

Helsinki University Change Review

Beyond the Changes:

The effects of, and lessons from, the downsizing and restructuring process of 2015-2017

From: Professor Sue Scott Chair of the Helsinki University Change Review Group

To: The University of Helsinki

October 2017

Contents

Acknowledgements

Preface

1. Introduction

2. The Review Methodology

3. The University of Helsinki in the context of Higher Education in the 21st century

4. The Feedback and Discussion

- The process of reducing staff numbers
- The centralization of the administration
- The 'Big Wheel'
- Faculties, 'Departments' and Disciplines
- A Comment on Communication

5. The Way Forward – Reflections and Recommendations

Appendix 1

Change Review Group Members

Appendix 2

List of Hearings, Group Discussions and Interviews

Appendix 3

Numbers and Distribution of Comments via the Website and email

Appendix 4

A detailed discussion of the Matrix Model of Administration

Annex i

Professor Green's Paper

Annex ii

The Formal Process Paper from HR

Annex iii

The Cooperation Process

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues on the Review Group (Mr Arnold Boon, Professor Lesley Yellowlees and Professor Mari Walls) for their hard work, expertise, insight and contribution to this report. Thanks are also due to: all of the staff and students of the University of Helsinki who gave their time to speak and write to us; the University Board, and the Senior Management Team for agreeing to have a review process; the Rector, and the Senior Management team for being open and welcoming throughout the process. Acknowledgement is due to Professor Sarah Green for having the idea for the review in the first instance.

Finally special thanks to Juha Hurme for his unfailing efficiency and support to the review process and for ensuring that we were comfortable, well fed, and in the correct place at the correct time.

Preface

The establishment of the Helsinki University Change Review (HUCR) was instigated by a paper written by Professor Sarah Green (available as Annex i) requesting that a process be put in place to help the University to recover, and move on, from the major changes that occurred in 2015/16 and in particular the downsizing (see Annex iii). This request was accepted by the Board and the Senior Management Team, and a Review Group was established towards the end of 2016 with myself as its chair (see Appendix 1). The Helsinki University Change Review Group (HUCRG) had two separate, but interconnected, tasks. The first was to give members of the University the opportunity to reflect on, and either speak or write about, their experiences concerning, the University's change process. The second was to draw on this testimony, and on other documentation, and information from interviews, in order to give feedback on the views about, and the lessons to be learnt, from the change process. The HUCR Group was established as an independent body with extensive experience of leadership, strategy and change management in Higher Education. Its members were drawn from four countries and from a range of disciplines and areas of expertise. The Group undertook the work on a consultancy basis, with a clear agreement that the review process, and the report arising from it, would be entirely independent of any group or body within the University of Helsinki and that the report would be written for and disseminated to the whole University community.

Professor Sue Scott
October 2017

1. Introduction

Myself and the other members of the Group were very pleased to be invited to undertake the Review of the changes at the University of Helsinki, we understood that it would be a complex and at times challenging task and this has indeed proved to be the case. This review has been much more than a dipstick enquiry into outcomes but, on the other hand, the constraints of time did not allow for a full blow organizational ethnography. We have been able to explore some issues in depth and others less so. We hope however, that all areas of the University community, if not all its members, have been represented in the pages of this report.

There will be some people who feel that they have not had their say, and we are sorry if this is the case. We did receive some feedback that the Review and the related meetings had not been sufficiently widely communicated. As will be stressed elsewhere in this report, communication is rarely sufficient for everybody and especially so in the context of a situation such as the change process where staff felt that they were not fully informed. It is likely that some staff expected the Review to be a 'managed' process rather than a fully open one. The irony is that while it was the clear intention that the Review process should be communicated as widely as possible the practicalities were sometimes challenging due to the restructuring process itself and the lack of new email lists etc. However, we are confident that a wide range of opportunities were afforded to staff to enable them to take part and that we heard the views of staff across the whole University.

Also, the accounts we have been given are so consistent we think we have gained a clear and representative picture.

Put simply, the University of Helsinki seemed to be a rather confused place during our visits and there was a good deal of anxiety and some obvious unhappiness. The strong image that has emerged from listening to staff and students is the shift from the idea of the University as 'Our University' to its more distant representation as 'The University'. Often the term 'The University' is used to refer to the senior management. This kind of shift has been experienced in the HE sector elsewhere perhaps especially in the UK where academic staff are more likely to identify with their discipline, nationally and internationally, than with the University in which they currently work. In the UK context academics move around a good deal, and this has been the case for many years, whereas a post at the University of Helsinki has been the acme of achievement for both academics and university administrators in Finland. Certainly my own experience of the University of Helsinki prior to undertaking this review was that it was a place where academics were very pleased to work and where, in the main, they felt valued and well supported. The problem was that there weren't enough academic posts to satisfy the demand rather than any restless desire to move to somewhere 'better'.

It could be said that a process such as this Review was bound to bring the disaffected to the fore and to illicit more negative than positive comments. We have two responses to this. First, we had concerns that this might be the case and that is why

we designed a process which would allow people to communicate with us in a number of different ways: In public hearings, in small meetings, one to one, via email and via a completely confidential website. It is well known that people who are satisfied respond less in such contexts, and it is also possible that some people would not wish to speak against the tide in open meetings, and that others just didn't want to talk about it anymore. However, given the nature of the review and the range of opportunities to respond we felt that if people had positive things to say then they would feel able to do so. Indeed we have had some positive comments and we have also comments from those who accepted that drastic changes were necessary, but who didn't like the way they had occurred, or didn't agree with the form they took. However the 'positive' comments made up less than 5% of the total.

Secondly, while there could be ongoing debate about biases in the feedback we received, what our discussions and the written comments make clear is that several hundred employees across the University of Helsinki are some combination of unhappy, angry, disappointed, anxious or frustrated and this is a situation which needs to be taken very seriously indeed.

There was a view, primarily from the senior management team that the majority of the criticisms were coming from the Central Campus. While we might expect 'critical' disciplines to be more critical of management hierarchies and decision making perceived as undemocratic, it was certainly not the case that staff on the other three campuses were happy with the situation and, indeed equally vociferous criticisms were offered from across the whole University. However, it is the case that the staff on the Central Campus felt that they were being fitted into a model more suited to the STEM areas of the University and that because of the nature of teaching and research in the social sciences and humanities some of the changes raised particular problems in these areas.

Of course the balance of numbers in our feedback has been with the staff rather than the senior management, but we have also had a number of discussions with the Rectorate and feel we have a clear sense of what their aims and objectives, for the change process, were as well as their hopes and vision for the University. It is important to note that they are also, to some extent, disappointed, frustrated and concerned about the difficulties of the change process. They feel that they have been trying to do the best thing for the University in a very difficult financial context and under the pressure of increased demands from Government in relation to the student experience and its outcomes as well as dealing with the pressures to perform well in the University Rankings in order to reap the rewards of being seen as an excellent global university.

The University of Helsinki is far too large and complex for there just to be two simple opposing positions or for anyone person (even the Rector) to have an in-depth overview of the whole organization. The Review Group feels that we have been in a privileged position and have been able to develop an overview, but we wouldn't pretend to understand, or be able to make recommendations relating to all aspects of the organization. In what follows we will attempt to set the scene for what has

happened at the University of Helsinki in a wider context and then to explore the main issues that have been raised with us. We will then go on to reflect on the change processes and to make the recommendations about how some matters might be addressed, ways in which the University can move on from this very difficult period and hopefully, ensure that any changes, however challenging, are undertaken and experienced in a more constructive and collegial way in the future.

2. The Review Methodology

Between January and June 2017 the members of the Review Group held four open meetings, one on each of the University's four campuses attended by around 100 people, and meetings with over 60 people with a wide range of roles and responsibilities across the University as well as 17 group discussions with around 80 academics and administrators (see Appendix 2). We received written submissions from over 400 individuals (see Appendix 3). On the basis of this information, along with documents relevant to the change processes and other background information, and in conjunction with our own expertise and understanding of current debates and issues in the Higher Education sector in Finland, and more widely, we have developed a view of the University of Helsinki's change process and its aftermath which is discussed in this report. In the report we draw out the dominant themes presented to us and illustrate these through the use of, unattributed, direct quotations and indicating whether these encapsulate either a majority or a minority view. Many more quotations could have been included, but the report would then have been even longer than it is.

We began all of the hearings by explaining who we were and what we were doing and by assuring people that they could speak to us in confidence and that if we did refer to or quote anything that they said then we would ensure that they remained anonymous. We aimed to create a friendly and collegial atmosphere and were left with the impression that in the main people were being open with us despite the fact that we were told by some people that they had been worried about speaking out in other contexts, as they feared for their jobs. We spoke to a very wide range of individuals and groups (see Appendix 2)

The only significant group of people to whom we did not speak were those who had been 'sacked'. While some of them attended the open meetings and several people who had been re-employed came to meet with us we didn't try to contact those who had left the University. This was in the main because they are no longer employees of the University and we didn't feel that we had the right to track them down and secondly if we did it they might find it very upsetting and finally, while we wanted to understand how people felt about what had happened we also wanted to focus on the future of the University community – on how to move forward.

In line with our first task we set out to listen to what staff had to say only asking questions for clarification or to encourage further comment rather than to lead the discussion in any particular direction. We simply said that we wanted to know what they thought about the change process: the staff reductions, the centralization of administration and the Big Wheel and how the different aspects of the process had affected them.

It was quite challenging to listen to so many people who were obviously distressed, anxious and in some cases angry, but the feedback so far has been that many people found it useful. Some were cynical about whether our report would make any

difference and, of course, we could give no guarantee that it would, but we did make people aware that we would not shy away from saying challenging things.

3. The University of Helsinki in the context of Higher Education in the 21st century

Until the change in the law in 2009 the University of Helsinki was a state institution albeit one with a good deal of autonomy over the form and content of its core activities of research and teaching. Historically Professors had a good deal of power and influence over their discipline and also over the decision making across the wider University. Academics were elected by, their peers, to the positions of Rector, Vice Rector and Dean. While Helsinki has had a Board for governance purposes since 2009 the University Collegium has continued to be influential.

It is this engagement in what is described as 'democratic' decision making that many of the academics across the University feel has been replaced in recent years by a more 'top down' process. It is understandable that there is a strong sense of loss and of the end of what many believe to be the 'very idea of a University'. The changes have been extremely rapid since 2009. The University seems to have accelerated through a process of change, in the last five years, which has occurred over 35 years in the UK. These changes have included: ceasing to be a state institution; a different and more centralized management structure; the possibility of privatizing some functions – Estates for example; staff cuts, the pressure to find funding from non government sources and an internationalization strategy to name but some. It is important that staff and students understand that the recent change process part of the wider transformation of the Higher Education sector across Europe and not something particular to Finland or indeed to the University of Helsinki.

The UK as a Comparative Case Study

Many would argue that the development of the management hierarchy, the increase in the audit culture relating to research (REF) and teaching (TEF), the pressure to operate as a businesses, alongside the introduction of student fees have damaged the very heart of University culture and works against the idea of academic freedom and of the importance of learning for its own sake. However, there have been some positive developments within this challenging framework:

There has been a much greater standardization and transparency in both the recruitment of students and of staff, leading to imperfect, but much improved diversity within UK Universities. Professors, can no longer ensure that lectureships go to their protégés, rather there are clear guidelines for how interview committees are constituted and how shortlists are drawn up, and HR are involved throughout the process. This level of regulation also applies to the promotions process. Alongside this there has also been much more standardization in the level and assessment of courses and much more information provided to students. It is no longer acceptable to simply provide a long reading list regardless of whether the material is available, or whether students can afford to buy the book. There is equity in credits both within and across programmes of study, and students are entitled to expect appropriate and timely feedback. In many UK Universities prior to these changes Departments ran as mini fiefdoms and organizing teaching across disciplines

was extremely challenging – credits didn't correspond and timetables could not be coordinated.

Of course some of the developments have brought with them, what might be seen, as excessive bureaucracy and a tick box response at times, but they have also helped to embed expectations about equity and parity for both students and academic staff. However these positive changes are more closely linked to changes in legislation and to the standardization of procedures than they are to changes in University leadership and governance.

Alongside these changes the UK has led in Europe on the development of audit and assessment in relation to both teaching and research. Again there have been positive aspects with more support available, especially for research development and acknowledgment and promotion on the basis of actual outcomes and outputs rather than on reputation – an increase in transparency leading to greater equity. However there are negative aspects such as pressure to capture research funding without sufficient acknowledgment of the differential availability of and indeed requirement for money in different disciplinary fields.

Pressure has come from central government for Universities to be more business like, with less reliance on taxpayers money, which in turn has created pressures to attract higher numbers of international students paying considerable fees and more recently greater competition for UK undergraduates as they also attract money from the government in lieu of fees to be paid back in the future. Academics are expected to diversify their activities in order to attract more resource from the private sector which, in some disciplines more than others, detracts from, rather adding to, core academic activities. With the development of research assessment have come greater pressures to publish with the aim of attaining a high score, which is paradoxically often translated into pressure to publish more, rather than better work. Rankings and leagues tables have become increasingly important to University leaders – as elsewhere in the world – and Universities are pitted against each other rather than being collaborators. There has also been a tendency to increasingly value STEM disciplines (and Business Schools, where they are seen as successful), more highly than Humanities and Social Sciences which, coupled with the fact that senior University leaders are more likely to have a background in science, means that all areas of the University are expected to fit the STEM model in relation to research grant capture and journal hierarchies. There has, in many cases, been a loss of support for a broad definition of a University as a place where critical thinking is engendered and knowledge valued across the whole spectrum.

All of this has occurred in the context of an increasingly individualized and monetized view of the value of higher education, by Government, which reached its apotheosis in the 2017 Higher Education and Research Act which has opened up the way for the expansion of private provision, of higher education, including by international businesses.

Could things be different?

There has been a tendency to confuse and conflate these 'neo-liberal' moves with the development of the audit culture. While excessive evaluation and assessment can certainly be counter productive it is not necessarily in itself a bad thing. Universities are still largely publically funded in the European context and, as public institutions, can be seen as having a responsibility to produce public value, just as a publically funded health or welfare system would be. For discussion of the shift from new public management to public value see [Moore and Khagram](#). Seeing the creation of public value as the role of a University should entail strong internal and externally facing qualities; the evaluation of research and teaching; efficient administrative processes and financial probity. This model seems likely to be more appropriate in the Finnish context than is the US business model. Indeed there is evidence that 'social democratic' systems outperform US Higher Education see [St Aubyn](#). Standing still is clearly not an option for Universities, in the current climate so it is important that Helsinki review the potential models and choose the one which best suits the University's situation and circumstances.

4. The Feedback from Staff and Students

Introduction

'Management thinks that they are over the change period, but many staff are still in the middle of grasping and adapting to the change process'

A large number of the respondents made general comments about the overall change process and there was a strong view that too many fundamental changes had taken place at the same time, that the process was overly centralized, that the University Leadership were not sufficiently visible during the process, and that when they were the main purpose was to transmit information rather than to engage in dialogue. There was frustration that there had been no clear means for staff to participate in the change processes and that the voices of staff had not been heard. While it was sometimes acknowledged that there was a good deal of information about what was happening there was also much criticism of the internal communications and of Flamma as the main means of transmitting information. On a more positive note a small number of people felt that change was necessary and overdue, as there had been too much inefficiency and the University of Helsinki was insufficiently focused on supporting cutting edge research.

The process of reducing staff numbers:

While there were positive comments along the lines of the University leadership taking measures immediately and pro-actively, with regard to the budget cuts, the overwhelming majority both of the people we spoke to and those who responded in writing held negative views about the process. Even the positive comments were sometimes tempered by concerns:

'Positive thing- we still have 80% of the staff working here, we have excellent IT and a good library. We are not desperate, but we still have to believe in it.'

The overwhelming feeling was one of shock and of finding it difficult to accept that such a thing could happen at the University of Helsinki. Most people had found it very stressful and tiring and felt that it was a very long drawn-out process. Some respondents felt that the process had not been clearly explained and some were very angry about colleagues losing their jobs, especially about the way in which they learnt that this was the case and the perceived lack of empathy from some managers. There was a good deal of discussion about the breakdown of pre-existing structures and processes, which were seen as having been democratic, and a concomitant breakdown of trust:

'The main problem has been the sense of loss of control and loss of ownership of the university.'

People spoke about the lack of discussion of alternatives to the staff cuts and a large number of responses can be summed up by the following comment:

'I would have liked to have better grounds and justification for the downsizing of personnel. Was there really a need to downsize so quickly? People were affected and offended by the process, and will also be so in the future. There was no dialogue between the leadership and the academic community. The 1000 dollar question is how to regain this trust'

Recurring themes were: lack of transparency, lack of leadership and criticism of the way in which the people who were 'fired' were dealt with. Many people felt that they had been kept in the dark for a long time about how the staff changes would be made and this meant that many people were in fear for their jobs for many months and yet expected to get on with 'business as usual'. There was also confusion about the process of redeploying staff who had been 'fired' and several people said that they found it both shocking and ironic that new people were hired on short term contracts to fill the gaps left by those who were seen as dispensable.

Communication was seen as central to the difficulties that staff were continuing to have with the process:

'With these large changes you need a genuine dialogue, which is difficult without democratic bodies where these dialogues can happen'

There was a widespread view that there was a lack of engagement.

'The biggest problem has been the lack of transparency; we do not know what is going on and what has been decided. We do not have the data or the information and therefore we cannot decide whether the process is good or not'

'Nobody knows how much taxpayers money the University has used last year. We do not have the numbers, we just got presented the budgets, but we have no information about the budgets last years, how the money flows. We can see many building projects, but we don't have the information on how much is spent on buildings and maintenance for example. If we had these data we could better understand the situation.'

Discussion:

The University Board and the Senior Management team were clearly under a good deal of pressure as a result of the Government of Finland's decision in May 2015 to cut funding to the University Sector across the years 2016-2020. It is important to appreciate the reasoning that it can be better to make rapid savings by cutting back on staff and aiming to recover as quickly as possible rather than go through a slower and potentially even more demoralizing and demotivating process of cutting budgets across the board, or of cutting courses which still have to be taught for several years because of student registrations. The plans, which were already under development in 2015, to centralize and professionalize the administration with the attendant aim of streamlining activities and reducing overlap created a context in which reducing administrative staff numbers was attractive. In the Finnish University context where there are relatively few academic staff on permanent contracts it is very difficult to

significantly reduce academic staff without seriously undermining whole areas of teaching and research. Thus, the decision that the burden of staff reductions would fall disproportionately on administrative and professional services, was understandable. It is important to note however, that this did also mean that the majority of those who lost their jobs were women, due to the continuing gendered nature of administrative roles.

While the Review Group tends to agree with the principle of restructuring and recovery rather than a slow drawn out process of making savings, we do have concerns about whether sufficient time was taken to work through the rationale and to plan systematically before cutting so deeply.

The situation was particularly problematic for the University community because there was no precedent for cutting staff in this way and it would not have been possible prior to the new University law in 2009. Prior to this change the University was a state institution where staff had more or less the same status and job security as civil servants. The University is now a public institution with financial matters and governance being the responsibility of the Board and the Senior Management Team. These changes are still relatively recent and the implications of the change have not always been well understood by staff. There is a view that the University is no longer a public body in any sense but has become a private body and therefore is more like a business. Despite these legislative changes the University is still highly dependent on public money, but is under pressure to reduce this dependence.

It is always very important to handle budget cuts, especially when jobs are under threat, with the utmost delicacy and this was even more necessary in a context where there was no prior experience of redundancies and job losses. It is clear to us that the University management did follow a clearly specified legal process, in both their decision-making, and in carrying out the reductions in personnel. However, it is also clear to us that the general lack of understanding of the process by the wider University and some of the specific practices within this process have left deep scars and widespread mistrust of the University Senior Management, which will take time and careful leadership to heal. This is the case even where there was acceptance that cuts had to be made and is even more entrenched among those who cannot accept the rationale for such drastic cuts in the first place.

At the heart of this chasm between the senior team and many of the staff is the issue of communication. There seems to have been a fundamental confusion - one that is not uncommon - between information and communication, and also about what information it was possible to put into the public domain. Many staff seem not to have understood why it was not possible to provide more detailed information about the criteria of selecting staff to be 'sacked' or about who had been 'sacked' and why. It seems likely that this is because senior management had no prior experience of explaining the legal process involved and nor did the human resources team or the trades unions. Having said this, it does seem that basic information about the legal time frame and the need for confidentiality should have been further

clarified and reinforced. The lack of a clear understanding of this process is likely to have increased anxiety and the sense of mistrust.

Even though there are things that cannot be said in the context of a redundancy process it is still important to communicate regularly with staff and to allay, wherever possible, the sense that everybody is vulnerable. It is of course necessary at the beginning of a process such as this to declare the maximum number of posts that might be at risk in order to make the necessary savings. The initial statement was that the University needed to lose 1200 FTEs by 2020. It is not entirely clear why this number was so high, except that it was related to the possible threat of further government cuts and also to the potential (now actual) loss of revenue from the Helsinki University Pharmacy (Apteekkimaksu) as a result of changes in the tax situation arising from the change in the University Law. Once it was obvious that further 'sackings' would not be necessary this information was made available, but not necessarily believed.

It is easy to be wise after the event, but it is our view that the University Board and Senior Management should have looked more closely at Universities which had gone through similar redundancy processes in order to learn about the pitfalls and to understand how best to avoid them. There are certainly plenty of examples in the UK. Given the general lack of experience it might also have been wise to have appointed an external, experienced project leader with an internal 'task force' to oversee the whole process and to support HR and the line managers who had the difficult task of conveying bad news to staff. This would have ensured that everyone involved was clearly briefed, operating within the same time scale and communicating the same information. While there certainly *should* have been very clear criteria for deciding which staff could be 'let go' we have the impression that this information was not always disseminated clearly. The HUCRG received a number of communications that suggest that at least some staff were not given any clear explanation as to why they had been selected. In our experience it is generally posts that are selected for redundancy rather than individuals. In a stable organization which has to downsize then decisions are made about how many staff are needed at any given grade and then criteria are drawn up in order to decide who will stay and who will go. However, because the budget cuts coincided with the process of moving towards a centralized administration, and indeed accelerated this process, then it seems that a straightforward matching process was not possible.

While we appreciate that there is no good way to inform staff that they are going to lose their jobs we do have concerns about the way that this happened. Effectively, it seems, staff did find out by email, because they had been told that if they received an email inviting them to a meeting with a manager then they were to be 'sacked' this would not have been quite so problematic if the meetings had always happened very quickly after the email, but this was not practicable and in some cases it seems that there was a gap as long as two weeks. While there are only certain things that can be said to a member of staff in a formal meeting of this kind, there are better and worse ways of setting out the situation, and it does seem that the communication was sometimes rather clumsy. We understand that Deans and

Directors and other managers involved had received some training in relation to how to conduct these meetings, but this was brief and they had no prior experience to fall back on. We also understand that there is always a set timescale for such a process and no one can be told anything until the appropriate stage. However, it does seem to us that in some cases the process was further protracted due to the sheer number of meetings to be held and also because some managers simply put it off because it was such an unpleasant task thus there was not always common practice in different areas of the University – especially across Faculties. The implications of these problems in the process are that managers were, in some cases, insufficiently prepared and insufficiently supported.

It is understandable that staff found it difficult to understand when people whose contracts have been terminated are reappointed to other posts in the University and the legal process here needs to be explained very clearly. Also it needs to be explained that, in the interim, other colleagues leave and therefore vacancies occur and some posts must be filled. However, it does seem that in some cases people were reappointed into roles extremely like the ones from which they had been removed a few months earlier – usually on a temporary basis. Now while there may have been good reasons for this it only takes one or two such cases for the word to spread and for this to make it seem that poor decisions had been taken and employees caused unnecessary distress – this is where even more communication is necessary – there can never be too much and it is never enough. It is important to use a variety of communication methods and never to underestimate the value of genuine face-to face communication, as opposed to ‘set piece’ information sessions.

The Centralization of the Administration:

The University administration was reorganized in 2016 into a matrix organization now called University Services. Previously there was a divisional structure with administration at the level of the University, the Faculties and the Departments. In the new matrix organization there are central administrative departments at the university level and administrative teams on each of the four campuses.

The senior management team argued that the previous structure was too 'fragmented' and needed to be more user orientated, more professionalized and to have improved process development. The original goal, however, was to professionalize administration through specialization and competence and to address the fact that as administrative staff had limited career options (see the results of the occupational well-being survey in 2013). However, as a result of the Government cuts, in 2016 the University of Helsinki reduced the number of administrative staff from approx. 1.150 to approx. 800 FTE, and while some staff resigned voluntarily or retired, and temporary administrative staff contracts were not renewed the majority of the downsizing was through dismissals. So, the budget cuts changed the goals of the administrative restructuring programme because senior management believed that it would be impossible to downsize administration within the original organizational structure. For further detail see Annex ii and Annex iii.

Prior to the administrative restructuring programme, the University of Helsinki had very few standardized procedures and the Faculties had to a large extent developed their own processes. An internal administrative benchmark indicated very different levels of administrative support across the faculties.

Senior management considered different administrative models in order to address these issues:

1. Administration at the faculty level and university level (*i.e. administrative staff at the faculty level continues to report to the dean*)
2. Administration at the campus level and university level (*i.e. administrative staff at the campus level report to the deans at the campus*)
3. Administration in one organization (*i.e. all administrative staff report to the director of administration*).

The organizational structure, which has been implemented, is a mix of models two and three i.e. all administrative staff are part of one organization, University Services, with report to the Director of Administration, but a part of University Services is located as an on-site service at each of the four campuses. Prior to the implementation there was information about all the options on the Intranet. The University also held 'pop-up' workshops that were open to anyone and comments from the workshops were published. Senior management emphasized that the administrative change programme is long-term process and that this was not the final stage. Moreover, senior management believed that the new structure was

more adaptable and future proof and that as a result of this change any future changes in the academic structure would be easier to implement, because the academic structure would no longer be dependent on the administrative structure - due to the movement away from a decentralized model with strong links between the local academic and administrative structure.

We have received many comments, from staff and students across the University, about the administrative restructuring and downsizing. Most of the comments were critical, although some also have acknowledged that some of the changes would in the end bring improvement. Some thought, for example that the new structure would provide career opportunities for service staff and a small number of people were of the view that the new structure was already proving to be more efficient and professional.

The feedback we received can be categorized around a number of themes:

The process of restructuring and downsizing

Many of the respondents criticized the process of the simultaneous restructuring and downsizing of the university administration. A number of people pointed out that centralization had been under discussion for some time, but that nothing had happened and they didn't see why it then had to be pushed through so quickly. Many people felt that the process caused a great deal of uncertainty and had hindered rather than improved service provision. There was much criticism of the recruitment process for the new services with an overall lack of transparency. These comments underline the lack of understanding of the process of making the cuts and the fact that undertaking the restructuring in parallel made it possible to create a situation where there would be fewer posts than in the previous administration and therefore some people would not have a job. As this wasn't clear it was hard for some people to find any justification for what they experienced as confusing and chaotic.

I applied for three positions and was selected for none of those. No interviews, no justification, no discussion.

According to the HR-department, both administrative leaders and staff lost their jobs, although faculty and administrators believed that only administrative staff were let go, while all administrative leaders kept their jobs. In January 2016, the Director of Administration selected the administrative leaders for the new Central University Service. A few months later these leaders selected their staff from 'pools' of administrative staff. For example, the new staff in the 'study administration' were selected from lists of staff, who had previously worked with study administration. If the administrative leaders could not reach the required number of staff within a specific administrative area, they could select staff with other competences. In that way, the administrative restructuring process did take into account the skills and competences of the staff. Nevertheless, we encountered a number of examples of unclear or fuzzy hiring criteria as well as staff who felt less than competent in their

new functions, and staff who had been appointed into roles that they didn't really want and didn't feel they were qualified to undertake.

'It has been an experiment that administrators have been moved to other jobs, even though they didn't want these jobs, but its better than unemployment. Furthermore they have been put in open space offices. So these things together have been severe for efficiency.'

A central intention of the administrative restructuring was to change administrative staff from generalists to specialists in order to provide a better, more professional, administrative service. Several Faculty members did acknowledge that the administrative processes were becoming better organized, and that now administrative staff can cover for colleagues in case of absence due to illness or holidays, or in the case of vacancies. Some also acknowledge that the administration has become more professional. However, several administrators complained that the administrative work had become more one-dimensional (*i.e. specialized*), and that while they had previously been responsible for several administrative tasks now their work had become more repetitive and standardized.

Staff qualifications

One of the basic ideas of the new administrative structure was to have more specialized administrative staff. However, several administrators stated that the administrative leaders had selected their staff on the basis of broad, rather than specialist qualifications. Furthermore, many respondents mentioned that the administrative restructuring and downsizing had a long transition period with a malfunctioning university administration, partly because the administrators in many cases lacked training in their new positions. Many administrators were transferred to new positions that differed substantially from their old ones but seem to have received very little training. Others we spoke to mentioned that a lot of the tacit and historical knowledge and experience were lost in the restructuring and downsizing process. So while some inefficient ways of working may well have been eliminated important local knowledge has been lost and new inefficiencies have occurred as staff attempted to work around problems and gaps.

'It has not been so severe as it could have been, because administrators that have been appointed to new jobs, also still do their old job. Then they also do somebody's other jobs because many administrators that have been move do not know their new tasks. It is not sustainable that administrators have gotten new titles and new responsibilities, but still doing their old jobs.'

Some of the Academics did acknowledge that, because of the professional service model, administrators now have more colleagues in the same team and therefore more opportunities to learn from others. They don't believe that the university administration has improved in terms of the quality of the service, but some do acknowledge that it has become more efficient in that it uses less resource to provide the same output. Some administrators did also acknowledge that there is

better peer support, greater expertise and better career opportunities in the new administrative organization.

Workload

Both administrative staff and academics complained about a tremendous increase in workload after the restructuring and downsizing which had resulted in a high level of stress and an increased level of sickness absence, which, in turn, increased the workload for the remaining staff. Many administrators complained about the lack of a clear strategy, from Senior Management and Directors of Services, on which to base the reduction of administrative tasks after the downsizing. In other words, what should administrators stop doing? Administrators' experienced 20% staff reductions without any obvious reduction in workload, added to which new practices and processes were being put in place, which needed to be adjusted to. Many administrators explained that they had to prioritize on a daily and ad hoc basis in order to cope. On the other hand several comments were made to the effect that the administration had never previously experienced any productivity demands and had never before experienced any staff reductions. Some administrators felt that, in the past, academics had viewed administration as an unlimited resource, whereas many academics complained that they now had to do a great deal of administration.

'Due to no longer having the same level of admin support we (my PhD students, post-docs and me as groups leader) are now spending many hours a month performing tasks that have nothing to do with teaching and research.'

'I got the impression that professors were (roughly speaking of course) being paid twice as much to do administrative work half as well in double the time.'

We also explored the administrative processes at the decentralized level of the campus services and found that these seem to be more clearly set out and differentiated than those at the Centre. Furthermore, there was widespread experience amongst administrators and academics of a top-down approach to administrative procedures rather than a bottom-up best practice approach.

Study administration

Several students and academics commented specifically on the situation with regard to study administration. While some thought it was working well, in general the students said that most counsellors seemed not really to be able to help students and the counsellors felt overworked with too many students to service. Prior to the restructuring the student counsellors had been specialized and trained in specific disciplines, whereas in the new system they are generalists and have to be able to advise students from many disciplines. Students were experiencing administrative problems, such as lack of credit registration and consequently, some students could not continue on to Master's programmes, because they did not have enough registered credits, while others thought they would not be able to graduate because the processes were not complete. In addition, several students had not received their course information before the start date and this created a risk of missing lectures and assessments. In general, there seems to have been a good deal of

confusion because the people who the students had been used to contacting had been moved to other roles or had been dismissed.

Academics explained that the planning of teaching had been a shared task between academics and administrators, but that now it had become 'nobody's job'. Study programme directors in particular were vociferous about not having any direct administrative support.

There were several academics who felt that the centralization of study administration was positive, because the administrators would be more professional, but on the other hand they found that other administrative services had become too bureaucratic and that hierarchical control had increased. Furthermore, they found that too many administrators were involved in even simple administrative processes, such as appointing staff.

Working in the new administrative structure

Many respondents complained that the restructuring and downsizing had been a confusing period, but some were confident that the situation would get better, not because of the new administrative structure, but because of the administrative staff would find new ways of working together, bypassing the official procedures and making things work.

Many faculty members and administrators particularly regretted that administrative staff members are not any integral to academic departments and areas as they were in the past. We were frequently told that academics and administrators used to regard each other as 'colleagues' and had good daily interaction, but that in the new administrative structure this was no longer possible because of physical distance and more specific roles and responsibilities. Respondents claimed that 'a wall has been built between the two groups', and many now talk about 'us' and 'them', an expression that had previously been reserved for the old central administration. Some academics felt that a centralized administration could work as long as the 'connections' were respected.

'The admin teams at the Faculty are located together but behind 'closed doors', so there is a lack of communication between admin staff and academics.'

A number of academics complained that 'silo behavior' has increased after the administrative restructuring whereas the goal of the new structure was to remove borders between Finance, HR, study administration, etc. not the opposite. This was seen as critical, as certain administrative tasks require a good deal of cooperation, but this is less likely to happen when staff are unsettled and anxious about their roles. We also received feedback about a latent power struggle between, on the one hand the Directors of Services, and on the other the heads of development (i.e. campus coordinators who have to liaise between the needs of the academics and the different administrative services/lines). The administrative service directors seem to have power over the heads of development, while the heads of development seem to have a better understanding of the needs at the campus. In

such situations, the administrative staff may experience conflicts of interest and contradictory pressures and in Campus administration some felt that they had to choose between loyalty to the Central Service or meeting the needs of their service users. We found that staff were experiencing a lack of communication and coordination, and wanted more and better leadership.

'The director (of a service department) is not visible to the staff, because in the hierarchy she deals with the next level of managers while in turn deal with the staff. Such work culture goes both ways to the staff are not supposed to approach anyone senior directly. If this medieval culture is not followed there will be resentment. No prioritizations have been done so the staff have to take care of the same workload with a smaller headcount'

'The resources are too scarce, the persons who are new in their jobs do not know enough and the overall attitude is arrogant from the top'

Expectations about administrative services

We received many comments about the service that students and academics expect from administration. In general, they want face-to-face service, and therefore, many students and academics regretted that administrative staff had been moved away from Departments and Faculties, and that academics and administrative now hardly ever meet anymore.

'We centralize admin, but normally academics, students, technicians and admin staff form a community. That means that centralization as in 'big is better' does not work at the University'

Academics also complained that they have to mail to a central mailbox for administrative service requests instead of contacting individual administrators. They also complained that they often receive a standard mail reply, and that they are uncertain whether their service request has been received and will be handled. Academics complained that the administrative restructuring has created a helpdesk-culture on the expense of proximity of administrative staff to faculty, with an increased expectation that academics would solve the problem themselves, but the academics did not accept that this was the solution, but they found it often very unclear where to ask for service.

'We had a good system, but now we have to 'hunt' who have to do the job.'

Another complaint concerns the basic idea that an administrator has to be able to find out who can help if they can't. However, many administrators have to say that 'it is not their job' because the administrative structure still seems to be unclear, leaving the administrative task unsolved. Yet another complaint is that, departments, and some individual, professors used to have secretaries but they have been moved to central administrative services. All these examples result in academics saying that they now have to do more administrative work.

Academics also told us that the university's financial system was not functioning properly and that shadow systems have developed that differ from the official records. Financial managers used to support academic leaders but now they have been moved to central teams, and hence, the academic areas no longer access to these services. We also received complaints about a number of new IT systems being introduced at the same time as the other changes which caused many problems. So while some academics did acknowledge that University Services should be more professional and more standardized their experience in practice was that the simultaneous administrative restructuring and downsizing had sometimes resulted in catastrophic situations.

Discussion:

The Review Group understood and appreciated the motivation for centralization in order to professionalize the service functions and we would also stress the importance of ensuring equity in relation to grades and activities and, very importantly, in relation to practices across the institution. We consider that for too long in the HE sector administrative and service staff have been seen as the 'helpmeets' of academics, which is particularly problematic because most of them were (and are) women, and that insufficient consideration was given to their professional and career development. In the past it would not be unusual for one individual to remain in post as a secretary, in one academic department, for most if not all of her (sic) working life.

In what follows we are not only drawing on the criticisms which we have heard and read from the staff, but also on our own considerable experiences of University administration and various forms of organization and re-organization processes elsewhere. Much of the criticism coming from UH administrative staff could be seen as directly linked to the staff reductions and to the actual process of restructuring as we heard that some felt that they had been shoehorned into roles which they would not have chosen. Whereas the complaints from the academics were often a result of dealing with change itself – not knowing where to go for support and to some extent to no longer being 'in charge' of 'their' administrators. These problems could well be characterized as 'teething troubles' and be expected to settle down within a few months or at the most after working through one academic cycle with the new arrangements.

One of the most common complaints from academic staff was that they were now doing routine administrative tasks for which they were ill equipped and overpaid and that this was a waste of their time and took them away from research and teaching. We heard a lot about academics having to do their own photocopying and some of us have heard this complaint many times before in other institutions – it has almost become a mantra of the academic resistance to administrative changes. The first question to ask is – is all the photocopying really necessary, has it just become routine practice or is photocopying just standing in for a whole range of tasks which were previously undertaken by someone else? The core of the problem is that it is not possible to change structures and expect practices to simply follow – these

things take time and also new ways of doing things need to be explored and discussed – preferably before staff changes are made. Academics also felt that the sense of being part of the same team, (in a Department or Research grouping) with common goals, had been irreparably damaged and that a wedge had been put between the academics and the service staff extending the ‘them and us’ mentality which already pertained in relation to the central administration.

Of course no organization design or method of management is perfect. Organizational structures can suffer from inherent problems and also problems of implementation – the latter especially when change has been rapid and/ or not widely accepted. The key question is whether the problems we observed and were told about are only temporary challenges, and that the new matrix structure will eventually work well and win acceptance, or whether it has been a mistake and needs to be rethought or at least adapted to the University context.

Many of the critical comments and complaints do seem to be due to the temporary challenges of the substantial organizational restructuring and simultaneously the significant downsizing of the administration in a relatively short time period. This situation has created enormous uncertainty among academics and students as well as administrators. It seems likely that some of these challenges will be solved over time as everyone gets used to the new structure and procedures.

There have, however, been good examples of centralization in the University. For example, the IT services were centralized several years ago into one central IT-department. This process took two –three years, where the IT-department established standard IT-procedures, particularly regarding IT-procurement. So in this case, it took some years to obtain and show the actual benefits of this centralization. It is important to mention that the centralization of the IT-department has worked out well due to the nature of IT-services, i.e. standardized services to obtain lower costs. This may not be the same situation for other administrative departments. Nevertheless, the restructuring of the IT-department and the libraries could be an example for the change programme of University Services. Another example of more positive administrative restructuring is the development of the University Library from 100+ independent libraries to one central library. Also, in the main our respondents felt that the move to a pool system for laboratory staff had been a success.

Among the four campuses at the University of Helsinki, the two campuses with only one faculty (i.e. Kumpula Campus – Faculty of Science, and Meilahti Campus – Faculty of Medicine) seems to be in a better administrative situation than the two other campuses (City Centre Campus and Viikki Campus). For example the Faculty of Science already had centralized its administration at the faculty level before the administrative restructuring and therefore, the changes were not so great as for the other multi faculty campuses.

However, there is reason to be concerned about the recent restructuring and the choice of a matrix organization (for a more detailed discussion see Appendix 4). Many organizations have changed their organizational structure, in recent years, to a complex matrix in order to meet the growing complexity in the world in which they operate. However, these organizations struggle to obtain the benefits, because matrix organizations require a lot of coordination. In the matrix organization, managers and staff have to work in interdisciplinary ways and across the traditional administrative disciplines and also across the 'usual way of working'. Before the matrix organization, each faculty had its own administrative culture. If one of the faculties was excellent in a specific administrative discipline, this good practices would not have easily been transferred to the other faculties. In a matrix organization, all managers and staff depend on each other, and have to coordinate across the professional areas and campuses. In this way, the university can ensure the sharing of administrative knowledge and best practice. This requires time-consuming engagement and can be expensive, however, the university benefits when all faculties and departments implement best practice. We consider that the benefits of the matrix model can be retained, but that there needs to be some rethinking of the structure. It is quite possible to have a professionalized service across the key administrative disciplines and also to have a structure in which services are located closer to the key budget holders and to the core activities of teaching and research - in other words at Faculty level. In our experience of working with, and being responsible for re-organizing, administrative services, this semi-devolved system is the one that works best. For example, it works well at the University of Edinburgh and Aarhus has moved to this structure from a fully centralized one in the last two years.

The Big Wheel:

We had more positive feedback about the Big Wheel than in relation to the other changes, but many people were, and continue to be, confused about both the reasons for the changes and the practicalities of putting them in place. Even when they thought that curriculum change was a good thing the view was that it was all too much in a short period of time and should have been delayed by at least a year.

We encountered a small number of academics and administrators who were enjoying their work in relation to the Big Wheel and felt that developing the new curricula was an exciting challenge and would produce good outcomes. However the general feeling was that staff had not been presented with clear enough reasons for such a major set of changes and, that there had been insufficient planning at either University or Faculty level. Some people understood that there was some pressure from Government for the changes to the BA/MA structure, but felt that there should have been more debate. Students felt that their views had not been incorporated into the planning process and some felt confused and didn't know where to turn for reliable advice.

Significantly, even when those involved in the new programmes felt that they were pedagogically positive they were still very concerned both about how they could be delivered in time and also how they could be made sustainable. The key problems outlined were: No designated budget for the new courses, no dedicated administrative support at programme or Faculty level, no certainty about who would be available to teach on the programmes. This last was felt to be a major problem in some areas given the high numbers of potential teachers on insecure contracts and the fact that programme directors have no line management responsibility and therefore cannot influence staff workloads or direct anyone to teach. Also we were told that many posts were frozen due to budget cuts so this made planning teaching very difficult.

Even where there was agreement that some aspects of the Big Wheel were positive, it was seen as an imposition that had not been fully thought through and that it might be difficult to make it work well across the whole University:

And many people were simply puzzled about the provenance of the Big Wheel and the thinking behind it:

'Where did the idea for the Big Wheel come from? Did management take any external advice about the changes?'

'Another example was the change in curriculum; there was never a dialogue about the needs. The change was marketed as good but without any dialogue. Some of the changes make sense but it does not make sense for other areas. We have a large University and we can't have a standard system for all education.'

'Senior management decided the change programme and did not listen or involve the Faculty. This has resulted in a lack of confidence in both management and the Big Wheel'

There were some unhappy and confused students as well who felt that they hadn't been involved in the process, for example:

'I wasn't happy at all. Didn't get any relevant answers I needed (regarding my studies) and felt like I was left adrift. Previously I haven't felt included either, but this is worse. Not a happy camper here, sorry. Why on earth do you take students if they are treated like a nuisance? I'd like to continue my studies and I'm willing to work hard, but I'm not getting any guidance (as aren't many others). It's very frustrating for students - and very shortsighted policy for any university'

Doctoral Schools and the Big Wheel – a Case Study

The major changes to doctoral education were introduced at the University of Helsinki in 2014, before the Big Wheel process. Discussion of Doctoral Education was a key issue for the International Advisory group between 2010 and 2013 and various possible structures were discussed alongside way to ensure that recruitment would be increasingly international. The option which was chosen by Senior Management consists of four large doctoral schools (one for each campus), each of which contains a number of doctoral programmes, which in turn cover a number of disciplines and subject areas. The intention was to provide doctoral training with more structure, to encourage multi-disciplinarity, and to provide more resources that would make completion of doctoral research more efficient. The 'Big Wheel' introduced the requirement of formal curricula for each doctoral programme; the requirement to train doctoral researchers in transferable skills; and a greater push towards multi-disciplinarity.

According to the Graduate School leaders we spoke to the most recent Big Wheel changes, have had both good and bad sides. The positive effects have been felt through the introduction of a clear structure and framework for doctoral education, which provides a great deal more support for doctoral researchers than they had previously experienced. There is now a much greater recognition that doctoral education is not simply a one to one supervisor-supervisee relationship, but also involves many different contributors, and requires a strong research environment in which researchers can flourish. The doctoral programmes seem to have been allocated enough resources to encourage the development of a strong research environment, although in the case of the Central Campus it is not always clear how this connects to the wider research environment. In the best cases the training courses and teaching content are of a high standard which was said to be lacking previously. So:

'The structural reform actually came at the right time for doctoral training.'

However, some felt that the connections between Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral curricula had not been fully thought through and that:

'The structure of the doctoral school has been decided before the Big Wheel structure and does not fit into it'

At the doctoral level, the encouragement towards multi-disciplinarity could have had beneficial effects, providing that it is recognized that the most important level of doctoral research remains at the disciplinary level. It was felt by some that this was one area where the new Big Wheel reforms may be going in the wrong direction.

'Currently, there is a tendency to regard multi-disciplinarity as being somehow in opposition to disciplines, and in doctoral level research, this is unhelpful. The greatest advantages of having the doctoral programs is that they strengthen and support the crucial supervision and training that must occur at disciplinary level, while providing a structure for multi-disciplinary dialogue. The pressure, within the big wheel, to squeeze out the disciplinary level and make it less visible is likely to be corrosive of the highly important synergy between disciplinary expertise and multi-disciplinary dialogue.'

It was pointed out that this problem is seen most starkly in the new PhD application forms where there is no longer anywhere for an applicant to state their discipline.

'In practical terms, the lack of information in the application forms about the discipline of the applicants has caused considerable difficulties to the coordinators and the program directors, who had to try and second-guess to whom each application should be sent for evaluation. The fiction that multi-disciplinarity exists without disciplines have caused some considerable and unnecessary trouble in this regard. Doctoral education involves carrying out original research; judging who is capable of doing that in any given field requires disciplinary expertise at the highest level.'

Doctoral Programme leaders saw changes to the University website as compounding this problem:

'There are still numerous difficulties and limitations to the websites, which has been partly generated by the insistence on understating, or even removing, the disciplines from the Internet.'

'There is no competition between the disciplines and multi-disciplinarity; they should work together, and in doctoral education, the structures are there to allow for that at Helsinki, but websites and application procedures are pushing towards breaking that crucial synergy.'

In structural terms, one of the biggest difficulties in relation to doctoral education is that there are parallel structures - Faculties and doctoral programmes. The Faculties each have their own governance structures, which means that different faculties

have different regulations. This complicates matters for doctoral programmes, many of which contain disciplines that belong to different faculties. This is a particular problem in doctoral programmes that stretch between the social sciences and humanities.

'The same regulations should apply at least within each campus, and preferably across the campuses.'

Discussion:

We fully understand the need to align the degree and qualifications structure at HU both with the Bologna process and with a structure which is internationally widespread and recognized: Bachelors/Masters/PhD, and the need to have more standardization of structures and processes across the University for reasons of equity and parity. It is clear that there were different ways of doing things in each Faculty, prior to the re-organization, and that this was inefficient, potentially unfair and didn't allow for the development of best practice or for the sharing of ideas and courses. It is also the case that in the context of a system in which there are relatively few full-time academics on long-term contracts who are available to teach and high student numbers then introducing teaching efficiencies made a great deal of sense. However, we remain puzzled about some aspects of the Big Wheel – not least about its name! We were told that the Big Wheel was meant to be both bottom-up and top-down and that the Vice Rector had worked closely with the Vice Deans for Education to achieve this, but most of our respondents perceived it as top-down, even when they thought it was a good idea.

We have been told that, at least in part, the 'Big Wheel' was a response to government pressure to produce students with a BA degree who were employment ready and to have fewer students taking MA's. Some of us are well used to the pressure from government to include 'employability skills' in our programmes and courses, and have been doing so for many years as well as trying to make it clear that non-vocational degrees already develop a set of important skills, which could be transferred into the workplace. It is worth noting that many major international employers of graduates, who don't require specific technical skills, prefer those with good basic graduate skills who they can then train for their specific needs. We are somewhat puzzled by the perceived need to move to multi/interdisciplinary programmes in the Humanities and Social Sciences as we have not encountered employers in general specifically asking for this, although in relation to STEM graduates the ability to think beyond disciplinary boundaries is highly valued, especially in the context of scientific careers. What graduate employers seem to want are good analytic, leadership and team-working skills, as well as flexibility, technical skills and discipline knowledge, where these are relevant.

Of course there is much discussion about the importance of interdisciplinary research and the need for this in order to respond to new issues and to develop new fields as well as finding ways to address particularly difficult problems. However, the majority of academics who are leading multidisciplinary research teams have come

from a disciplinary base and have developed a confident position from which to explore and address other angles on a problem. Increasingly Doctoral Programmes offer the possibility of working across disciplines, especially in the sciences, but at Bachelors level this can cause a good deal of confusion. Internationally leading Universities continue to offer discipline based undergraduate degrees or alternatively dual or joint, or major/minor, or cross Faculty programmes, where each discipline has some separate identity. It is extremely challenging to produce a genuinely interdisciplinary Bachelor's programme, unless it is in an established interdisciplinary field and therefore most degrees, at this level, which embrace more than one discipline, are actually multi disciplinary rather than inter disciplinary. Of course these can be excellent, but there is a serious danger that students will not be provided with sufficient grounding in any of the disciplines covered. This kind of programme is common in the US in Liberal Arts Colleges and in the UK in the newer Universities, where it is sometimes thought to potentially disadvantage students in relation to proceeding to post graduate study. Of course there are both established and emerging areas, which are inherently and successfully interdisciplinary, such as Geography, but others they tend to have grown over time either out of cognate disciplines e.g. Criminology or from the development of a new field e.g. Women's/Gender Studies, rather than by changing institutional arrangements. Of course there is nothing totally sacrosanct about disciplines and they evolve over time, but a key point is that genuinely interdisciplinary areas tend to emerge from research collaborations. Sometimes these percolate down and become teaching fields in themselves as has been the case with 'Public Health' and 'Environmental Studies' for example, but 'artificially' creating inter or multi disciplinary programmes is unlikely to produce new research collaborations.

In relation to external and international applicants, especially at doctoral level, it is well known that they are likely to be looking (on websites etc.) for potential supervisors, in the field they wish to work in, or for evidence of the quality of research and education in their discipline and if they can't find these things easily they are likely to look elsewhere.

Faculties, Departments and Disciplines:

The feedback in this area was fairly unequivocally critical and there was a great deal of confusion about the role of Deans, the implications of moving the academic budget to Faculty level and especially about the future of Departments and indeed in some cases of Disciplines.

'There are many rumours, for example now the Departments are abolished who supervises the programme directors?'

'The conspiracy theory is 'divide and conquer'. Management also has removed the department structure. Power has been centralized. As Director of a master's programme I do not feel any ownership of the change.'

Many academics, particularly from the Central Campus, said that they felt cut adrift and in relation to some of the Faculties that the Faculty was too big to be the only focus for academic identification.

'The University used to be communities, which you felt part of and created loyalty. Now you can no longer see the science in the curriculum, there are several bodies deciding on the curriculum and you can no longer identify with a community. The University should think seriously about this. People do not and cannot belong to such large communities as in the new system.'

For those who had been used to a single discipline Department where the Head of Department was responsible for the budget and for key decisions, and where the teaching allocations, and the curriculum were decided, within a fairly small group, the new structure is a major change

'It has become unclear who takes decisions. It seems to be different people who decide on curriculum, on staff and on financial matters. It also seems to be very few persons.'

'We used to be one Department, but now we are struggling with our colleagues, partly because we do not know who makes the decisions.'

Discussion

We received many comments from academic staff about the problems they saw with strengthening the management hierarchy by consolidating responsibilities, budgets and decision making at Faculty level and 'disbanding' Departments and disciplines. We asked the University leadership this about and were told that there was no directive to do away with Departments and it was up to Deans how they organized the internal structures in their Faculties. There seems to be a good deal of confusion about this matter and we wondered if, in some cases, it was that the concentration of budgetary responsibility with Deans was seen as the end of Departments as such. Many Universities, if not most, in the UK, have moved most of the budget responsibility upwards in recent years, and many of them have restructured single discipline departments into multi-disciplinary Schools, but in the main and certainly in the research intensive institutions the line management and responsibility for teaching and research has remained at departmental or school level and in the latter context there would still be leadership at discipline level. Only the post 1992 Universities (and not all of these) have moved away from Departments or Schools to a programme based teaching system led by programme directors, with research – in areas of research strength located in research institutes. Of course the Russell Group and other research intensive Universities do have some multi-disciplinary programmes and many of them have research institutes which sit outside of departments, but they have not disbanded the basic unit of the Discipline, or cognate discipline, based department, although some have a School system which brings cognate disciplines together, which is the 'home' of all staff involved in both

teaching and research and where the academic leadership and line management is situated.

There is clearly confusion about the future of academic disciplines and Departments at HU and this coupled with the lack of support for programme directors and also, in the case of the Central Campus, the lack of any clear structures to support research seems to us particularly problematic. Whatever their views about the value of interdisciplinarity academics tend to think of themselves in relation to their specific field or discipline and assessment exercises and rankings usually make their evaluations on a disciplinary or established multidisciplinary basis. International staff tend to consider moving to a University on the basis of the status of their discipline within it and international students do likewise. Doctoral candidates will be pleased to see a Graduate School that they can be located within, but will still wish to be assured that they have a disciplinary home (or homes) as well. It therefore seems to us that 'undermining' the position of Departments and therefore disciplines at HU could create serious problems for the international status of the University. While we would argue that one size doesn't necessarily fit all it is very puzzling to discover that, despite the fact that we were repeatedly told that there were to be no Departments this is clearly not the case across the University.

To give an example of the potential for confusion:

A Google web search for a range of disciplines at HU produces a Department of Physics, Department of Chemistry and a Department of Psychology, for example. Whereas a search for 'History' leads to a Department of 'Philosophy, History, Culture and Art studies, which in most University's would be described as a School. On the other hand a search for Sociology or Anthropology leads to The Faculty of Social Sciences where clicking on 'Faculty' – as opposed to 'Studying' or 'Research' – leads to 'Units' and finally under the 'Unit' of Social Research there is a list of disciplines. To add to the confusion if, for example, I go to the HU website and enter Sociology in as a search term I am taken to a page where the first item is a specific Finnish Academic project and the second is link to an interview with myself conducted when I was on the International Advisory Board, which comes up because I am a sociologist! When structural changes occur it is crucially important that they are very quickly reflected in the website and in other communications otherwise reputation can suffer.

It seems to us that the changes to the Faculty structure are variable and incomplete, as has already been stated, there is no need for a 'one size fits all model, however, it is important that structures are the optimal size and the fact that some departments/units are larger than some Faculties does not seem to fit with other aspects of the change process. Also the changes to the academic structure occurred before the appointment of the new style Deans who we would expect to have the appropriate skills and the contractual obligation to manage in a new way and this indicates a lack of planning as it would be much more usual to establish the Faculty leadership teams and the planning process before implementing other changes.

A Comment on Communication

A key recurring theme in all our discussions and feedback, in relation to all aspects of the change process was that of communication so we are returning to it here.

Many of the respondents felt let down by the way in which the changes were communicated. Of course staff need to accept that UH is not going to return to the decision making processes of the past, but it was not only long-standing staff members who complained, but rather those of all ages and career stages across the University.

'The Rector has visited the campuses, but it was like a 'theatre', because things are different behind the scenes. Decision making at the University of Helsinki is currently a black box. Furthermore, the chain of command in administration has become unclear'

'Good leaders need to talk to their employees every week, keep on repeating the strategy. We are more reacting instead of participating in the strategy. Good leaders communicate with their staff.'

We understand that there was a communications strategy for the change process, but perhaps it needed to be revisited and refined more regularly. Also, it does seem to us that there was confusion in relation to the important difference between 'information' which was generally available on Flamma, and genuine 'communication', which entails listening and ensuring that people understand why, if their views and requests are not taken into account. Communication in relation to difficult issues is a major challenge for University leaders and managers, and UH is far from alone in not always getting it right, but the benefits of trying to have a genuine discussion rather than presenting information and decisions are usually well worth the effort.

There were also many complaints about communications more broadly throughout the process - we have already mentioned the way in which people learnt that they were to lose their jobs, but it is worth reiterating as it is at the heart of some of the distress. Many staff simply did not understand the required legal process sufficiently well and the waiting and uncertainty were experienced as cruel and unnecessary.

The website was also a common topic. A University's website is a major plank of its communications strategy and HU's website has, it seems, been an added source of confusion and concern for staff. Our understanding is that the website was taken down in January 2017 without a fully functioning replacement, and without sufficient warning. People complained about the amount of time it took

'trying to recreate what was lost and searching for things that are no longer there. Finding something that took five seconds in December 2016 could take over an hour in 2017.'

We were told that IT services had improved, responding quickly and helpfully to requests for assistance, but that the major problems are not technical, but relate to content and structure and therefore the accessibility of information to applicants and stakeholders:

'The Internet is the university's window to the world; for many months it was almost impossible to find the people or information that prospective doctoral researchers might need without quite a bit of time of searching'

'The attempt to destroy the visibility of disciplines on the Internet was, in the opinions of almost everybody, both students and academic staff, an unmitigated disaster. There have been some indications recently that disciplines will be permitted a bit more visibility than was originally planned, which has been warmly welcomed; but much more needs to be done still to repair the damage done.'

When it comes to the website the way in which information might be read by different audiences and stakeholders needs to be carefully considered which is why testing with groups of users is very useful. An example worth considering is the following extract from the webpages outlining University Strategy to be found under the heading 'Resources for Reform'

'The environment the University is operating in is in a state of upheaval, which requires that the University be able to continuously reform itself. Because of the tightening economic situation, the University must seek funding from various national and international sources. Hence, the University must be able to redirect its operations according to the changing environment.'

Universities are indeed operating in difficult and changing external environments and this does need to be addressed, however, given the changes which the University has gone through in the past two years the wording could convey a lack of clear direction and the idea of 'continuous reform' could certainly cause anxiety within the University. This is just one example of the importance of careful attention to communication and the need for a clear understanding of how the same words can be read differently.

5. The Way Forward

Reflections:

It is hoped that, as was the intention set out in Professor Green's paper, the process of undertaking this Review has helped members of the University community to process what has happened, to feel that they have been listened to and taken seriously and therefore to feel able to begin to focus more positively on the future. It is important to learn from the changes that have occurred in the University, but equally important not to focus on the past to the detriment of the future of the University as a whole.

Having said this there are, nevertheless some important lessons to be learnt from the events of the past two years a major one being that, in the context of Universities, totally top-down decision-making rarely works - it is simply not effective or efficient.

As one academic put it:

'Change was needed, is needed and will be needed. One of the key success factors of sustainable change is empowering staff lower down the hierarchy to have an investment in the process. What was seen in the re-structuring was overwhelmingly top-down management...'

In any major change process is it useful to ensure that there are 'islands of continuity', and to be clear about what is positive, valued, and does not need to change, and to avoid changing too many aspects of an organization too quickly. Excellent project management, and a clear and agreed timeline for the changes, is also very important. It is also helpful to have change managers in place in all areas of the organization that will be affected and to ensure that all concerned understand their roles and responsibilities. Most important is the need for very good communication using a variety of delivery models and communicating 'early and often'.

While the Senior Management Team clearly followed all of the legal requirements, with regard to the termination of employees contracts, and disseminated as much information as was permissible on Flamma, an acceptance that they did not take sufficient cognizance of the way in which this drastic and unprecedented process would be experienced by many in the wider University, and that some things could have been communicated and carried out with greater sensitivity, would now be helpful. The changes undertaken since 2015 have been extremely challenging for many members of the University and extremely painful for some. While the argument that the changes were necessary may well still hold, an evaluation of the organizational and financial benefits would be also helpful.

The University community should try to accept that change is inevitable in large and complex organizations and, that it is not always possible, or even desirable, for everyone to know everything about the thinking and processes behind every change. Engaging in discussion of every detail would take staff away from their central tasks. Also, the Senior Management Team and other leaders must understand the differences between making decisions about, on the one hand, the best IT system or the web architecture, where it would be unrealistic for everyone to be involved and where expert advice is essential and, on the other hand, for example, the need for teachers and researchers to be involved in the design of new educational structures and curricula from the outset.

As the final stage of producing this report I asked a small number of academics, in the University, with a strong commitment to making things work, to say something about how they perceived the situation a year on from the initial decision to have the Review. This was not, of course, a large or a random sample but some of the comments are nevertheless interesting and instructive:

There was some reiteration of the kinds of response, which we had earlier in the year and a view that while the reforms were generated at a senior management level, they then took on a life of their own, disrupting activities at every level of the University and that this disruption led to many different levels of confusion, sometimes perceived to be bordering on chaos.

'My teaching has been chaotic, I didn't know when I was teaching until the last minute and then the students didn't know that there were two lectures and so only came to one.'

'Overall, it is clear that there are not sufficient administrative resources now in the structure: although administrators are no longer going off sick at the rate that they were last year, they are still overworked, and neither students nor academic staff are receiving the level of support that they need. The loss of all discipline-level administrators has been at the heart of creating the sense of mild chaos that many are experiencing. The depersonalized system that has replaced it sometimes works well, in that it avoids the situation in which a particular member of staff became the clearing house for anything that happened within a discipline, which was fine when that individual was efficient and professional, but caused problems when they were not. The down side of this more anonymous system is that people do not know where to go when something goes wrong, or when a problem, is not one that the system can deal with'

Some people think that there is still a long way to go before a steady state is reached:

'The new academic year has brought with it a fairly strong sense of vertigo: the scale and speed of the changes has meant that everyone who remains employed at the university is so intensely busy with trying to understand what is going on that there is little time to reflect, think or consider what is going right or wrong. People are

generally less frightened than they were last year, but they are also wary. It will take a long time before trust is restored, most particularly amongst the administrative staff. There is still a lot of exhaustion and stress amongst the staff, even while there is also excitement about some of the new structures and procedures that have been introduced.'

However, there does seem to be a sense, in some quarters that things are getting better:

'There is a general sense among staff members that the reform process has been like a large and heavy object that has rolled over them over the last few years. However, there is also a sense that the heavy object has now passed by and that life in the University is returning to a more sustainable situation. The beginning of the academic year has been met with a sense of seeking to make the new situation work, now that the dust has settled. A perceived trough of staff morale, that was it its most profound around two years ago, has now been overcome and staff seem more positive in their thinking. There is a sense that a corner has been turned, and that the short and medium-term future looks better than the immediate past.'

One of the aims of the Review was to explore what were the short term effects, which would occur in the context of any major change and what were the more lasting issues, which were perceived as problematic. One senior professor responded like this:

While no doubt many of these issues are teething troubles and will sort themselves out with time, there are two key structural issues that are likely to persist: the damaging pedagogic and research effects of suppressing disciplines; and the under-resourcing of administrative staff.

As was stated at the beginning of this report, we set out to document the views of the staff and students at the University of Helsinki and to examine the main aspects of the recent change process. In relation to the view that any major change causes anxiety – and most especially in an organization unused to major rapid change – we have certainly found this to be the case. However, there is some evidence that, while there is still a good deal of confusion and disruption, the fog is lifting and people are beginning to settle in to new roles and to develop new ways of working. Of greater concern is the fact that some aspects of the changes and the problems are more fundamental and will have long lasting repercussions if not revisited.

Many academic staff are still struggling with the transition from the University as an academic led organization, based on election by peers, to an organization, which is centrally run by appointed managers. The desire to return to, what is seen by some, as a democratic golden age certainly coloured a number of the responses. We are critical of the notion that Universities were, in the past, fully democratic and subscribe to the view that they were, in the main, hierarchical institutions in which academic seniority and male privilege held sway and where junior academics and administrators had little say in how things were run. However, the transition at UH

has been extremely rapid taking the University to a point in five years that took 25 in the UK. In this context there are lessons to be learnt from other major Universities, which have gone through this process, and more or less successfully, come out of the other side. As was suggested earlier in this report there are different models and strategies and HU needs to find the one that suits it best in relation to both the changing external environment and the needs of its staff.

We hope that it will now be possible to acknowledge that it has been a very difficult time, for staff and students, and that communications need to improve, greater trust engendered, and a commitment given that any future changes would be handled more sensitively. We also hope that, in the areas where there is most significant criticism, of the new academic and administrative structures and organization, dialogue will develop along with a will to revisit and re-evaluate some decisions. Finally, we hope that the view will prevail, that all staff, senior management included, and students, are part of the same University, are and valued, and that it once again Helsinki University will be referred to as 'Our University'.

Recommendations

Vision and Strategy:

- That all members of the University have the opportunity to be involved in discussions about the best way forward for Helsinki, as an international University for the 21st century with its specific context and constraints, with the intention of valuing the full range of knowledge and expertise within the institution, and helping to re establish a sense of belonging

Communication:

- That urgent attention is given to the University's communications strategy including an evaluation of the communications functions across the University. This could include researching staff views about the forms of communication which work best for different kinds of information and establishing a multidisciplinary working group to explore how to develop the strategy
- That the University's website is urgently reviewed with regard to its fitness for purpose internally and externally and especially in relation to its functionality as a tool for international reputation enhancement and recruitment
- That due thought is given to how to develop the communications skills of staff in leadership roles across the University
- That there is absolute clarification of the processes legally necessary to implement and manage both voluntary and compulsory redundancies so that everyone can understand why there was a lack of open consultation and a need for confidentiality and a line can be drawn under the process
- That there is transparent communication about the University's financial position and the overall effect of the downsizing
- Should there be the need for major change/restructuring in the future that there is greater transparency and engagement with staff and also that appropriate training and project and communications management are put in place.

Leadership and Development:

- It is important that senior management acknowledge that the last couple of years have been very difficult for everyone make it clear that they do understand that this has been a very difficult time, that they have learnt from the process, and that confidence and trust needs to be re built
- That the University Board strives to become less distant and engages in a process whereby they come to understand better the effects of the change

process – this could be done in part through the use of an expert facilitator and in part via informal visits to different areas and projects within the University

- That the Rector and the Director of Administration engage more directly with staff and that members of the senior team engage in more regular smaller scale meetings with staff in different areas of the University where genuine conversations can occur
- That consideration is given to ways of building trust both between the academics and the new services departments and also between the staff and the senior management team – through shared projects. These could be led by new Vice Rectors, Directors and Deans who were not directly involved with the previous changes

Structural and Organizational:

- That there is a process evaluation of the centralization of administrative in order to understand what is and is not working
- That serious consideration is given to establishing devolved administrative support teams located in Faculties along with specifically dedicated support for Deans
- That the Faculty Structure be reviewed with a view to strengthening and raising the visibility of the Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences
- That the decision to move away from 'Departments' be clarified and reconsidered. In doing this an comparative analysis is needed of the organization of academic areas in comparable and highly ranked universities
- That work should be undertaken to develop a more nuanced understanding of the different research needs across the whole range of disciplines and fields and therefore of the need for appropriate support on each campus. It is still an open question as to whether establishing research institutes in the Humanities and Social Sciences, along the lines of those in the other Faculties, would be a positive development, but due consideration should be given to the value to the University's international reputation of having an Institute of Advanced Studies

Academic:

- That there is an in-depth, preferably external, evaluation of the roll-out of the Big-Wheel in order to ascertain how well it is working and whether any changes are necessary
- That the question of 'Interdisciplinarity', where it is appropriate and how best to achieve it, in relation to research and teaching, is explored further by a multi-disciplinary 'Working- Group'

- That consideration is given to further expansion of the tenure track scheme with the aim being to move as far as is financially possible from ad hoc teaching arrangements to appropriate and stable staffing levels for each programme
- That each Programme should have a clear budget line and that there should be consideration of how best to provide administrative support to all Programme Directors and to greater clarity in relation to the organizational 'home' for all programmes

Appendix 1

Helsinki University Change Review Group Membership:

Professor Sue Scott (FAcSS) Chair
Professor of Sociology, Freelance Research Consultant, Honorary Professor,
University of York, Visiting Professor, University of Helsinki,

Mr Arnold Boon
Director, University of Aarhus, Denmark

Professor Lesley Yellowlees, CBS, FRSE, Hon FRSC
Professor of Chemistry, Vice-Principal of the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, and
Head of the College of Science and Engineering

Professor Mari Walls
Professor of Biodiversity and Environmental science and President and CEO of the
Natural Resources Institute Finland (LUKE)

Administrative Support – Mr Juha Hurme

Appendix 2

List of Hearings, Meetings, Group Discussions and Interviews Held by members of the Review Group during 2017

January

Meetings:

Rector Jukka Kola

Chair of the University Collegium Markku Kulmala

Director of Administration Esa Hämäläinen

Vice-Rector Anna Mauranen

Chair of the Board Jaana Husu-Kallio

Director of Human Resources Kira Ukkonen

Head of Personnel Management Jaana Sirkiä

Head of HR Hannamari Helander

Human Resources Specialist Jaana Nylund

Director of Administrative Services Antti Savolainen

Student Union: Secretary General Jannica Aalto, Chair of the Board Susanna

Jokimies, Specialist in Academic Affairs Aaro Häkkinen

Chief Shop Stewards: Tiina Niklander, Seppo Sainio, Elisa Hyytiäinen, Timo-Jussi Hämäläinen, Anne Lehto

February:

Open Hearings on all four Campuses with 90-100 participants

March:

Meetings:

Director of Administration Esa Hämäläinen

Director of Administrative Services Antti Savolainen

Chief Information Officer, Centre for IT Ilkka Siissalo

Dean of Pharmacy Jouni Hirvonen

Dean of Veterinary Medicine Antti Sukura

Head of Development Leo Pyymäki

Head of Human Resources Veli-Pekka Heiskanen

Senior Research Administration Advisor Seija Oikarinen

Dean of Medicine Risto Renkonen

Head of Development and member of the Board Kirsi Rauhala

Director of the Collegium for Advanced Studies (CAS) Minna Palander-Collin

Head of Administration (CAS) Jaana Fränti

12 Researchers from CAS

Occupational Safety Representatives

The University Collegium

Group Discussions and Interviews in Viikki and Meilahti

Meetings held in April:

Vice-Rector Keijo Hämäläinen
Chancellor Thomas Wilhelmsson
Rector Jukka Kola
Dean of Arts Hanna Snellman
Dean of Social Sciences Hannu Nieminen
University Librarian Kimmo Tuominen
Director of the National Library Kai Ekholm
Dean of Sciences Jouko Väänänen
Head of Development Arto Halinen
Steering Group for Properties and Facilities
Occupational Health Unit
Chief Shop Stewards

Group Discussions and Interviews in Kumpula and Centre Campus

Meetings held in June:

Chancellor Elect Kaarle Hämeri
Communications Director Kirsti Lehmusto
Head of Services Päivi Pakkanen
Head of Services Kati Kettunen

Group Discussions with Staff on each Campus:

| | Vikki | Meilahti | Central | Kumpula | |
|-----------------------------|-------|----------|---------|---------|----|
| Professors | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 13 |
| Research and teaching staff | 8 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 26 |
| Admin Staff | 6 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 21 |
| Students | 4 | | 2 | | 6 |
| IT Staff | 4 | | | | 4 |
| Graduate School leaders | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Degree Programme leaders | | | 4 | | 4 |
| | 27 | 17 | 23 | 10 | 77 |

Appendix 3

Numbers and distribution of Comments on the HUCR Website

| | |
|----------------|--|
| In English 139 | These comments were from staff and students across all four campuses and central services |
| In Finnish 286 | These comments were from across the University, but with the largest grouping of the academic respondents coming from the Humanities |
| In Swedish 11 | These comments were from mainly from the Swedish school of Social Sciences and from the Humanities |
| Total 436 | |

Note:

The comments in Finnish and Swedish were translated by Professor Mari Walls

Appendix 4

A detailed critique of the Matrix Model of Administrative Services written by Arnold Boon, based on his own experience, as a Senior University Administrator and on discussions within the Review Group

Burton et al. (2015) argue that three factors are critical for the success of the matrix organization:

1. Strong purpose: only choose the matrix structure if there are strong reasons for doing so
2. Alignment among contingencies: a matrix can only be successful if key contingencies are aligned with the matrix's purpose.
3. Management of junctions: the success of a matrix depends on how well activities at the junctions of the matrix are managed.

Strong purpose

It appears that senior management has had different agendas for the administrative restructuring and to implement the matrix organization. First, the administrative restructuring should create better career options for administrative staff. Later, the administrative restructuring was necessary to develop administrative specialists and standardized administrative procedures. Even later, senior management argued that the administrative restructuring was necessary to implement the huge downsizing of the administration.

It seems to us that neither academics nor administrators really have understood the need for the administrative restructuring. They even have less understood why the administration should be organized as a matrix organization, and how the matrix organization should benefit the students and faculty. Therefore, it is imperative that senior management can explain the overall goal of the administrative restructuring, i.e. why the administrative restructuring is necessary simultaneously with the considerable downsizing, and why the matrix organization is the best organizational structure for the University of Helsinki, i.e. what are the benefits and the challenges with the current organizational structure.

Alignment among contingencies

According to Burton et al. (2015), a successful matrix organization requires its own leadership, culture, knowledge sharing, information technology and incentives. Furthermore, the organization must invest in ways to coordinate work among repetitive tasks and at the same time support the non-repetitive work of other task. This approach to task design encourages those responsible for subtasks to develop innovative ways to do their work, accommodating the unique demands of each user, while at the same time integrating their work with other units in the organization, often following overall organizational standards. This way of organizing are likely to lead to greater customer satisfaction since production is customized as well as being efficient due to overall company uses of best practices.

We believe that the University of Helsinki not yet is in such a situation, and that the coming years will be critical. Both managers and staff have to think in a new way, if the matrix organization has to be successful. For example, if managers continue to use traditional leadership styles from the traditional hierarchical organization, then it will be difficult to implement the matrix organization successfully. Likewise, the administrative staff have to develop new ways of working, and to adopt a new mindset.

Another challenge seems to be division of labour between the administrative line managers vs. the campus heads of development. The administrative line managers should focus on the introduction of the overall organizational standards, while the heads of development should focus on the local customization of the administrative practices, following the overall university standards. We feel that there seems to be a power struggle between the administrative line managers and the heads of development, and that the administrative line managers seems to have the most power. The risk of this power struggle is that there may be too many top-down decisions on even small or detailed issues, leaving the local administrators with an even greater struggle between the local demands for administrative service, the impression of an increasing top-down control and bureaucracy, and the need to comply with university standards.

Knowledge development and sharing is there a key contingency in the matrix structure. Furthermore, interpersonal relationships are critical to knowledge sharing in a matrix organization.

Management of junctions

According to Burton et al. (2015), in the daily life of a matrix organization, it is “what is happening” at the junction points between the administrative lines and the campuses that will make or break the organization. At a junction point, the individual administrator experiences multiple bosses, conflicting goals, and work overload. But it is also at the junction points that the benefits of the matrix are realized in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.

If in one of the campus units a best practice is realized, then there is a communication path from that campus unit to the administrative line. If the administrative line works well, that will enable the best practice to be used in all campus units. This requires that the best practice should be communicated to the administrative lines, and that there is a willingness to transfer the knowledge. So far, we believe that the University of Helsinki not really has created these conditions for communication, coordination and knowledge sharing. There is an intention for communication, coordination and knowledge sharing, but the feedback from the administrative staff as well as faculty and students does not indicate that such practices are understood in the daily activities.

The development of a new matrix organization is an enormous change process and thus, the new organizational structure as well as the administrative procedures and systems have to support this new way of working. It is important for both

administrative staff and faculty that the new organization and its basic idea make sense to them. This means that communication about the change is critical. If the matrix organization makes sense to the administrative staff and they can see new career possibilities and new possibilities to cooperate with other colleagues, the matrix organization can be a success. The administrator needs to have the right administrative competences in order to function well in the matrix organization. But the administrator also needs to have the right human competences, such as the skills and desire to cooperate with other colleagues with different backgrounds, experiences and perhaps different ways of working

Annex i

Proposal for an External Review of the 2015-16 structural change at the University of Helsinki

Sarah Green, Professor of Social and Cultural Anthropology.
20 September 2016

Summary:

This proposal suggests that an external review be conducted of the events of the last academic year that resulted in rapid and substantial change at the University of Helsinki, which culminated in the dismissal of almost 500 staff combined with the introduction of a process of major structural change (the isö pyörä).

The purpose of this review is:

- (a) To conduct an independent analysis of the process and effects of the changes made, and to generate an evidence-based report on the results;
- (b) To provide an opportunity for members of all sectors of the university to give evidence on their experiences of the changes to an independent review board;
- (c) Through an open discussion of the report produced by the members of the independent review board, to provide some closure to these events, and provide a means for the university, and the people involved, to move on from them.

Background: dramatic change in a very short period of time:

In the academic year 2015-16, the Isö Pyörä (Big Wheel) structural changes began to be rolled out. At the same time, an unprecedented and rapid reduction in staff numbers, most particularly in administration, was implemented, in response to budgetary cuts from the Finnish government. The combination of these two events strongly affected the normal working environment of the university, and continues to reverberate today. The administrative staff experienced the most dramatic changes, as the entire administrative structure was changed, and all administrators were asked to apply for new jobs in the new structure. For several months, administrative staff did not know whether they would continue to have employment after the spring of 2016, and even if they did, where they would work or in what capacity. The academic staff, although relatively lightly affected by job losses, were left with many fewer administrative support staff, all of whom were now in new positions. In addition, the ongoing implementation of Isö Pyörä left many academic staff concerned about the future of the university and of their own disciplines and positions within the university. This high level and speed of change has inevitably affected the remaining staff, and also the students, who were highly confused about what was going on. Many staff commented that they had never experienced anything like this in their academic careers. Others turned to the media, social media

and their own social groups to express their concerns and share information. The atmosphere

In many parts of the university became highly tense, and rumours began circulating widely both in the media and on the Internet. Despite the summer period, during which people had time to reflect and recover from the changes it is clear that these events have left many people strongly affected by the events, and perhaps even more with a sense that they have not had an opportunity to go over what happened, how it happened, and what it means. After changes and events as major as these, something is needed to help to move forward positively, and to put the past to rest. It is for this reason that I would suggest commissioning an independent review board to take evidence from all sectors of the university, and then to write a report based on that evidence. The purpose would be to learn from the process; to give staff an opportunity to voice their experiences to an external panel; and to provide closure both for staff and the university, and allow everyone to move on.

The university specializes in teaching and research: it is committed to learning from past experiences and drawing on rigorous and independent analysis to understand any phenomena. Given the very high level and speed of change undertaken at the university in the last academic year, it makes sense to draw on that commitment in order to positively move on from this experience.

External reviews: types and purpose:

For many years, universities across the world have drawn upon external reviews as a technique to provide data and guidance on managing change, both for planning and to reflect on the effects of implementing changes.

These types of reviews have been used as a management tool, both to justify policies pursued by university leadership, and as part of a means to actually implement change. As such, the technique has attracted quite negative attention associated with what could be called the 'audit explosion' in higher education.¹

However, there are other forms of external review, which are aimed more at helping the process of moving on after quite traumatizing events have occurred. The principle in this type of review mainly involves bearing witness: an independent board hears the voices of those involved in the events, both those who carried out the events, and those who are affected by them. The enactment of the process itself is intended to achieve a large part of the intended outcome. This is closer to the idea of a truth and reconciliation commission than it is to an audit of processes. Again, there have been many debates about this kind of process, and what it might achieve.²

Nevertheless, the potential benefits of providing an independent forum in which people can give evidence are clear. First, people have a chance to provide some closure to an event that was traumatizing. Second, the process can help to restore a sense of trust in the university's leadership: providing an entirely independent board that listens to people's concerns and reports on them gives a sense that the leadership itself understands and is willing to listen. Inevitably, there will also be

some discomfort in reviewing these events for some people; but the experience of having been heard, and the recording of the views of those who gave evidence, can do a great deal to restore trust and to put the distressing events into the past. While the simple passage of time can sometimes help to move on from large scale change, when the events are as dramatic as the changes that occurred in the spring, there is the risk of leaving permanent damage, both to the reputation of the university and in loss of trust in the leadership, without some proactive engagement such as this.

Past experience with external reviews:

I have been involved in a number of external reviews in the past in universities, both as a member of external review committees, and as a witness. It is this experience that has convinced me that this process could have beneficial effects.

At the University of Manchester, the School of Social Sciences undertook an external review of all disciplines and its activities while I was head of Social Anthropology, in 2009. During that process, I acted as a witness, giving evidence, in the company of colleagues. Sitting on the other side of the fence, I have been part of a research assessment exercise at the University of Eastern Finland, in which I was a member of a panel taking evidence from academic members of staff in 2013. In that exercise, students were also asked to give evidence to the board, in a separate set of hearings from the academic staff. In addition, I have been a panel member for anthropology on the UK government's Research Assessment Exercise (2008) and Research Excellence Framework (2014), which were major audits of the research achievements of all disciplines in UK universities. What my experience with these review processes has taught me is that the perception of independence is crucial to the effectiveness of the panel's work: if there is any suspicion that the panel members are in fact internal, or have personal ties with the university's leadership, trust in the findings of the board is lost. It is crucial, therefore, that a group of independent scholars are asked to form the board, and that this board has full independence to take evidence and write its report without any form of censorship or editing.

How the process would work:

It would be up to the university to finalise the terms and conditions of how the board would work in practice. The three key principles would be to ensure independence of the membership of the external review board; to ensure the competence of the board; and to ensure the transparency of the board's work, to maximise trust in the board's work and independence.

(a) Membership of the external review body

I would envisage a board of four to five external reviewers, with a chair, supported by an administrator. These reviewers would have to be experienced academics and administrators, who also could be trusted by all sides – the leadership of the university, the staff and the students – to be independent, competent and transparent in their work. One name that came to my mind when thinking about this

is Professor Sue Scott, who has had close links with the university in the past, and who has had very substantial administrative roles in British universities in the past. I have spoken to Professor Scott to ask if she might consider taking this role, and she has said that she would in principle be willing to do it.

(b) Language issues

In order to be truly independent, the board would ideally be international. For that reason, most of the work of the board would have to be done in English. This raises issues of translation and transcription for those who would wish to give evidence in Finnish and Swedish. I do not envisage this to be a large-scale problem, but it will need to be addressed.

(c) Process of gathering evidence

I would suggest that evidence be collected from all the campuses, from all levels of staff – support staff, administrative staff, academic staff, and the university's leadership – as well as students.

Anyone who wishes to give evidence should have the opportunity to do so; representatives of each sector should have the right to suggest people, but individuals should be able to volunteer themselves. In addition, the external review board should have the right to call anyone to give evidence, though those called would have the right to refuse. It is important that those who were involved in planning and implementing the changes should give evidence as much as those who were affected by the changes. Gaining insight from the views of all sides of this debate is one of the most important elements of it. In addition, it is crucial that it is made clear to everyone that the external review board's purpose will not be to apportion blame, but to hear all views and understand what happened.

I envisage that this evidence would be gathered in three different ways: witnesses could send in their evidence in writing; public hearings could be held (one in each campus); and representative organizations could send in answers to questions set by the review board. The process of translation, so that the board could understand the contents of the evidence, would occur at the same time as the evidence is being gathered.

(d) Process of writing the report

Following the completion of the gathering of evidence (which may take up to a whole academic year, I expect), the Chair of the external review board will draft a report, which will be edited and finalised by the rest of the review board. This report would be translated into Finnish and Swedish. This would then be sent to the University Board and Rector, and then it would be published and made publicly available. Witnesses who provided evidence will have already agreed that any evidence they give could be published in this report, and that they have no right of censorship.

(e) Process of discussing and responding to the report

Once the report is published, a process of formally discussing it – at all levels, from the top of the university leadership down to the student bodies – should be implemented. All representative groups would have the right to formally respond to

the report, and for these responses to be made public.

After this, the process would end.

Time line:

| Activity | People involved | Remarks |
|--|--|---|
| Terms and conditions of the review board decided | The University Board and the Rector | There is a possibility of involving other bodies, but there is a danger of becoming bogged down |
| External Review Board appointed | The University Board taking advice from the Professoriate | The people in the external review board should have extensive experience of higher university management |
| External Review Board takes evidence | Planners and policy makers, managers, administrative staff, support staff, unions, students – and the Rector | The evidence can be collected both anonymously and in open public hearings. The hearings would be crucial part of the process |
| The External Review Board writes a report | External Review Board | This should be published immediately, publicly and with no right of veto from the university's management |
| The Report is publicly discussed | All those who were involved in giving evidence as well as the media | The aim here is to really debate all the main issues |
| A response is written to the report | The University Board with advice from other groups | This should be published And made freely available in an entirely open access way |
| The review process closes | | |

Notes

1 Power (1997); Power (1994); Shore and Wright (2015); Holmwood (2010); Shore (2008); Kipnis

(2008); Lempert (2002); Johnston (2002); Shore and Wright (1999)

2 Hirsch (2014); Nagy (2013); Rushton (2006); Ross (2002)

References:

- Hirsch, M. B. 2014. "Ideational change and the emergence of the international norm of truth and reconciliation commissions." *European Journal of International Relations*, 20:3, 810-833.
- Holmwood, J. 2010. "Sociology's misfortune: disciplines, interdisciplinarity and the impact of audit culture." *British Journal of Sociology*, 61:4, 639-658.
- Johnston, R. 2002. "The audit and accountability culture in UK universities: time to strike back?" *Environment and Planning A*, 34:10, 1713-1716.
- Kipnis, A. B. 2008. "Audit cultures: Neoliberal governmentality, socialist legacy, or technologies of governing?" *American Ethnologist*, 35:2, 275-289.
- Lempert, D. 2002. "Audit cultures: Anthropological studies in accountability, ethics and the academy." *American Anthropologist*, 104:2, 689-692.
- Nagy, R. L. 2013. "The Scope and Bounds of Transitional Justice and the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission." *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 7:1, 52-73.
- Power, Michael. 1994. *The Audit Explosion*. London: Demos.
- . 1997. *The audit society: rituals of verification*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, Fiona. 2002. *Bearing witness: women and the truth and reconciliation commission in South Africa*. London: Pluto.
- Rushton, B. 2006. "Truth and reconciliation? The experience of truth commissions." *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 60:1, 125-141.
- Shore, C. 2008. "Audit culture and illiberal governance Universities and the politics of accountability." *Anthropological Theory*, 8:3, 278-298.
- Shore, C. and S. Wright. 1999. "Audit culture and anthropology: Neo-liberalism in British higher education." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 5:4, 557-575. —. 2015. "Audit Culture Revisited: Rankings, Ratings, and the Reassembling of Society." *Current Anthropology*, 56:3, 421-444.

Annex ii

Timeline for the administrative restructuring and downsizing

2013 – Occupational well-being surveys show low believe in career advancement for administrative staff. Furthermore, administrative staff assess having fewer opportunities to develop their skills and competences

2014 – The University of Helsinki initiates a project to examine alternative ways of organizing university administration in order to 1) create better conditions for administrative staff to develop their competences and create better career path opportunities; 2) strengthen administrative support for research and education. The report was finalized on January 28, 2015 and published on Flamma (UH-intranet)

February 17, 2015 – The senior management team discussed the report and considered the matrix organization to be preferred over organization structures. The senior management team also decided to interview the faculty deans on the conclusions of the report.

Spring 2015 – Several university forums discussed the report and critiqued the proposal to organize university administration in a matrix organization.

April 29, 2015 – The deans and the senior management team agree to conduct individual interviews with a number of deans (eight out of eleven) on the report about the university administration. Several deans claim that they already had centralized administration in larger campus administration in a matrix-like organization.

Spring 2015 – The Finnish government announces major cuts in university funding. The University of Helsinki's funding will decrease by €106 million in the period 2016-2020.

May 2015 – The board of the University of Helsinki decided on several measure to handle the budget cuts, including staff reductions.

September 2015 – The University Board launched the Change Programme, including 1) budget cuts of €86 million and staff reductions up to 1.200 staff; 2) the Big Wheel change of the university educational programmes; and 3) the reorganization of the university administration in a matrix-organization.

Fall 2015 (Oct-Nov) – Cooperation negotiations with the trade unions about the planned measures; the principles for staff selected for the planned measures; and an estimated time period for the implementation of the measures.

January 12, 2016 – The University of Helsinki announces University Services as the new organization of the university administration, comprising approx. 800 positions (previously, university administration was approx. 1.150 staff, i.e. a reduction of approx. 350 staff or approx. 30%). The new organization will be implemented on May 1, 2016. The staff reductions will be effectuated in 2016 and 2017.

THE COOPERATION PROCESS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIVERSITY SERVICES IN 2015–2016

The decision of the Finnish Government to cut university funding was announced in early summer 2015.

The academic community was immediately told that the decision would lead to the need to cut costs. Supervisors were offered training between June and November 2015 to increase their awareness of people's behaviour in situations of change and to provide them with practical tools to successfully steer their unit through the changes. Approximately 220 supervisors participated in such training.

Over the summer, the University management and Finance unit calculated the effect of the reduced funding on the University. They found that staff costs were the highest expense item and considered various options for action.

The University Board decided at its meeting on 16 September 2015 to launch a change programme which would aim for savings totalling €86 million. The programme also included a cooperation procedure affecting all staff. The aim was to reduce staff by no more than 1,200.

On 30 September 2015, the rector established a steering group to implement the change programme. The group was tasked with collecting and sharing information about the change programme and its effects. It also ensured that individual measures were carried out. The steering group included the rector, four deans, the director of administration, the chief financial officer, the director of development and the director of strategic planning. The steering group reported to the University's management group and Board.

Launching the cooperation procedure

The employer launched the cooperation negotiations required by law on 30 September 2015. The negotiations continued for a total of eight weeks, while the law requires that they continue for at least six weeks. The employer's representatives in the negotiations were the director of administration, the director of human resources, the head of personnel management and the legal counsel for HR affairs, who prepared the minutes of all the negotiations. Staff organisations were represented by all five chief union representatives. Also invited to the negotiations were experts in the topics discussed.

Communications about the cooperation procedure

At the end of each negotiation session, the employer representatives and chief union representatives agreed on the content of news releases published on the Flamma intranet.

Two PR and press officers from the communications unit supported the HR unit throughout the cooperation procedure. They edited all the jointly agreed news releases on Flamma, wrote articles and conducted interviews relating to key issues, and ensured that the questions posed by staff on Flamma were answered. The aim was to keep the staff as well informed about the process as possible. Due to the nature of the events, not all information could be shared publicly, but all information possible to be shared was released.

Between May 2015 and May 2016, more than 70 news releases related to the change programme, the cooperation negotiations, the staff cuts and the new service organisation were published on Flamma in Finnish, Swedish and English.

All staff were also able to participate in two briefings, in which the University management explained the situation and its background. These briefings were also accessible online.

The content of the cooperation negotiations and the methods of reducing staff
The cooperation negotiations discussed ways to reduce staff. In addition to terminating permanent employment contracts, the reduction of fixed-term contracts would be required, along with arrangements in which a unit would commit to not filling a vacancy after the retirement of the previous post holder. The format of a letter enquiring of all those aged 61 or older whether they would be interested in retiring by the end of 2017 was agreed with the chief union representatives. Under Finnish law, a person can retire at age 63 and must retire by age 68. Some 200 persons submitted such retirement commitments, and this figure was taken into account when calculating the number of staff whose contract would need to be terminated.

Another issue discussed at the negotiations was the long-standing plan to concentrate all administrative staff into a single organisation separate from faculties and departments. This new service organisation was prepared in the autumn by several work groups.

After the cooperation negotiations

The cooperation negotiations concluded on 30 November 2015. The employer then reviewed options to carry out the measures planned during the negotiations. This took place in December–January. The director of administration and the director of human resources met with the dean of each faculty and the director of each independent institute to discuss the unit's cost-cutting needs. The deans and directors were then asked to submit to the employer lists of non-administrative staff whose employment contracts they proposed to be terminated. The purpose was to focus the cuts on positions that the University required the least, i.e., positions with duties that would be reduced the most or abolished entirely. In other words, personal grounds played no role in the termination of employment contracts.

The employer's reports

In its capacity as the employer, the University submitted two reports on the measures relating to the cooperation process, as required by law. The first report was submitted on 12 January 2016, and it described the launch of preparations for

the new service organisation. The second employer report was published on 27 January 2016.

The report explained that the University was considering the incorporation of facility and property services. The matter was explored in 2016, and the University Board decided on the incorporation in January 2017.

The report also described how the University would reorganise its continuing education and incorporate related services. The new company was estimated to employ 35 people. This company began to operate on 1 June 2016.

The report also outlined plans to place laboratory staff in intra- or inter-campus "pools" and to increasingly centralise the provision of IT services to the University's IT Centre.

The report also stated that the reorganisation of other activities would be considered.

Estimated number of staff cuts according to the employer's report

The University estimated that the overall number of staff cuts would amount to 570 employees and that this number would be distributed as follows:

- Teaching and research staff: 75 employees
- Other staff: 495 employees

Estimated timetable for the staff cuts

The report found that the termination of employment contracts would begin in February and be carried out by the end of May.

Other means to reduce staff outlined in the report

The reduction of fixed-term staff was estimated to amount to 210 by 2020: 160 members of teaching and research staff and 50 members of other staff.

The number of employees to retire by the end of 2017 from positions which were not to be filled would be about 200: 140 members of other staff and 60 members of teaching and research staff.

Placement of administrative staff in the new service organisation

A process launched in January 2016 aimed to place the University's administrative staff in a new service organisation which was estimated to have a total of 800 positions, i.e., 200 positions less than before. Staff were requested to enter their personal qualifications into the University's electronic recruitment system to ensure that they could be optimally placed in the new positions.

Based on the descriptions of positions in the new service organisation, an assessment group specified the demands level of the positions in accordance with the University's salary system.

Staff were informed on Flamma about the planned process of appointment to the new positions and when and how they could express their interest in the positions. The positions of directors and heads of sectors were filled first. Administrative staff could express their interest in these positions by 29 January. The positions were filled by mid-February. A total of 66 directors and heads in supervisory positions were selected for the new service organisation.

The expression-of-interest procedure for other administrative positions took place from 8 to 19 February. Expressions of interest were submitted for all the positions advertised, and some people expressed their interest in more than one position. Directors and supervisors were tasked with reviewing all those who had expressed an interest in a position in their sector or unit and with appointing the persons they considered most suitable for each position. The decisions were primarily based on the candidates' previous positions because they had right of precedence to be appointed to positions in their own field. If an employee's job description had previously included duties from several sectors (e.g., HR and financial affairs), an assessment was conducted to determine which sector had been predominant. Because the directors and supervisors were not familiar with everyone, interviews and other means to establish a person's suitability were also used in some cases. There were also situations in which two sectors were interested in the same person, in which case the director of administration decided on the sector to which the person was appointed. The appointment of staff to the new positions was completed in late March.

The contracts of staff for whom no position could be found in the new service organisation were terminated.

Change support for all staff

In February 2016, the University organised change support sessions for all staff on all campuses. The support sessions provided staff with information about typical psychological responses to changes and opportunities to discuss their thoughts, emotions and responses regarding the situation together with an occupational psychologist. Other topics addressed included coping methods that have proven effective. Open discussion helped the participants gain more understanding about the difficult change process. Support sessions tailored according to unit needs were also organised. The occupational psychologists of Mehiläinen (the occupational health provider) acted as experts at the sessions.

The practical implementation of staff cuts

While the new service organisation was being established, the employment contracts of some non-administrative staff had to be terminated.

Deans and the directors of independent institutes decided when these terminations would take place in their units; however, all terminations had to be completed by the end of April. The weekly timetable for the terminations was published on Flamma to ensure that all staff would know their unit's timetable.

The plan was for the new service organisation, University Services, to begin operations on 1 May 2016, by which time all staff cuts would have to be made. The termination of the employment contracts of administrative staff was scheduled for April, when it would be known which staff had been appointed to the new positions and which had not. The number of administrative staff was approximately 1,000, but the new service organisation featured some 800 positions.

In practice, a separate meeting was scheduled between each person whose contract was to be terminated and the unit director or head as well as a member of administrative staff. For this purpose, all directors and heads as well as other

participants in such meetings had to complete a one-day training session on the termination of an employment contract. The training was provided by an external consultancy with extensive experience of similar processes.

Directors and heads received detailed instructions on how to handle the situation with respect to the individual employee. The matter of whether to invite the employee to the meeting by phone or email was thoroughly discussed. After discussions with both the consultants and the chief union representatives, the latter option was chosen. To be sure, the employer representatives were aware that, as the cuts affected all staff, everyone was in a state of stress and was anxiously waiting to see whether they would be invited to the meeting. To relieve this stress, it was announced when the staff of each unit would receive invitations to the meeting. Each employee whose contract was to be terminated was invited to a personal meeting, at which he or she received the notice of termination and related instructions, as well as instructions for how to obtain support for re-employment. The University made every effort to support staff according to their individual needs. The chief union representatives were informed of each meeting, so that they could attend it with the employee if he or she requested it. Most of the meetings were conducted in a calm and professional atmosphere. This was influenced by the fact that the persons holding the meetings had been carefully trained and instructed, and the presence of the chief union representatives also helped to calm the situation. Support for the staff whose contracts were terminated

The University and the employment authorities provided the staff whose contracts had been terminated with an exceptionally high number of training opportunities and other support, using not only the University's own funding, but also separate funding from the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment.

The staff members were offered group training related to job-seeking support. The training themes included the recognition and description of professional skills and personal qualities, the job market and channels for job seeking, the use of networks, the tailoring and polishing of application documents, and preparation for job interviews. In addition, the training participants had the opportunity to take part in two one-hour individual training sessions with a specialist in job seeking.

They were also able to participate in briefings held by the employment office and the unemployment fund, and they received information about long-term change training geared for them. The aim of this training was to update the skills of staff whose contracts were terminated so as to meet the needs of today's labour market and to help the staff find a new job or profession by enabling them, for example, to complete certain qualifications. Change training could also help the participants develop their entrepreneurial skills and receive support to establish a company. The training was organised by three external service providers. A training path was created for each participant based on his or her skills and goals.

The staff whose contracts were terminated also received special support from the occupational health services. After the terminations, they had access to "low-threshold" services, i.e., half-hour appointments on Fridays with an occupational health nurse or psychologist from the beginning of February to the end of May.

Where necessary, longer appointments were also available. Information about these services was also provided on Flamma on 11 April 2016 (article entitled "Don't brood alone"). Material related to job-seeking and coping skills was also produced and made available on Flamma.

Number of staff cuts

The final number of staff whose contracts were terminated was 371: 48 members of teaching and research staff and 323 members of other staff. Other staff reductions were achieved through the retirement and resignation of staff as well as the conclusion of fixed-term contracts.

University Services launched on 1 May

The new service organisation, University Services, began to operate on 1 May 2016, but the summer holidays slowed down the full launch of operations. By the autumn, some staff had already found their bearings, but for others the situation was difficult as a result of the new duties and workplace. The situation varied according to sector. Academic affairs services have proved the most problematic in this respect.

External coaches and occupational psychologists from the occupational health services have supported staff, and the sectors have worked to enhance the skills staff need in their new duties.

Reassignment and re-employment of staff

By law, if the employer needs to hire a new employee during the notice period (up to six months) of staff whose employment contracts have been terminated, the employer must strive to reassign such staff. The requirement for reassignment is that the person in question can reasonably be considered capable of coping with the new position.

After the notice period, a further nine-month re-employment obligation applies to staff whose contracts have been terminated. If a person whose contract has been terminated has previously worked in a position equivalent to one for which the employer is now seeking an employee and the person has registered, as an unemployed job seeker, he or she must be employed in the vacant position.

The University has re-employed a total of 61 former staff members on the above grounds.

This re-employment period will continue to apply to some former staff until the end of July.

The current situation

The first year of University Services has been challenging. The leadership of faculties and other units are just beginning to be accustomed to not having their own on-site administrative staff. The reduction of staff has been reflected in the quality of service, and some staff are still orienting themselves. However, the situation is continuously improving.

Annex iii

Reduction of staff through cooperation negotiations 6/2016 From HU
Human Resources

REDUCTION 1.9.2015-31.12.2020

| AMOUNT OF STAFF | T&R | OTHER | TOTAL | | T&R | OTHER | TOTAL |
|---------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|--|--------|--------|-------|
| Sacked | 48 | 323 | 371 | | 12,9 % | 87,1 % | 100 % |
| Retired | 61 | 174 | 235 | | 25,6 % | 74,4 % | 100 % |
| Reduced other ways | 9 | 119 | 128 | | 7,0 % | 93,0 % | 100 % |
| reduction of temporary positions 2020 | 120 | 40 | 160 | | 75,0 % | 25,0 % | 100 % |
| Total | 238 | 656 | 894 | | 26,6 % | 73,4 % | 100 % |
| Staff 1.9.2015 | 4843 | 3581 | 8424 | | 57,5 % | 42,5 % | 100 % |
| Staff 2020 | 4605 | 2925 | 7530 | | 61,2 % | 38,8 % | 100 % |

Reduction % 1.9.2015-31.12.2020

| Amount of staff | T&R | OTHER | TOTAL |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Sacked | 48 | 323 | 371 |
| Retired | 61 | 174 | 235 |
| Reduced other ways | 9 | 119 | 128 |
| reduction of temporary staff 2020 | 120 | 40 | 160 |
| Total | 238 | 656 | 894 |
| Staff 1.9.2015 | 4843 | 3581 | 8424 |
| Staff 2020 | 4605 | 2925 | 7530 |
| Reduction % | | | |
| Sacked | 1,0 % | 9,0 % | 4,4 % |
| Retired | 1,2 % | 4,9 % | 2,8 % |
| Reduced other ways | 0,2 % | 3,3 % | 2,1 % |
| reduction of temporary staff 2020 | 2,5 % | 1,1 % | 1,9 % |
| Total | 4,9 % | 18,3 % | 10,6 % |

Reduction % 1.9.2015-31.12.2020

| Amount of staff | T&R | OTHER | TOTAL |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Sacked | 48 | 323 | 371 |
| Retired | 61 | 174 | 235 |
| Reduced other ways | 9 | 119 | 128 |
| reduction of temporary staff 2020 | 120 | 40 | 160 |
| Total | 238 | 656 | 894 |
| Staff 1.9.2015 | 4843 | 3581 | 8424 |
| Staff 2020 | 4605 | 2925 | 7530 |
| Reduction % | | | |
| Sacked | 1,0 % | 9,0 % | 4,4 % |
| Retired | 1,2 % | 4,9 % | 2,8 % |
| Reduced other ways | 0,2 % | 3,3 % | 2,1 % |
| reduction of temporary staff 2020 | 2,5 % | 1,1 % | 1,9 % |
| Total | 4,9 % | 18,3 % | 10,6 % |

Staff Reductions by Gender

Dismissed (%)

| Group | Male | Female | Grand Total |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Other Staff | 29,4 % | 70,6 % | 100 % |
| IT-Staff | 75,7 % | 24,3 % | 100 % |
| Library Staff | 29,6 % | 70,4 % | 100 % |
| Technical Staff | 50,0 % | 50,0 % | 100 % |
| Administration | 17,8 % | 82,2 % | 100 % |
| Support and Expert Staff | 24,1 % | 75,9 % | 100 % |
| Other Staff | 38,9 % | 61,1 % | 100 % |
| Other TR Staff | 100,0 % | 0,0 % | 100 % |
| Teaching and Research Staff | 56,3 % | 43,8 % | 100 % |
| TR Staff Level 1 | 100,0 % | 0,0 % | 100 % |
| TR Staff Level 2 | 0,0 % | 100,0 % | 100 % |
| TR Staff Level 3 | 55,6 % | 44,4 % | 100 % |
| TR Staff Level 4 | 63,6 % | 36,4 % | 100 % |
| Grand Total | 32,9 % | 67,1 % | 100 % |