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I. PREAMBLE

This report is intended to inform the PRME Board of the process and achievements of the SIP Sub-Committee. It is the result of many inspiring conversations and discussions by a large and diverse team of committed people from across the global PRME ecosystem. The members of the Committee were all very determined to help PRME future-proof its core value process of reporting on progress towards the Principles for Responsible Management Education. The design principles for SIP reporting and the vision for the future PRME Commons provide a solid foundation for further development of Responsible Management Education (RME) reporting and knowledge sharing at industry level.
II. BACKGROUND OF THE SIP COMMITTEE

The PRME Sub-Committee on Sharing Information on Progress (SIP) Impact was created and approved by PRME’s Board on 30 November 2020. This Sub-Committee operates under the umbrella of the PRME Board’s Committee on Nomination and Governance. The original purpose of this Sub-Committee was to support and provide PRME signatories with inspiration to support and provide PRME signatories with inspiration for a more precise Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) goal-setting and a more thorough recording system for business school activities and impact on sustainable development.

According to the SIP Policy, part of the commitment of a PRME signatory institution is to "regularly share information with its stakeholders on the progress made in implementing the Six Principles through the Sharing Information on Progress (SIP)." In this sense, it is important to point out that SIP becomes the main channel for communication and information on the implementation of responsible management education. This process aimed to offer to the signatories a way for facilitating stakeholder dialogue and peer learning between the ecosystem of signatories. In addition, the SIP can be an effective tool for facilitating stakeholder dialogue and a learning community among signatories.

In the Terms of Reference that define the activities of this group, PRME describes the value of the SIP Report in offering the ten functions below:

- Creating awareness of the mission of PRME and your commitment to it
- Giving a concise and comprehensive overall picture of your activities
- Boosting visibility and reputation
- Organizing and connecting relevant people across their organization
- Defining direction and strategy
- Tracking and benchmarking progress
- Identifying where more can be done
- Fostering a sense of achievement
- Creating new synergies and collaborations
- Promoting PRME’s impact globally
After 15 years of SIP Reporting on PRME's Six Principles, it was possible to understand the importance of this document as a way of reporting the PRME implementation journey within the institution and as a way of communicating these advances to internal and external stakeholders. From 2008 with its implementation, until today, there are more than 2,800 reports available on the PRME website, evidencing the commitment of the signatories with the environment of responsible management education.

During this period, different ecosystem agents collaborated for the evolution of sustainability and impact reporting, whether in the higher education environment or in the business environment, since multiple frameworks and many metrics are emerging and growing in importance. With the advancement of visibility around the SDGs and ESG metrics, these topics have taken the lead in the need to "walk the talk". Building on an era of advancing the Principles, with an action oriented mindset, a new SIP reporting scheme can strengthen the convergence of responsible management education, impact and responsible business.

The objective for creating a Sub-Committee was to design a renewed and helpful reporting logic with regards to responsible management education and sustainable development for signatory schools aligning with the changing institutional environment. Intended to last from January until June 2021, the committee has grown in relevance and impact, having its mandate expanded, and ending its activities in June 2023.

As deliverables of the Committee, the Terms of Reference indicated that the group should:

1. Design a renewed SIP/impact reporting logic for signatory schools, making good use of accreditation, stakeholder and sustainability reporting schemata, respecting the school’s mission and context.
2. Produce an overview of relevant impact reporting schemes and indicators aligned with the PRME Principles and relevant schemata for sustainability reporting, including a set of illustrations of productive impact reporting practices from PRME Signatories.
3. Recommendation for a new infrastructure/platform for reporting under PRME orchestration: The reporting infrastructure can be more or less technology driven. Either the platform can evolve into a database/data graph-based platform with dynamic reporting
facilities using smart and open science technology (making use of technology like AI and persistent identifiers (PID) logic). Or the alternative can be a more traditional document based periodic/thematic reporting mechanism.

The following pages of this report will present the PRME Sub-Committee’s performance process during these two years. The next chapters will present, among other topics, i) the members of the group during this period, ii) the main lessons learned from the meetings, iii) the PRME community consultation processes, iv) the design principles, v) the PRME Commons concept, vi) the new SIP questionnaire, vii) the pilot phase, viii) implications and next steps.
III. PRME SUB-COMMITTEE ON SHARING INFORMATION ON PROGRESS MEMBERS

The Sub-Committee is led by Wilfred Mijnhardt and consists of a group of members from the global PRME Community and supported by the PRME Secretariat. The members were selected based on their professional expertise in SDGs, impact, and impact reporting. The Sub-Committee is comprised with respect to diversity (e.g. gender, geography, and ethnicity).

Members

Wilfred Mijnhardt  
Policy Director,  
Rotterdam School of Management,  
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Mette Morsing  
PRME Secretariat  
Global Head of PRME

Jim Walsh  
PRME Board Member;  
Professor, Michigan Ross

Alec Wersun  
Senior Lecturer, School Lead for the Common Good, Glasgow Caledonian University

Antonio Hauile  
Executive Director,  
Global Compact Network Switzerland & Liechtenstein

Gustavo Loiola  
PRME Secretariat Manager, Former Chair of PRME Chapter LAC

Dagmar Langeggen  
Director of Library and Learning Center  
Norwegian Business School

Heather Ranson  
Professor at Gustavson; Director of the Centre for Social and Sustainable Innovation (CSSI)

Dilip Mirchandani  
Professor of Management, Rowan University, Rohrer College of Business

Louise Whittaker  
Deputy Dean, Executive Director; Faculty  
The University of Pretoria’s Gordon Institute of Business Science

Molly MacEachen  
Senior Consultant, Sustainability & ESG Services, Deloitte & Touche LLP

Dilip Mirchandani  
Consultant on Excellence in SIP Reporting Awards;  
Former Editor, PRIMEtime Blog

Katell Le Goulven  
Head of Hoffmann Institute for Sustainability at INSEAD

Divya Singhal  
Professor, Chairperson, Centre for Social Sensitivity & Action, Goa Institute of Management, India
Former Members

PRME Secretariat and its community sincerely appreciate the hours of work dedicated to the development of this process, the commitment, engagement and donation throughout this period.

Luisa Murphy  
Senior Manager, Global Impact  
PRME Secretariat

Delphine Gibassier  
Professor in Accounting for Sustainable Development, Audencia Business School

Laura Palmeiro  
Senior Advisor & COP rework team member, UNGC

Sean Cruse  
Head of Technology & Data, COP rework team member, UNGC

Hari Babpuji  
Professor, Marketing and Management, University of Melbourne
IV. TIMELINE OF THE MEETINGS

According to the Terms of Reference (ToR), the Sub-Committee’s work should consider how to:

- Advance and grow a professional global community of Responsible Management reporters/narrators, making use of the knowledge of experienced reporters and supporting new reporters, while maintaining a respect for economic, geographic, and structural differences of the signatory school’s Higher Education ecosystem.
- Set expectations and explore potential indicators for the advancement of RME and the SDGs towards 2030.
- Support schools in developing quantitative as well as qualitative demonstrations on RME, SDGs and societal impact, smartly synchronizing this new logic with schemata (1) developed by accreditation agencies such as AACSB and EQUIS, (2) by key stakeholders (e.g. the UN Global Compact), sustainability reporting in general, and (3) inclusive of country-specific expectations.
- Encourage business schools to push boundaries and innovations in RME and the SDGs to create responsible impact at their institutions.
- Explore how to make use of smart and open science technologies to build a viable RME and SDG impact repository/graph for demonstrating collective global impact.
- Maintain a respect for economic, geographic, and structural (e.g. large versus small or public versus private institutional) differences among PRME signatories.

To achieve this goal, Committee members met in 23 online meetings during the years 2021, 2022 and 2023, with a trajectory of activities divided in three phases that are summarized below.

Phase 1: Development of SIP Logic - January to July 2021

- Definition of the Terms of Reference
- Reflection on the current SIP Reporting structure
- Designing a smart reporting logic
- Aligning with External stakeholders: ranking, accreditation, SIP, reporting and stakeholder approaches
Some examples of the participants includes: AACSB (Tim Mescon); Financial Times (Andrew Jack); SIP Reporting (Giselle Weybrecht); PIR (Thomas Dyllick); QS (Daniel Kahn); WikiRate (Theresa Heithaus).

- SIP Focus, SIP Levels & SIP Approaches
- Reporting challenges; standard-setting role; multi-level approach
- Sustainability Reporting Schemata and SIP Levels
- UNGC Communication on Progress (CoP) inspiration, Open Science and CoP data warehouse
- Inspiration from CoP indicators for the development of basic SIP indicators
- Reflection on the PRME principles (Deconstructing the PRME principles, authored by Katell Le Goulven, INSEAD and Jim Walsh, Michigan Ross)

The end of the first phase of the committee’s work was marked by a set of recommendations presented to the board, and the reflections below that were conclusions of the meetings and discussions.

**Sustainability context & sustainability reporting**

The sustainability context is the societal environment in which the institution operates and influences. The concept refers to the combination of circumstances that determines what the norms, standards or thresholds for sustainability performance should be when attempting to understand whether or not an institution’s activities are sustainable. The SIP’s main objective is to serve as a public vehicle for information on responsible management education. In addition, the SIP can be an effective tool for facilitating stakeholder dialogue, institutional knowledge and a learning community among signatories.

**Sustainability reporting frameworks**

We experience a wave of sustainability reporting & assessment, in business and in higher education due the raise of new regulations by governments and stakeholders pressure for transparency. How does the SIP reporting logic relate to these frameworks? SIP reporting differs from SR frameworks in the sense that SIP is focused on the transformative impact of our initiatives and activities, and is aimed at accountability and not a ranking activity. SIP is a service for advancing progress for the individual school and knowledge exchange between schools. This is demonstrated through a narrative approach, through storytelling and cases for learning and progress.
Responsibility perspective

Most (academic) associations (like AOM, EURAM, etc) and platforms (like PRME and RRBM) have developed sets of Principles for professionalization, ethics and rules of engagement in the field. PRME has identified and formulated values to guide its collective strategic focus and priorities. These Principles are often fundamental and serve as generic long term drivers of the development of the mission, vision and strategic narrative of the institution.

Quality perspective

Every higher education institution has a compliance dimension represented by national and international accreditations and quality assurance agencies. Depending on the nature of the institution (public/private, free standing/embedded) these are national governmental agencies for evaluation and accreditation, and international agencies like AACSB, EFMD and AMBA. Every institution has a narrative of quality assurance for education and research, most often reported in self-assessment reports. SIP reporting results can be part of quality assurance narratives as building blocks for the demonstration of continuous improvement dynamics and to inspire and learn from each other.

Impact perspective

The story from the impact perspective is focused on how the behavior, engagements and activities of the institution influence societal and business transformations. It reveals how the institution has framed its relationship with, and contributions to society, the scope of the impact, and how it measures its success. The institution can choose multiple impact indicators next to sustainability, in this sense building their impact portfolio with SIP reporting included. The information translated into the SIP contributes to understanding the individual impact of the institution within the community in which it operates, and also contributes together to identify the global impact of an initiative such as the PRME, and how we are collaborating to build a new logic to responsible management education.

Role of metrics

As indicated, SR frameworks rely a lot on metrics. Metrics and indicators are used as evidence underpinning the claims for impact, quality and responsibility by the institution and its scholarly community and to benchmark on progress against selected indicators of success on the strategic journey. The goal for the new SIP logic will produce analytics at ecosystem level, based on generic institutional descriptors.
**Openness**

Emerging from the Open Science movement in academia in general, openness is an important emerging value in higher education research, education and impact. As part of the responsible turn in academia, open science is a strong wave changing academia and the committee was aware that SIP reporting could strategically sail this wave by adapting a logic of openness for reporting on progress of PRME signatory schools. SIP reporting needs to be supported by modern reporting and communication platforms as these are currently developed in academia. The advanced smart technology of these platforms can be a great value for more efficient linking and harvesting existing research results and help to focus stronger on the qualitative narrative instead of the administration of results.

**Phase 2: Consultation process and resourcing - September to December 2021**

Consultations with the community were a fundamental part of the evolution of the Committee's discussions, as well as a way of guaranteeing that the interests of the signatories are heard and considered in this transition.

The consultations had two objectives: The first was to reflect on the intention to update the PRME Principles and include a new principle focused on resilience; The second objective was to explore the participants' perception of the new logic of SIP Reporting and also inputs regarding potential indicators and narratives for each Principle. Professor Dilip Mirchandani (Rohrer College of Business, USA) and Professor Divya Singhal (GOA Institute of Management, India) - both PRME SIP Committee Members - were supported by the PRME Secretariat in leading this process.

Below is information about the consultations that were carried out, their objectives, the stakeholders consulted and the main insights arising from the activity.
Audiences invited for consultations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRME Community</th>
<th>Ranking/Rating/Media</th>
<th>Leadership associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● SIP Awards winners</td>
<td>● AIM2Flourish</td>
<td>● AACSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Global Chapter Council</td>
<td>● ARCS</td>
<td>● ABIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Regional Chapters</td>
<td>● Financial Times</td>
<td>● AMBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Champions Group</td>
<td>● HES</td>
<td>● Aspen Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Working Groups</td>
<td>● NBS</td>
<td>● CEEMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● PRME Global Students</td>
<td>● PRI</td>
<td>● CLADEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● UN Global Compact</td>
<td>● QS</td>
<td>● EFMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● PRME Board</td>
<td>● RRBM</td>
<td>● GBSN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● SDG Dashboard</td>
<td>● SDSN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● STARS</td>
<td>● GRLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Sulitest</td>
<td>● EMBAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● UNESCO</td>
<td>● Doctorates association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Wikirate</td>
<td>● AABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● South African Business School Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● NBA and AICTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● UK Chartered Association of Business Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● ASEAN Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Association of Asian Pacific Business School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the groups mentioned above, a number of specialists and experts were consulted during this period, in addition to being invited to participate in some meetings.

Consultation results:

The first point of consultation was in relation to the change of the PRME Principles, with the addition of a seventh principle. The consulted stakeholders questioned the process for this review and also the reason for the interest and need to carry out this review. Despite the interest raised in modifying the words and concepts to facilitate the understanding of these Principles, there was a push back from the participants when they stated that the Principles are something "sacred"
for the PRME and were built after a long consultation process. The second point of consultation was on the community’s view of a new approach to PRME reporting. The inputs around this process focused on three dimensions: the first in considering the use/adaptation of metrics that already exist in other entities in order to facilitate reporting to multiple stakeholders and compare with peers, the second point in appreciating the storytelling and narratives that are a richness important in SIP, and finally, explore the use of a digital platform, portal or database.

Phase 03: Operationalization - January to July 2022

- Construction of indicators
- Definition of priorities
- PRME Commons Framework
- SIP and CoP relations
- Levels of reporting
- Endorsement from global accreditation and leadership associations
- Fundraising
- Global infrastructure
- New PRME Principles

Phase 03 was very relevant for forwarding the committee’s advances towards the feedback and engagement of the PRME community. Some decisions were fundamental, such as the process of approaching and aligning with rankings and accreditors, identifying indicators and potential narratives, in addition to directing fundraising strategies to support the construction of the PRME Commons.

An important course adjustment was the board’s recommendation to remove the discussion on the new PRME principles from the activities of the SIP Committee, as a way of sticking to the original Terms of Reference. In the future, a specific taskforce was implemented under the board mandate to deal with this process.

Based on the feedback during the first round of consultations and recommendation from the community, the SIP Impact Sub-Committee has explored the need to engage in a second round of consultations at local level on potential indicators to advance development of SIP 2.0.

The proposed framework contained 104 questions aligned with the PRME principles and divided into the dimensions of: impact, institutional strategy, governance, environmental impact, labor policies, human rights, anti-corruption, educational practices, research, innovation, SDG
integration and operation management. Among other sources, such as the Global Compact, OECD and ISO, this material was inspired by the System of Social Responsibility Indicators for the SIP, developed by the PRME Latin America and Caribbean Chapter.

Questions were sent to all Chapter Chairs for regional consultation.

**Consultation results:**

The vision in relation to a set of issues to report was seen positively, as it facilitates the understanding of signatories in relation to what to report in relation to each principle. At the same time, the set of questions was presented as a challenge, as it contains information that is not collected by schools, especially smaller ones, or that are not accredited or ranked. The need to reduce the number of questions was pointed out so as not to offer too much work to respondents, and also in order not to reduce the reporting process to an audit or "box ticking". As points of attention, the feedback indicated the concern to receive adequate direction to answer the questions and also that this can be done through an intuitive platform that makes it possible to share the stories and good practices of each signatory.

**Phase 04: Setting the stage for implementation - September 2022 to May 2023**

With the announcement of the 3-year partnership between PRME and the Economics of Mutuality Foundation the work of the SIP Committee was dedicated to creating a solid platform for the strengthening of this partnership. The goal is to create a collaborative and multi-level platform that will enable peer-learning and engagement.

Its objective is to incentivize business schools to incorporate the teaching of responsible management and mutual value creation and to report on progress. Through the three-year partnership with EoM and the development of the PRME Commons, business schools will be provided with such a space for global knowledge exchange and peer-learning on RME across countries, regions and issues accelerating their journey towards responsible management education.

In this sense, the Committee solidified the Five Design Principles that guide the transition to SIP 2.0 as a way to create the foundations for the platform, in addition to having carried out a new consultation with the PRME community in relation to a new set of questions and indicators for reporting.

This information is presented in the next chapters.
V. FIVE DESIGN PRINCIPLES

It is important that members of the PRME community are able to learn from each other, share practices and encourage the dissemination of institutional learning, in this way creating a collective memory of institutional progress and responsible management education. We want them to be able to explore the emerging database of stored information, engaging each other with real time ideas, questions, and answers. The expectation is to create a knowledge management platform that will help business schools serve the world by helping each member school best serve its own internal and external stakeholders.

For this, 5 design principles were developed by the PRME Sub-Committee on SIP Impact SIP and are presented below:

1. Beneficial to multiple users
SIP creates value for individual faculty members and students, as well as center directors, deans, and admissions/placement/development officers, and the many external stakeholder who care about the state of business education in the world today (firms, NGOs/NFPs, government, media, prospective students and alumni, donors). Help those who are doing the day-to-day teaching, research and learning in the business schools, as well as those who are designing and leading the initiatives to better the teaching and learning environment in the schools, and those in the world who affect and are affected by the schools’ work.

2. Inspire for creativity & learning towards progress
Enable emulation, foster problem solving, encourage collaboration, and in the end, make a better world.

3. Use the power of evidence based strategic narratives
Convinced of the power of story-telling, we want to capture narrative reports of a school’s work and add the counts and analytics of initiatives and quantitative assessments of impact.

4. Institutional learning journey
We want to hear about how the schools plan and implement their initiatives, their success (and yes, struggles and failures), and of course, the impact of their work. We want our members to be able to learn from each other and explore each other’s work at any time.

5. Inspired by open science values and smart technology
Explore the emerging (selective open) knowledge base of stored information and analytics that will help business schools serve society by helping each member school best serve its own internal and external stakeholders.
VI. PRME COMMONS

The PRME Commons is a novel and multi-layer technological platform that will serve as a global knowledge exchange space on responsible management education, including research and business school operations with regards to responsible leadership and sustainable development. This platform will accelerate the speed and scale by which global progression happens from first to second-generation Responsible Management and Responsible Management Education, i.e. from classical economic shareholder approaches to sustainable development (i.e. ‘the business case’ as the goal) to novel economic short-term models of stakeholder long term inclusion (i.e. ‘societal betterment’ as the goal).

PRME Commons has six objectives as listed below, with the intention for being implemented in 3 different layers.

- Creating global technological platform to store and incentivize interactive knowledge sharing among business schools on RME and RM;
- Establishing new criteria to distinguish between first- and second-generation RM and RME and integrated into revised SIP Reporting logic;
- Developing an incentive structure with different maturity levels for business school evolution from first- to second-generation RME by providing a platform for business school self-reporting on PRME’s principles and second-generation impact indicators. Schools will use their own evidence but also plug-ins such as SDG mappings and dashboards to report on the PRME Principles;
- Exploring the potential for a novel commons repository to index and archive the evolution from first to second-generation RME reflecting maturity levels;
- Using open infrastructures and smart technologies to build a knowledge sharing platform of RM and RME beyond PRME business schools across countries, regions and the world by sourcing additional data from partnerships with data suppliers e.g., Resarch4Life, UN Publishers Compact, aggregators such as media, rankings, accreditations as well as other stakeholders e.g. UN Global Compact, WEF and WBCSD;
- Incentivizing global systemic change on RM and RME by providing an open science platform that is freely available to the public. The ambition is to engage the ecosystem to integrate more second-generation RME to influence the existing business school sector rankings, ratings and accreditations based on the analytics and
text mining provided at Layer 3 (see Figure 01 below). This may challenge the status quo of successful “North” vis a vis “South” business schools and transform the dialogue of what constitutes “best practices” according to the diversity of schools, narratives, and industry examples within the platform.

![Figure 01: PRME Commons](image)

**Structure of the platform and three corresponding layers**

The platform consists of three layers that build upon one another incrementally with different purposes.

In the first layer (“self-reporting level”), the platform serves as a self-reporting database for business schools to report on progress and provide collective evidence of progress. In this layer, criteria for the evolution from first to second-generation RME, an incentive structure with different levels of maturity and sharing good practices to influence and inspire self-reporting among PRME’s signatories. Consistent with the design principle 1, we focus on a multi actor input, leveraging existing knowledge and content of schools, faculty, students and external stakeholders.

In the second layer (“resource sharing layer”), the focus is on the business school sector and data providers and stakeholders in the
ecosystem. The platform will extend Layer 1's repository of business school reports by adding a substantial amount of data that is shared voluntarily by PRME signatory members and partners that emerges from beyond the PRME signatory base. The aim is to build data alliances with data providers to import legacy data on RME from a diversity of sources and repositories, currently distributed. Harvesting the codified body of RME knowledge and making it accessible will enable PRME to build a collective memory of progress on RME. We aim for active faculty involvement in the curation of content at the platform which will help us to develop narratives and metrics of progress for layer three.

This will enable business school sector examples and narratives to be organized according to a RME maturity model; first- and second-generation responsible management themes e.g., Economics of Mutuality, climate change, sustainable finance and gender equality. Content organization and curation will enable schools to compare and contrast practices on issue areas and identify particular potentials and challenges across regions / countries and schools facilitating knowledge exchange among schools while encouraging them to innovate based on industry examples and narratives.

In layer three ("progress monitoring level"), the emphasis is on advancing and scaling systemic change on Responsible Management and Responsible Management Education that extends far beyond the PRME ecosystem. This layer will on the one hand offer institutional profiles of PRME signatory members, highlighting their efforts and progress in RM and RME practices and knowledge, while on the other hand provide an overarching PRME community statistics and stories which will be presented in both quantitative indicators and qualitative narrative data.
VII. SIP QUESTIONNAIRE

As presented in the previous section, the first level of the PRME Commons refers to a database of self reports by multiple stakeholders (institutions, faculty, students and external stakeholders). One of these reporting stakeholders are the institutions, producing school level reports focusing on the institutional contribution of the signatories in relation to their progress in the inclusion of the PRME principles. In this context, an important part is the SIP Questionnaire, which is an entry point for Layer 01 and will be the mandatory tool for all signatories to be in compliance with the PRME.

The new reporting logic suggests that members submit annually i) an electronic statement by the Dean of the School/University expressing their commitment with PRME as well as ii) complete the Sharing Information on Progress questionnaire.

Overall, the questionnaire was designed to add value to participants in several ways:

- Build credibility and relevance by showing their commitment to the PRME Principles and the Sustainable Development Goals;
- Measure and demonstrate progress on the PRME Principles for the individual school as well as regionally and worldwide;
- Receive insight, learn and continuously improve performance. The idea of the new PRME Commons is to be a space for global knowledge exchange and peer-learning across countries, regions, and the world with an incentive mechanism for transitioning from first- to second-generation RME. It aims to provide technical help, resources, and guidance at every step of the way, and also create a space to share good practices. It will help you identify gaps and set goals to improve school’s impact and evolution journey on PRME year over year;
- The questions have answers aligned with "progression" levels, to enable a self-diagnosis of the school at the time it fills out the report and also to reflect on commitments;
- Space to share narratives and stories in a systematic way creating a space for data analysis, tagging, etc.
- To monitor, and not to rank, progress with peers through one of the largest sources of free, public, and trusted responsible business education data.
The questionnaire was structured in six sections based on the PRME Principles suggestion. Within each section, schools need to answer questions that address processes and policies that demonstrate a school’s commitment to progress, performance indicators, impact measurement and reflection on lessons learned.

From October to December 2022, this document was sent for a new round of consultation with the Chapter Chairs to provide input and to take part in the thinking and development of the proposed questionnaire. Other actors in the RME ecosystem were consulted, such as Andrew Jack (Financial Times), Stephanie Bryant and Nick Igneri (AACSB).

As a conclusion of this process, the stakeholders returned with a set of adjustments and recommendations on how the new SIP questionnaire report should be. The results of the first set of consultations are summarized below:

- Clear relation with PRME Principles;
- Provide guidance for questionnaire filling;
- Appreciate indicators as a way to promote and account for progress;
- Invite narratives to share processes for progress;
- Connect with other standards and indicators;
- Encourage reporting on operations issues (e.g. CO2 emissions, Diversity and Inclusion);
- Stimulate the pedagogical knowledge sharing;
- Future target-setting;
- Define a glossary of concepts and core references/literature/materials to support data collection;
- Allow for global data analysis annually;

---
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• Serve as a basic accounting and knowledge sharing report, expected by all PRME signatories.

The final questionnaire with the adjustments was the object of the next phase of action by the SIP Committee, the pilot with a group of early adopters. This process will be presented in the next section.
VIII. THE EARLY ADOPTERS: SIP PILOT PROCESS

Between December 2022 and January 2023, a call was launched for the PRME community, inviting institutions that were interested in piloting the new PRME reporting logic, through the SIP Questionnaire. A group of 25 schools engaged in a 3-month process in order to meet the expectations below:

- Set the new global tone for developing and implementing a new logic of business school reporting on sustainable development reporting (i.e. SDG, ESG, CSR, RME) with a set of guidelines that will be used in the future for all PRME community and other stakeholders (such as accreditations and local/global rankings);
- Provide recommendations for a new infrastructure/platform for reporting under PRME expectations;
- Collaborate with leading HEIs and the SIP Committee members on a project of value to the PRME community by contributing to the flagship project PRME Commons Platform;
- Inspire creativity & learning towards progress by enabling emulation, foster problem solving, encourage collaboration, and in the end, make a better world.
- Learn with the journey as the new logic seeks to create a process of self-reflection within the institution based on different levels of progress and maturity;
- Inspired by open science values and smart technology, explore the emerging (selective open) knowledge base of stored information that will help business schools serve the world by helping each member school best serve its own internal and external stakeholders.

During this period, early adopters met every two weeks to answer questions and share their inputs and feedback on the questionnaire. Through an interactive platform, pilot participants were able to answer the guiding questions of the process that contributed to the progress and construction of the transition strategy:
The SIP Questionnaire facilitates comparisons between business schools, promotes best practices, and streamlines the reporting process, leading to time and cost reduction. The survey allows for flexibility in narrative writing while providing structure in each question, enabling a focused approach in both quantitative and qualitative data collection. It also establishes a clearer understanding of reporting requirements and promotes accountability within the PRME community. The standardized format facilitates comparison and learning, so that we could create unique institutional profiles which foster collaboration and continuous improvement.

The early adopters raised valid concerns regarding the drawbacks of the SIP questionnaire format as opposed to pdf report submission. The structured nature of the survey may restrict concerns and issues that schools deemed important and impede the expression of unique perspectives and contexts. The lack of a balanced approach between the survey and existing reports could skew the overall assessment. The PRME Commons will mitigate this issue by allowing the upload of multiple objects (e.g. policy documents, course curriculum, strategic plans, letter of commitment etc) within the survey questions.

The standardized approach might miss the richness of narratives, storytelling, and the diverse range of activities within an institution. Data collection challenges, lack of clarity, and language barriers could lead to misinterpretation and a loss of translation, undermining the accuracy of the information gathered. As such, guidance and educational material on how to interpret and answer the survey questions will be provided. One critical issue revolves around the assumption of the level of autonomy granted to business schools as signatories.
The questionnaire may overlook the fact that many business schools operate within larger universities, where activities and strategies extend beyond the school level. Questions about school-level strategies and the presence of sustainability centers lack clarity and fail to address whether these initiatives may exist at the faculty or university level, potentially obscuring the actual impact and scope of sustainability efforts. Achieving clarity on the unit of assessment and ensuring alignment between the survey and the organizational structure is crucial to avoid misrepresentation and inaccuracies. These issues were mitigated by providing more clarity in defining an institution and also allowing signatories to share its contents more widely, including its policies and practices at different levels.

The PRME Secretariat developed a testing platform where all the inquiries were addressed. This system was designed with the aim of analyzing data, contemplating the submitted information, evaluating the quality of questions, and establishing the foundational framework. The framework is set to underpin the structure of the upcoming PRME Commons. Specifically, the Commons is designed to serve as a repository for both tangible objects and intangible narratives, while also functioning as a tool to connect individuals and entities. The results gathered from the first SIP survey act to influence the future data architecture and enacted technical vocabularies.

The PRME Secretariat and the SIP Committee members would like to acknowledge the work and effort of the early adopter schools involved in the pilot process. They are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Member since</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Institute of Business Science</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash University Malaysia</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Salle University - Dasmarnas</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>ASEAN+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasin School of Management</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thammasat Business School</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith Cowan University School of Business and Law</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>AUSNZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The questionnaire updated after the early adopters’ feedback will be released during the Global Forum and will be available at this link.

After the work developed with the Early Adopters, a transition process was established to be presented to the PRME community. The intention is to disseminate the questionnaire, platform and process in the best possible way, to ensure a smooth transition that can contribute to community buy-in.
IX. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTCOMES

The work of this Committee has been a long journey to this point. It is an honor for PRME to bring together a group of experts, professionals, professors and different stakeholders with multiple backgrounds who have been engaged for more than two years to collaborate in building something new and of strategic importance for advancing responsible management in the world via the PRME community.

Reporting progress against the Principles is part of our core concepts, and they came along with the creation of the PRME. Accountability, transparency and “walk the talk” are terms of evidence within the language of the Sustainable Development Goals and are part of our everyday activities in the classroom. But we learned during this journey that SIP is an important part of who we are as an organization. It is a source of pride for the institutions, as it demonstrates all the effort of each individual within the business school willing to make a change and leave a positive impact on society. It is a way of portraying advances, lessons learned, experiences, good practices and also challenges. It’s a milestone.

It is with great pleasure and gratitude to the PRME community professors, administrators, students and businesses that we conclude this report by confirming that the PRME SIP Impact Sub-Committee has concluded its task and report accordingly with reference to its Terms and Reference decided by the PRME Board. Consultation processes with different stakeholders, accreditation bodies and the analysis of existing reporting frameworks were essential for designing a renewed logic for SIP reporting. This brief report provides an overview of the process towards the development of the questionnaire and the creation of indicators aligned with the PRME principles that will collaborate in creating impact stories for our signatories. Finally, the development of PRME Commons, as a platform with dynamic reporting facilities using smart and open science technology.

The work of this Sub-Committee helps us move to the next stage. The PRME Commons will significantly advance PRME’s value proposition, enhance our growth and importantly increase the opportunity for impact and visibility within the responsible management ecosystem by being the central global knowledge sharing spacehub for our community.

The SIP Survey is one central part of a transition that begins now. The more we advance in discussions about the relevance of metrics and indicators, the more we can be clear that we are on the right track and know where we want to go. The more we encourage learning from our
peers, the more we increase our sense of community and value the exchanges we can have with each other. The more we expand the capacity for self-diagnosis within our schools, the more we are aware of our points for improvement and opportunities to innovate and advance in relation to building a more just and sustainable society.