fit for enhancing student engagement or actually barriers? Which ones make the most positive differences?
- Radical approaches – has the business school HEIs kept up with the demands of its students (and staff)? What does highly engaged performance for staff and students mean now? How is it defined in your context?
- Robust and simple – How lean are our processes? Would a new staff member be able to understand them, would a new student?
- PDCA, 6 Sigma, BPR – can any of these management techniques be applied to make the organisation function well?
- Stress tests – More elegant organisations have the capacity to ride out problems or change? Can you do this?
- QA/QC/QE – How do we define quality? How do our clients/students assure themselves of quality purely by adherence to codes?

Quadrant 4 Engagement

- Listen, understand and deliver – How do you listen to students? Mystery student shoppers?
- Set and hold manageable expectations – over promising is a big temptation, under delivery is a risk.
- Signpost and support – What do today’s students need more or different to the

support that those of 10 years ago needed? How do we resource ourselves to do it?

- Empower and partner with SU – Where and how does the SU contribute best?
- Trust vs rules – Do senior managers trust their leaders and academics to deliver? The less they do the more rules we will need to have. Rules don’t generally build much by way of engagement.

It could be that not all four quadrants are applicable everywhere and they probably cannot be the focus all at the same time. But the purpose of this paper is to stimulate thinking, discussion and hopefully take up of the model. At the start two perceived drivers for change were postulated:

- The fundamental relationship between provider, (academic institution and academics) and consumer (student) has changed with the advancement of marketization
- The role of the business school is under reconstruction in response to the demands and needs of funding providers and other stakeholders

It is hoped that the preceding commentary has unpacked some of the details behind these drivers and that the model that has been derived will address how business school managers can take their organisations forward and keep student engagement front of mind.

8. References

- [1] Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A., (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the student engagement instrument. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44, 427-445.
- [2] Appleton, J.J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J., (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in the schools*, 45, 369-386
- [3] Betts, J., Appleton, J. J., Reschly, A., Christenson, S. L., & Huebner, E.S., (2010). A study of the reliability and construct validity of the School Engagement Instrument across multiple grades. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 25, 84-93.
- [4] Bempechat, J., Shernoff, D. J., Li, J., Holloway, S. D., & Arendtsz A. L., (2012). Achievement beliefs and school engagement in low income adolescents; A mixed methods study. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Denver.
- [5] Brophy, J., (2005). Goal theorists should move on from performance goals. *Educational Psychologist*, 40, 167-176

- [6] Chickering, A. & Gamson, Z. (1987). Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education. *AAHE Bulletin*. Vol. 39, No. 7: 7.
- [7] Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., and Wiley, C., (2012), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement*, New York; Springer.
- [8] Christenson, S.L., (2008) January 22. Engaging students with school; The essential dimension of dropout prevention programs (Webinar) National Dropout Prevention Centre for Students with Disabilities.
- [9] Ellis, S., and Haines, C, (2012). 'Great e-expectations, using eportfolios to assess and engage undergraduates, challenges and opportunities. ABS/HEA Conference, Innovation in difficult times, Manchester.
- [10] Fredricks, J., McColskey W., Meli, J., Mordica, J., Montrosse, B., & Mooney, K., (2011). Measuring student engagement in upper elementary through high school; A description of 21 instruments (Issues and Answers Report REL 2011- No 098. Washington DC; US Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Centre for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- [11] Hidi, S. & Renninger, K.A. (2004). Interest, a motivational variable that combines affective and cognitive functioning. In D. Y. Dai & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Motivation, emotion, and cognition: Integrative perspectives on intellectual functioning and development*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [12] Holbeche, L., and Matthews, G., (2012), *Engaged*, Jossey Bass
- [13] Klem, A. M. & Connell, J. P. (2004) Relationships matter; Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health* 74. 262-282.
- [14] Lam, S., Wong, B. P. H., Yang, H., & Liu, Y., (2012). Understanding student engagement with a contextual model. In S.L. Christenson, A.L. Reschly & C., Wylie (Eds.) *Handbook of research on student engagement*(pp403-419), New York: Springer
- [15] Levesque, P., (1995) *The WOW factory*, London, Irwin
- [16] Maier, C., (2004) *Hello Laziness*, London, Orion Books
- [17] Mosher, R., & McGowan, B. (1985). *Assessing student engagement in secondary schools: alternative conceptions, strategies of assessing, and instruments*. University of Wisconsin Research and Development centre (ERIC document reproductive service No. ED272812).
- [18] Mulder, P., (2015). *Scientific Management and Taylorism*. Retrieved 23.02.18 from ToolsHero: <https://www.toolshero.com/quality-management/scientific-management/>
- [19] Newmann, F., Wehlage, G. G., & Lamborn, S.D. (1992). The significance and sources of student engagement. In F. Newman (Ed.). *Student engagement and achievement in American secondary schools*. (pp11-39). New York: Teachers College Press.
- [20] Pereira and Mullins, (2018), Seven drivers of learning, *Global Focus*, The EFMD Business Magazine, Iss 1 Vol 12.
- [21] Peters, T., (1992). *Liberation Management*, London BCA.
- [22] Peters, T. & Waterman, R., (1984), *In search of excellence*, London, Harper Collins
- [23] Rumberger, R.W., & Lim, S. A., (2008). Why students drop out of school; a review of 25 years of research (California Dropout Research Project Report # 15). University of California Santa Barbara
- [24] Semler, R., (1993), *Maverick!* London; Random House.
- [25] Skinner, E., Furrer, C., Marchand, G., & Kinderman, T., (2008). Engagement and disaffection in the classroom; Part of a larger motivational dynamic? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100, 765-781
- [26] Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R., (2012). Developmental dynamics of student engagement coping and everyday resilience. In S.L. Christenson, A.L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp21-44), New York; Springer.
- [27] Willetts, D., (2017). *A university education*, Oxford, OUP.
- [28] Wylie, C., & Hodgen, E., (2012). Trajectories and patterns of student engagement; Evidence from a longitudinal study. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly & C. Wylie (Eds) *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp585-599) New York; Springer.
- [29] Russell, V. J., Ainley, M., & Frydenberg, E. (2005). *Student motivation and engagement. Schooling Issues Digest*. Australian Government, Department of Education, Science and Training.