



FINNISH EDUCATION  
EVALUATION CENTRE

# EVALUATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT BY NOQA AGENCIES

Annual NOQA seminar, Oslo 7 Sep  
2017  
Senior Advisor Kati Isoaho, FINEEC

**ALL THE AGENCIES  
ANSWERED, THANKS!**



FINNISH EDUCATION  
EVALUATION CENTRE

# QUESTIONS INCLUDED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

- **How important and necessary is evaluation impact assessment in your national context?**
- **Please describe briefly what kind of impacts the evaluations of your agency are intended to produce?**
- **What methods does your agency currently use to assess the impact of evaluations? Please describe.**
- **How does your agency use this collected information?**
- **What kind of experiences do you have of evaluation impact assessment? How do you cope, for example, with the inevitable uncertainties and possible discomfort related to evaluation impact assessment?**
- **Do you have plans of implementing new forms of evaluation impact assessment in the near future? If yes, please describe.**
- **If you had unlimited resources, how would you assess the impact of your evaluations?**

# How important and necessary is evaluation impact assessment in your national context?

**All see it as an important or quite important approach**

# GOVERNMENT AND AGENCY ENGAGEMENT?

**Government engagement with the knowledge-based decision-making and impact as a concept?**

**Statement from the respective Ministry?**

**Agencys own statement (strategy, work plan, development programme etc.)?**

# Please describe briefly what kind of impacts the evaluations of your agency are intended to produce?

- **Key feature that all the agencies share: intended impact is a high quality of higher education and its internal quality assurance**
- **Complacency with the standards vs. pushing higher education institutions for the enhancement-path: both exist (all share this as an issue to balance with)**
- **Quality of student's learning experience/learning path (Rannis, FINEEC)**

# **What methods does your agency currently use to assess the impact of evaluations? Please describe.**

- **Informal meetings with the HEI management after the accreditation process (Denmark)**
- **No specific methods; data in education collected annually, but with no evaluation whether it indicates adherence with NOKUT standards (NOKUT)**
- **Impact study conducted in 2016, mainly on the programmes found to be of inadequate quality**
- **Plan: Benchmarking against the institutions prior performance/with similar institutions (NOKUT)**

- **On-going process of building up the follow-up system and methods, along with a result chain and an aim to collect information on the possible short/mid-term effects of evaluations (UKÄ)**
- **None at present (Rannis)**
- **Established feedback system included in the audit process; both institutions and audit team members are asked to answer (FINEEC)**
- **Annual follow-up seminar on the quality audits and development in the quality management at HEIs**



# **ROLE OF THE AGENCIES`FEEDBACK SYSTEMS IN IMPACT MATTERS?**

## **ROLE OF THE FOLLOW-UP DATA ON EDUCATION (BIG DATA?) IN EVALUATION IMPACT ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT??**

# How does your agency use this collected information?

- **N/A (Rannis)**
- **Not so much, yet (Denmark)**
- **Used to evaluate whether the HEI are maintaining quality of education and the new evaluations/interventions are necessary (NOKUT)**
- **Design of the new national model for the external quality assurance and deliverinf information on the results (UKÄ)**
- **The results are delivered to the institutions and audit team members (annual Dev. Report), also web sites)**

# What kind of experiences do you have of evaluation impact assessment?

- **N/A (Rannis)**
- **Not so much, yet (Denmark)**
- **Great interest for the topic, the main challenge is to find a good set of measures for the impact (NOKUT)**
- **Experiences from the previous EQA model rather controversial; (UKÄ)**
- **The experiences on the feedback procedure regarding the audit mainly positive (FINEEC)**

# Do you have plans of implementing new forms of evaluation impact assessment in the near future?

**Summary: plans and aspirations exist in every NOQA member country/agency**

- **Comparison of the 1st and 2nd round reviews, along with subject level and institutional level (Rannis)**
- **Brain storming stage (Denmark)**
- **Linked to the planning of the new EQA (UKÄ)**
- **Challenge is to find a a fit for purpose concept for assessing the evaluation impact on the society in the wider sense (FINEEC)**

# If you had unlimited resources, how would you assess the impact of your evaluations?

- **Through content analyses of key documents related to quality produced by the HEIs (Rannis)**
- **Analyses, qualitative and quantitative, of action items identified in QEF1 that closed in QEF2, and those that are not. (Rannis)**
- **Through comparisons of information dashboards used at different time points in the universities (Rannis)**
- **Through assessment of adoption of learning outcomes strategies, as outlined in ESG (Rannis)**
- **Student representation and voting rights in various bodies over time (Rannis)**

- **The higher number of follow-up evaluations (FINEEC)**
- **Investment on the research on the broader societal impact (FINEEC)**
- **In addition, it would be great to be able to arrange more face-to-face meetings with the different stakeholders; not only linked with the single evaluation projects but in general. (FINEEC)**
- **Do not know (UKÄ)**

- **Comprehensive interviews of several rep's from all the participating HEIs focusing on their preparation for accreditation, their adaptation during the process and their adjustments afterwards. (Denmark)**
- **It is less of a resource problem than a methodological problem.** In an ideal world one could do randomized control trials to assess the impact of specific evaluations, but this is of course not possible in our field. The critical component is therefore access to reliable and valid longitudinal data that allows us to do a fairly accurate impact assessment of specific evaluations. (NOKUT)

# TARGET OF THE IMPACT EVALUATION ASSESSMENT?

**IMPACT ON THE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL QUALITY  
ASSURANCE?**

**IMPACT ON THE EDUCATION PROVIDED AND RDI  
CONDUCTED?**

**IMPACT ON THE SOCIETY AS SUCH?**



# THANKS!



FINNISH EDUCATION  
EVALUATION CENTRE

# **Impact of internal and external evaluation**

**Experiences from the HEI perspective and  
results of the IMPALA project**

Bernhard Minke

**NOQA Conference, Oslo, 07.09.2017**

# Agenda

---

---

## Introduction

---

- 1 The HEI perspective on internal and external evaluations
  - 2 Experiences from the IMPALA project
  - 3 Impact of Quality Management at FOM and some suggestions
-

# Introduction



**Hier studiere ich.**

**Founded in 1991** und publicly  
recognized as UAS in **1993**

**Not-for-Profit Foundation**

Main focus on programmes for  
working students

Network of 30 University centers  
throughout Germany

Regular evaluations by the  
German Research Council  
(Wissenschaftsrat) and by  
accreditation agency FIBAA



**Currently over 45.000 students**  
**More than 30.000 Alumni**







**About 2.000 teachers**  
**400 Full Professors**  
**60 Academic Directors**  
**7 Deans and 60 Module Coordinators**



# Factors for success



study times for professionals → **combine profession and academia**

Special professors → **applied and theoretic skills**

Specific didactics → **Transfer didactics & Präsenzlehre<sup>plus</sup>**

Applied Research → **Institutes and Centers of Competence**

Top Services → z.B. **Online Campus, counselling, service levels**

Excellent Quality Management → **quality and evaluation culture**

# Study programmes at FOM

19 Bachelor programmes

22 Master programmes

Hochschulbereich <b>WIRTSCHAFT &amp; MANAGEMENT</b>	<i>Economics &amp; Management</i>
Hochschulbereich <b>WIRTSCHAFT &amp; PSYCHOLOGIE</b>	<i>Economics &amp; Psychology</i>
Hochschulbereich <b>WIRTSCHAFT &amp; RECHT</b>	<i>Economics &amp; Law</i>
Hochschulbereich <b>IT MANAGEMENT</b>	<i>IT Management</i>
Hochschulbereich <b>INGENIEURWESEN</b>	<i>Engineering</i>
Hochschulbereich <b>GESUNDHEIT &amp; SOZIALES</b>	<i>Health &amp; Social Work</i>
Hochschulbereich <b>DUALES STUDIUM</b>	



10 Institutes

12 Centers of Competence

BERTELSMANN

**e-on**

COMMERZBANK 

 Sparkasse



 Deutsche Telekom

 **EVONIK**  
INDUSTRIES

**Peek & Cloppenburg**

**Strauss**  
INNOVATION

STADT  
ESSEN

 **HOCHTIEF**

**AOK**  
Die Gesundheitskasse.

VORWEG GEHEN

ThyssenKrupp 



**SIEMENS**

  
**Ferrostaal**

**METRO GROUP**

**IBM**

**VAPIANO**

**GFOS**   
IT – inspired by you.

**BME**  
akademie  
BME Akademie GmbH

ifm electronic



Landeshauptstadt  
München



## Evaluation an der FOM Hochschule

Instrument	Evaluationsgegenstände	Evaluiierende	Zeitpunkt / Frequenz
Studierendenbefragung	Lehre, Prüfung, Modul, Organisation und Beratung, Rahmenbedingungen	Studierende	Ende jedes Semesters
Lehrendenbefragung	Modul, Organisation und Beratung, Rahmenbedingungen	Lehrende (hauptberuflich und nebenberuflich)	Ende des Sommersemesters, jährlich
Peer Review Abschlussarbeit	Abschlussarbeiten	Dekane und Peers	jährlich
INCHER-Absolventenbefragung	Studiengang, Organisation und Beratung, Rahmenbedingungen	Absolventen und Absolventinnen	1,5 Jahre nach Studienabschluss jeder Kohorte
Konzeptevaluierung und Studiengangsreview	Studiengang, Modul, Rahmenbedingungen	Studierende und Studiengangsfachgruppe	Nach Abschluss der ersten Kohorte eines neuen Studiengangs und bedarfsorientiert
Studiengangsevaluation	Studiengang, Modul, Rahmenbedingungen	Evaluiierungskommisison Studiengang (EKS)	Bei neuen Studiengängen vor Studienstart, bei bestehenden Studiengängen alle 4 – 6 Jahre





# 1 The HEI perspective

# HEI external evaluation practices

## Government regulated HEI evaluation in Germany

### Institutional Accreditation

#### Evaluator:

German Research Council (Wissenschaftsrat)

#### Aim:

assurance of university status, adequacy of teaching, learning and research

#### Process:

„Peer Review“ every 5-10 years



FOM: successful re-accreditation in 2016

### Accreditation of study programmes

#### Evaluator:

Accreditation Council (Akkreditierungsrat) and accredited Agencies

#### Aim:

Assurance of the quality in study programmes according to formal standards of KMK

#### Process:

Programme accreditation

OR

Quality system accreditation



FOM: currently preparing for re-accreditation of the quality system



## Why we do it


### 1. Because we have to

- Accreditation requires coherent internal quality management system
- University law requires regular internal performance evaluations



### 2. Because we want to

- Demographic change is a future challenge for HEIs → competition!!!
- Perceived quality will become the most important recommendation and selection criteria
- Quality processes will be more cost-efficient in the long run
- Feedback is an essential step of the teaching-learning-relationship
- HEIs are expert organisations with a strong individual aim for highest quality

# What we do at FOM



- **Clear goals**
- **Transparent processes**
- **Quality monitoring**
- **Systematic action**




# Quality on all levels




Entire HEI

1




Study programmes

2a



Study modules

2b



Courses & exams


3




Support Services

# Effects on all levels

## Commonly expected changes/effects



## Other Effects of Quality Management



## Other Effects of Quality Management



# The quality manager's dilemma

Is there change because of  
or despite QM?

And what kind of  
change or impact?

And is it worth it?



# **3 Experiences from the IMPALA project**



# IMPALA Project Description

- **IMPACT ANALYSIS OF EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**
- **Project funded by the European Commission in the Lifelong Learning Programme**
- **Eight main project partners: four agencies and four HEIs in four countries**
- Finland: FINEEC & Jyväskylä University of Applied Sciences
- Germany: evalag & University of Stuttgart
- Romania: ARACIS & Technical University of Civil Engineering Bucharest
- Spain: AQU Catalunya & Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
- **3 years (2013-2016)**
- **<http://www.impala-qa.eu/impala/>**



TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF  
CIVIL ENGINEERING BUCHAREST



UiO: University of Oslo



FINNISH EDUCATION  
EVALUATION CENTRE

# The idea

---

- **external quality assurance procedures are carried out in higher education institutions with increasing intensity and extensiveness**
- **HEIs and agencies are asking for efficient and effective quality assurance instruments**
- **knowledge about the impact of (external) quality assurance on higher education institutions is still rudimentary**
- **Project goals:**
  - developing a methodology to assess the impact of (different) external quality assurance procedures
  - Establish a causal connection of external quality assurance procedures and changes in quality management and organisational structures
  - simultaneous impact analyses which were are based on surveys and document analyses (before-after case studies)

## IMPALA Case Studies


---

- Finland: international EURACE programme accreditation
  - Germany: internal programme review process
  - Romania: national institutional audit and programme accreditation
  - Spain: national programme accreditation
- 
- Different Focus points
  - Range from „voluntary“ to „mandatory“ and „rather internal“ to „rather external“


# Possible impact of QA procedures

	Before	During	After
Criteria	Adjustment Reflection		
Self-evaluation		Reflection	
Exchange with peers		Reflection	
Assessment report		Reflection	Reflection
Formal decision			Adjustment

# Basic Concepts of the IMPALA project



Leiber, Scheuthle (2015)



Leiber, Scheuthle (2015)

## Generic Items


➤ Course type in study programme	„facts“
➤ QA instruments used in programme	
➤ Competence-oriented assessment	
➤ Discussions of study programme	„quality culture“
➤ Attitude towards internal QA	
➤ Attitude towards externalQA	
➤ Perceived attitude of leadership towards QA	
➤ Observed impact and cost/benefit of QA	

## EQA specific Items (Stuttgart)


➤ Process of handling the evaluation report	„were instructions followed?“ „perceived impact“
➤ Process of handling the peer review report	
➤ Assessment of impact	

# First IMPALA results


How often do teachers of your study programme meet in order to discuss the further development of the study programme?



In general, what is your attitude towards external quality assurance and quality development in learning and teaching?



Has your attitude towards external quality assurance and quality development in learning and teaching changed in the last year?




Leiber, Scheuthle (2015)

- **Programme development cultures differ between institutions**
- **attitudes towards EQA differ between institutions**
- **Positive assessment of QM in general in FI, RO, ES**
- **Critical assessment of QM in DE**




# The Finnish case


Students' and Teachers' attitudes towards QM



Students' experience of QM having an impact



Teachers' experience of QM having an impact



Jurvelin, Leiber, Malinen (2017)

- Positive development of quality culture
- Positive assessment of QM in general

## What we learned from it

---

### The general perspective

- **Preference must be given to comparative and longitudinal studies which include assumptions about causal mechanisms**
- **Four steps of successful impact analysis**
  1. Thorough analysis of the EQA procedure
  2. Formulate survey questions for various stakeholder groups
  3. Formulate causal social mechanism hypotheses and investigate them
  4. Carry out document analysis and longitudinal studies, simultaneously with EQA procedure
- **Assessing impact is a very complex task**

# What we learned from it

---

## Learnings from the Stuttgart perspective (1/2)

### ➤ Methodology

- Very small sample size (expert interviews were most valuable)
- Survey timing very close to procedure shows only very short-term impact
- Involvement of students proved difficult

### ➤ QM in general

- Quality culture is very heterogeneous throughout the University
- Discussing impact and experiences with professors and HEI management is a valuable asset to quality culture (expert interviews)
- Quality management is often seen as a time consuming task with little added value (writing reports, stating the obvious, and window dressing)

## What we learned from it

---

### Learnings from the Stuttgart perspective (2/2)

#### EQA procedure

- Very detailed information on „black blox“: how does the study commission work with the QA-procedure results
- The EQA procedure worked mostly as planned (following the rules)
- Working with critical feedback is challenging for programme boards
- QA processes need constant monitoring (just like study programmes)



**Did IMPALA show impact?**


## What remains for future research

---

- **Quality culture**
  - Systematic assessment of quality culture could be a starting point for more adequate quality instruments
  - Differences in quality culture between institutions but also within institutions
  
- **Systematization of quality instruments and their effects**
  - Standard instruments are broadly used
  - Knowledge of (desired/undesired) impact could help further developing quality systems

# **3 Impact of Quality Management at FOM and some suggestions**

# Impact comparison



# How do we deal with impact of external evaluation at FOM?

---

- **External institutional accreditation**
  - **Formal governance structures**
  - **separation between academic and management tasks**
  - **Passed in 2016 (re-accreditation in 2021)**
  
- **External quality system accreditation**
  - **Increased focus on impact of quality management**
  - **Formal regulations regarding programme structure**
  - **Currently drafting of self-evaluation**
  - **Site visits in Spring and Fall 2018**
  - **Impact?**



# How do we deal with impact of evaluation at FOM?

- **Continuous voluntary external evaluations are „hard-wired“ in our quality system**
  
- **Evaluation Commission for study programmes**
  - External experts from academia and business
  - Evaluate every new study programme concept
  - Evaluate Programme Development every 5 years
  
- **System audit**
  - External HEI management and QM experts
  - Evaluate overall consistency of the quality system every 3yr
  - Last system audit in 2015

# How do we deal with impact of evaluation at FOM?

- **Continuous internal evaluations**
- **mix of survey results, process indicators, student performance indicators, peer feedback and local background information**
- **Benchmarking culture**
  - **30 study centers with same programmes**
  - **emphasis on best practice and support of quality projects**
- **Quality instruments with CLOSED LOOP**
  - **no check without an act**
  - **and no Do without a Plan**
  - **empowerment to systematic self-assessment instead of central control**



What could help us to  
further develop impact in  
QM?

## Suggestion 1: lets learn from programme theory evaluation

- Programmes can be evaluated
  - Evaluations are programmes *IMPALA experiences*
  - Evaluations can be evaluated
- 
- **Follow the “quality managers mantra”: PDCA**
  - P- Clear goals for evaluations
    - Definition of expected (multi-) normative mechanisms
    - Desired/undesired outcomes
  - D- transparent processes
  - C- monitor evaluations on a meta level
  - A- change (and leave ineffective/inefficient instruments behind)
  - **Further systematize the way we assess the causal mechanisms of our instruments**

## Suggestion 2: QA impact and programme impact


- When programmes are changed, effects of change should be monitored


Possible impacts of QA procedure			
	Before	During	After
Criteria	Adjustment Reflection		
Self-evaluation		Reflection	
Exchange with peers		Reflection	
Assessment report		Reflection	Reflection
Formal decision			Adjustment

Possible impacts of changed programme	
Impact	Mode of Monitoring
Better goals	Expert assessment (Student survey)
Better processes	Better grades Student satisfaction Teacher satisfaction Better transfer into professional life

## Suggestion 3: Continue Shift from Control to Development

- **Quality Systems in a lot of German HEIs are quite well developed**
- **Controlling standard attainment will provide less benefits in the future**
- **Individual development goals can become important elements of external QA**
- **Role of agencies could change from „accreditor“ to „counselor“**





Your remarks, experiences, questions?

## Sources



# Sources

---

- <http://www.impala-qa.eu/impala/index.php/presentations>
- Scheuthle, H. & Leiber, T., 2015, Impact Analysis of Quality Assurance in Higher Education. Methodology, Design and Results, Presentation, 2015 INQAAHE Biennial Conference “Changing Landscape of Higher Education: New Demands on Quality Assurance”, Chicago (USA), 30 March-3 April 2015 [[PDF](#)]
- Jurvelin, J., Leiber, T. & Malinen, H., 2017, Breakout session 4.A ‘practice’: Impact analysis of external quality assurance processes of higher education institutions: the experience of the IMPALA project, Presentation/Workshop, EURASHE, Seminar on QA, Brussels, 06-07 February 2017 [[PDF](#)]
- <https://web.hsu-hh.de/fak/wiso/fach/icu/forschung/projekte/wirqung/abschlusstagung> (German language only)
- Chen, Huey-Tsyh. Theory-Driven Evaluations. Sage 1994

## **A (former) student perspective on the impact of evaluations**

Erin Nordal, Advisor

## A word of caution



## Educational background

- From Minneapolis, Minnesota
- 2005-2007 University of Minnesota, double bachelor in Sociology and German
- 2007 Exchange through Humboldt University
- 2008 Freiburg University
- 2009-2011 University of Bergen
- 2013-2016 Masters of Philosophy in Higher Education at the University of Oslo



## Student representation

- 2011-2012 Vice-chairperson of the Student Parliament at the University of Bergen
- 2012-2013 Officer for International Affairs, National Union of Students in Norway
- 2013-2014 Member of the Executive Committee of the European Students' Union
- 2013-2015 NOKUT expert reviewer for the evaluation of institutions' quality assurance systems
- 2014-2015 Vice-Chairperson of the European Students' Union
  - Development of the ESG 2015 (E4)



## Quality assurance in Dreamland

- Quality is personal;  
Quality is choice
- Students as equal partners in the development of their education
- Full transparency



Do we have a common goal? We all want quality in higher education, but once again we face the problem of defining what quality is. On a personal level, quality for me is very individual, which is why I connect it so much to choice. That is students choosing their courses, literature, even their assessment forms.

Closely connected to this is considering students as equal partners in the development of their education. Students are capable of making these choices, they are at the university to learn and the staff are also at the university to learn. They have different roles, but they all have the same mission – the creation and dissemination of knowledge. Now, when they share the same mission, students' feedback should naturally be treated seriously, like how feedback from a researcher would be treated. Quality assurance is there to catch that feedback and use it to make things better.

Full transparency – open reporting, building trust

## What does it really look like?

- Periodic evaluations - top-down processes
  - Last minute “creation” of systems
  - Paradox: small institutions, “open-door policies”, most satisfied students, BUT... unsystematic, ad-hoc
  - QA agencies: too much focus on system, too little on implementation?
    - Should we really approve institutions that only have *plans* on implementation?

My experience both as a student expert and a student representative at the University of Bergen – many times it’s the leadership that controls the process. Little ownership or knowledge at levels below of how the systems work and the results of quality assurance activities. Worst practice that I’ve heard of is an institution that «created» their system just months prior to delivering their documentation. You see a lot of documents revised right before the deadlines. Can we really speak of implementation and ownership?

At the small institutions I evaluated, there were some doubts as to whether the system was being used, or if there were quality assurance practices living their own lives outside of the system. This kind of open-door policy was something that students pointed out and seemed very satisfied with. With small complaints and issues, this may not be a huge issue. However, if those small things happen every year and go undocumented, nothing will improve. So there needs to be some sort of balance here. More open doors at bigger institutions, and across the board, write down on a notepad even, what kinds of issues there are, and bring them up in programme meetings.

Another issue is with the QA agencies. Much of the focus has been on the system itself; if it’s in place, and what kind of reports come out of it. Does that mean the system is actually being used and there is a «quality culture»? Again, little ownership and/or knowledge of how things are supposed to work was common in my

evaluations. Regulations are much clearer on what kind of system needs to be in place, but not so much on the extent to which it is embedded among staff and students. Should we really be approving an institution that simply has a plan for implementation? My personal answer: No.



- Feedback to students sporadic and/or uses inaccessible language and jargon
  - “Result quality”?
  - Poor lecturers continue to lecture or are “allowed” to focus solely on their research
  - Students become less motivated to give feedback



Feedback for students is sporadic and/or difficult to understand. As a student, I had poor lecturers that had been lecturing for at least 10 years, using the same pedagogical methods and technologies that the lecturers they had when they were students used, and hearing from students that had already taken the course «there’s no point in even going to the lectures». A lecturer that receives so many complaints that they are whisked away from the classroom and allowed to focus on their research. The problem is that if students see that their feedback leads to no action here, they become demotivated – which may very well be why we see such low response rates.

Then comes communicating the results and actions. They usually have a lot of jargon and numbers and are often hard to find. Of course there are reports that need to go to the board, but QA agencies should look at how the institution manages to communicate the results and actions taken specifically to students.

## Reality cont.

- «Forced» involvement of students/student representatives/student experts
  - What does «the student» have to say?
  - Informal «discussions in the hallways» without students set the conditions for formal discussions and decision-making
- Supervision of quality vs. quality assurance activities

Looking back at what I had said earlier about treating students as the equal partners in the academic community they are, one thing that is quite noticeable is that there still is some resistance to student involvement. Either it's because «they're not relevant here» or «it will take so much time», or, we take them in, but don't really work for their views to be taken in. Then you notice how these groups, committees, etc. are «forced» to involve a student. Many of the discussions will take place outside the official meeting rooms, which will then lay the groundwork for how the decisions are made in the formal meeting rooms.

As a student expert, even though I had been on evaluations before, I had years behind me working alongside rectors and ministers, yet still, around the professors in the committee, I felt unsure and sometimes, outnumbered.

Typical «student tasks» - leading the interviews and following up on what students say. All of this is great, but it's not the only area of competence a student expert has. The quality assurance agencies have a special role here, in overseeing that each of the members is involved in the work, so this is something to be aware of.

Then, the last dilemma. Perhaps somewhat context specific for Norway, but I would argue that the supervision of quality has the greatest impact on students' every day lives. Here we look at the composition of the academic environment, learning outcomes, teaching and assessment methods and infrastructure. However, this is

often only targeted on one study programme or a single institution. On the other hand periodic supervision is broad, and like I said, can be a top-down process, limiting the impact it has on students' everyday lives. BUT! At the same time, it's the kind of supervision that covers all institutions and all programmes within the institutions.




What would it look like if we didn't do quality assurance?

- Quality assurance has had a democratising effect
  - General tendency towards greater student involvement
  - Breaking down barriers between teacher and student
  - <https://vimeo.com/19694603>
- Genuine interest on all levels in improving quality
- Agency initiatives to boost motivation
  - Educational quality award, centres of excellence



## Good practices

- Reference groups
- Mid-term evaluations
- Evaluation result portals
- Communicating actions based on results



## Developments for impact

- European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance
  - 1.3 Student-centred learning

*Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an **active role in creating the learning process**, and that the **assessment** of students reflects this approach.*
  - Public information and dissemination
  - Periodic reviews and use of information in decision-making
- NOKUT regulations

European standards and guidelines set the rules for how institutions and quality assurance agencies must conduct their activities. When these were revised in 2015, they were also heavily used in the development of NOKUTs regulations, so these principles and changes were also taken in.

## NOKUTs periodic supervision

- From evaluation to supervision, criteria to requirements
- Institutions must ensure compliance with accreditation regulations
  - Programmes must facilitate for students to take an active role in the learning process
- “Quality culture among staff and students”
- Correct insufficient quality within a reasonable timeframe
- Student evaluations in periodic reviews



Like I mentioned, periodic supervision has a more limited effect than the supervision of the quality of single programmes or a single institution. However, periodic supervision impacts the largest number of students. This is why work with the methodology is so important. Part of the requirements connect these two types of supervision, by specifically requiring that the institutions have a system to ensure that each of their programmes follows NOKUTs accreditation requirements (which are the ones that form the basis for supervision of quality).



## From NOKUT expert to NOKUT advisor

- We have a framework of laws and regulations that must be followed
- Politics within – and outside of the agency

**How we write reports, the feedback and input we provide to the government and the debates we partake in within the sector and wider public:**

*How we put that framework into practice involves making active choices*

We **are** change-drivers

Thank you for following – and hopefully –  
thinking along with me!





# The Swedish Higher Education Authority

Viveka Persson

Head of Unit,

Robin Moberg, project  
manager

Department of QA,



# The effects of a control-led programme review model


- The impact of the Swedish external quality assurance system on HEIs during the period 2011-14 and on their programmes
- Future monitoring and evaluation activities at UKÄ



# Programme evaluations 2011-14

- a consequence of two major reforms (Autonomy and Quality bill)
- Explicit and narrow results focus
- Assessing goal attainment through systematic appraisal of independent project "do students (programmes) attain the LOs laid down in the qualification descriptors"
- Unique and controversial

# Outcome and follow-up 2011-2014



# The material used

- **Analysis of the follow-up opinions on measures adopted**

- Calculating measures

- UKÄ interviews with persons in charge of programmes (programmes with high or very high quality)
  - Assessors questionnaires
  - Written questions to student unions
  - The Parliamentary Committee on education's study (based on surveys carried out by the Danish Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy Translation at Aarhus University)
  - SUHF:s (the association of Swedish Higher Education) questionnaire survey of quality coordinators at HEIs

# Overall effects

- Awareness of and enhanced focus on the qualitative learning outcomes in the Qualification Ordinance
- Thorough reviews of their programmes → enhanced focus on quality assurance procedures



# Direct effects

## Greater focus on the independent projects

- Clearer requirements laid down before students can start
- Clearer instructions and guidelines for thesis work,
- Improved supervision, more time and more qualified supervisors
- Graded on more stringent criteria

## Extensive revision of course and programme syllabuses

- More teaching of theory and methodology teaching added to programmes
- Greater focus on specific skills, e.g. through introduction of more hand-in assignments, written proficiency classes

# Negative effects

- Greater emphasis on the independent projects may have led to a shift of resources from other aspects of a programme which, in some areas could be considered more important.
- Negative consequence of programme evaluations on HEIs own routines of follow-up and programme reviews

# The effects of programme evaluations 2011-2014


Read more on:

<http://english.uka.se/download/18.6b3261a315a296ca0f3dc4cb/1487932593265/Effects-of-programme-evaluations.pdf>




# Studies of effects – the future

- Time-consuming to summarise conclusions when self-monitoring and self-assessment is not built into the model
- **Government instruction:**  
“The Authority shall annually report on how quality assurance contributes to development and high quality in the university’s activities”. (from 2017)  
**3 years after implementation – an external evaluation of the same (by 1 February 2021)**
- ESG 3.4 – thematic analysis: Agencies should regularly publish reports that describe and analyse the general findings of the EQA activities




# Monitoring and evaluation framework



# The use of M&E frameworks in internal planning to prepare for new assignments


- the case of gender equality (JiM)





# Political instruction on gender equality

Number of students registered in first and second-cycle courses and programmes each autumn semester 1977–2015:




- The overall goal of gender equality politics is that women and men should have the same power to shape society and their own lives.
- Gender mainstreaming strategy for state agencies and authorities as well as for HEIs.
- The system for quality assurance should have a focus on gender equality

# Internal processes and follow up

Activity	Timeframe	Direct results	Follow up indicators	Short term effects	Effect indicators	Long term effects	Risks
As part of the work on developing the new quality evaluation system, a review of revised control documents, manuals and manuals, etc. must be carried out in order to elucidate the basis of gender equality. The following documents are to be reviewed from an equality perspective in 2017: the assessor's manual, the investigator's manual and the components guides.	jan-dec 2017	Steering documents, handbooks and manuals are gender mainstreaming.	Revised documents contains a gender equality perspective and governance for the project mangagers.	Gender mainstreamed documents. Steering processes and decisions will be gender mainstreamed.	Particular part of the annual follow-up of JiM work in the department.	A gender mainstreamed system for quality assurance and better quality of UKÄ's evaluations. A more equal higher education sector.	That implementation is not due to lack of time or other priorities.

# Gender equality in external quality assurance



# The example of gender equality

Gender Equality	
Institutional audits	Programme evaluation
A. The HEI ensures working actively to integrate a gender perspective at all levels of the organization.	A. A gender equality perspective is integrated into the design and implementation of the programme.
B. The HEI is working systematically to monitor, evaluate and develop the integration of the gender perspective. Measures planned or implemented as a result of a review is communicated to relevant stakeholders	B. The programme is systematically monitored to ensure that gender equality is integrated into the design and implementation of education. Measures planned or implemented as a result of a review is communicated to relevant stakeholders

# Thank you!

Learn more

[www.uka.se/english](http://www.uka.se/english)  
[twitter.com/UKambetet](https://twitter.com/UKambetet)



Uddannelses- og  
Forskningsministeriet

# Student involvement in accreditation processes

Kevin Gønge  
The Danish Accreditation Institution



Danmarks  
Akkrediteringsinstitution

# Why do we need student involvement?

- Key stakeholders
- Identifying blind spots
- Accreditation utilization by students
- A gatekeeper



# The formal involvement of the students the accreditation proces



## The Accreditationpanel

- Student representation in each panel

## Site visits

- "Organised" students are interviewed on the first site visit
- "Ordinary" students are interviewed during the second visit



**STUDERENDE**




## The Accreditationcouncil

- Two members who are students





# How can we strengthen the involvement of students?



# STAR – the students accreditation council

- STAR: a discussion forum for students engaged in quality assurance and political activities at the HEIs (since 2014)
- The student organisations appoint their representative
- 19 national student organizations are represented in STAR.
- 2 meetings a year
- Discussions on issues of accreditation and quality
- Knowledge sharing between students across sectors



De Studerendes Akkrediteringsråd



## We use STAR to:

- Appoint potential students for accreditation panels
- Provide input to thematic analyses
- Appoint students to be interviewed during first site visit
- Bridge the gap between AI and ordinary students

# "Ambitions for student involvement"

## AMBITIONER FOR STUDENTERINVOLVERING I AKKREDITERING

### Udvælgelse af studerende til interviews

Akkrediteringspanelerne får gennem interviews med relevante studerende viden om de studerendes oplevelser af og erfaringer med kvalitetsarbejdet og/eller uddannelsen. Ambitionerne i forbindelse med udvælgelse af studerende til interviews er, at:





- Alle involverede parter (uddannelsesinstitutionen, Danmarks Akkrediteringsinstitution, akkrediteringspanelet, lokale studenterorganisationer m.fl.) bidrager til en gennemsigtig proces med hensyn til udvælgelse og rekruttering.
- Institutionerne så vidt muligt inddrager organiserede studerende eller studerende i kollegiale organer i forbindelse med udvælgelsen.
- Akkrediteringspanelet møder et bredt udsnit af studerende. De studerende, der udvælges til interview, skal så vidt muligt have tilknytning til forskellige campusser, uddannelser og semestre, hvor det er relevant.
- Institutionerne orienterer akkrediteringspanelet om eventuelle udfordringer i rekrutteringsprocessen.
- Alle parter bidrager til at tydeliggøre, hvorfor det er hensigtsmæssigt, at de studerende er involveret i akkrediteringsprocessen.

### Information til studerende forud for interviews

Det er vigtigt, at de studerende forud for interviews med akkrediteringspanelet føler sig godt klædt på og er blevet informeret om rammerne for og formålet med interviewet. Ambitionerne for, hvordan og hvorfor de studerende informeres forud for et interview, er, at:

- De studerende oplever, at deres indblik i og erfaringer med kvalitetsarbejdet og/eller uddannelsen bidrager til og er værdifulde for akkrediteringsprocessen.
- De studerende ikke oplever, at de er til eksamen i institutionens samlede kvalitetssikringssystem.
- Alle involverede parter bidrager til at skabe trygge rammer for en åben og tillidsfuld dialog under interviewene.
- Danmarks Akkrediteringsinstitution aktivt informerer de studerende om akkreditering og ses som en ressource, der fx kan afholde orienteringsmøder i samarbejde med institutionen og/eller studenterorganisationerne forud for en akkrediteringsproces.
- Studerende, som tidligere har deltaget i akkrediteringsprocesser, af alle involverede parter inddrages som en ressource og informationskilde, der med fordel kan informere andre studerende om akkreditering.

Baggrunden for ambitionerne er et ønske hos de studerende, på uddannelsesinstitutionerne og i Danmarks Akkrediteringsinstitution om at fremme en dialog, der skal skabe øget gennemsigtighed i forbindelse med processerne for udvælgelse af studerende til interviews og for, hvordan de studerende informeres forud for interviews i forbindelse med uddannelses- og institutionsakkreditering. Arbejdsgruppen bag ambitionerne består af repræsentanter for Danske Universiteter, Danske Erhvervsakademier, Danske Professionshøjskoler, STAR – De Studerendes Akkrediteringsråd og Danmarks Akkrediteringsinstitution. Resultatet af dialogen er Ambitioner for studenterinvolvering i akkreditering, som er målrettet de lokale studenterorganisationer, uddannelsesinstitutionerne og Danmarks Akkrediteringsinstitution. Ambitionerne er formuleret på et overordnet plan, og det har været et opmærksomhedspunkt for arbejdsgruppen, at der i enhver akkrediteringsproces bør tages hensyn til uddannelsesinstitutionernes forskellighed.



# How we reach the ordinary students

- Coffee-events
- Online as #danmarksbedsteuddannelser


>1000 cups  
of coffee





# How do we prepare students that are to be interviewed?

- YouTube videos of students sharing their experiences with interviews during site visits.
- Short animated films about accreditation
- Info-meetings with the local student organisations



Accreditation for dummies

# The benefits so far

- A channel for communication with ordinary students
- The student bodies have come to appreciate The Danish Accreditation Institution as a partner with mutual interests
- To a larger extent, students see accreditation as a tool to push for quality improvement at their programmes/institutions



# Challenges

- Representation: Differences in the degree of engagement  
Universities vs. Vocational institutions
- High replacement rate
- No formal power of decision making





# Contact info



Kevin Gønge  
[kev@akkr.dk](mailto:kev@akkr.dk)  
+45 72318832



Ina Jakobine Madsen  
[ijm@akkr.dk](mailto:ijm@akkr.dk)  
+45 72318832





# A new role for UKÄ: Quality assurance of research

# A new role for UKÄ

- Quality assurance of the higher education institutions as a whole.
- Both higher education and research
- "to further develop the national quality assurance system to also include the quality assurance of research"
- "to propose how evaluation activities from different national agencies could be nationally coordinated"
- In close collaboration with VR (the Swedish Research council)

# Quality assurance of Higher Education





# Challenges (3/4 through the pilots)

- Finding the right balance and focus in different components for the system and cycle as a whole.
- Overlaps between programme evaluations and institutional reviews
- Too little focus on the results of the internal quality work of the HEIs in institutional reviews

# The focus on results in the system - the sharpness of the system

- The assessment criteria: monitor, evaluate and develop

Part of every aspect and summarised in the end

- The experts
- The scale – currently 2 grade

# Aspect area: Governance and organisation

## Aspect: Policy for Quality assurance and information management

- The HEI's quality assurance work is systematic and relate to overall goals and strategies that the HEI has established for its operation
- The HEI has an appropriate and clearly defined responsibilities for its quality assurance work
- The HEI's quality assurance work is based on systematic processes that encourage participation, involvement and responsibilities of teachers, other staff and students
- **The HEI is working systematically to monitor, evaluate and develop quality assurance work.** HEI ensures that the information generated is communicated to the relevant stakeholders.



# Aspect area: Design, implementation and outcomes

## 3.1 Aspect: design and implementation

- A. The HEI has clear responsibilities and adequate procedures and processes for the development, establishment and closure of programs
- B. The HEI ensures that its programs are designed, developed and implemented in a way that encourages students to take an active role in the learning process, which is also reflected in the examination
- C. The HEI is working systematically to monitor, evaluate and develop program design and implementation.** Measures planned or implemented as a result of the review is communicated to relevant stakeholders.

# Aspect area: Design, implementation and outcomes

## 3.2 Achievement of learning outcomes

A. The HEI ensures their programs are designed, developed and implemented with clear linkages between national and local learning outcomes, learning activities and examinations. The HEI ensures that every student is given good conditions to reach the intended learning outcomes and within planned time


**B. The HEI is working systematically to monitor and evaluate that students' achieved learning outcomes corresponds to the intended learning outcomes.** Measures planned or implemented as a result of such review are communicated to the relevant stakeholders

# Proposed changes

A clearer reasoning on focus and desirable impact of the different parts of the guidelines is needed!

Will guide UKÄ in the revision of the model

# Decisions on institutional accreditation in Denmark – universities – 2014-2017



# Preliminary observations (2014-2017)



- Quality assurance is now anchored in the managerial system
- The responsibility on all levels is now clearer
- More efficient flow of information through the organisation
- Ongoing dialogue
- "common language"
- Focus on need for more efficient follow up

# Key elements in Conditional positive accreditations



Procedures and practice do not assure the research base of programmes

- Students' contact to research field
- Connection between research field and programme

Procedures of evaluation of programmes are (often) too loose

- External experts
- Fields of focus

# Small change(s):

New funding system should incorporate "quality of education" – nobody knows how to measure it

Second cycle Institutional Accreditation: SCL, quality standards, actual quality and the exam system – from 2019

Perhaps: Risk based programme evaluation based on external examiners' reports on failing quality



# Changes and Challenges





# Quality Enhancement Handbook

for Icelandic Higher Education

2017

2<sup>nd</sup> Edition



**Quality Board**  
for Icelandic Higher Education



**Quality Board**  
for Icelandic Higher Education



**rannís**

# QEF2

- Quality Board of foreign experts
- Quality Council of Icelandic stakeholders
- Secretariat (Manager of the QB)
- HEIs ( $N = 7$ )

# Components

- 7-year cycle
  - Six years of reviews
    - Mid-term Progress Report
    - Year-on Report
  - Year of Reflection



# Components

- Two types of Reviews
    - Subject-Level (HEI responsibility)
    - Institution-Wide (Board responsibility)
      1. Quality of the student learning experience (LE)
      2. Standards of degrees and awards (ST)
      3. Commentary on quality of management of research
- Judgments:
    - » Confidence
    - » Limited confidence
    - » No confidence



# What else is new in QEF2?

- Research included in SLR and picked up in IWR



## The 5 dimensions of the Core model for evaluation of research management

a. Research strategy

b. Management of research outputs

c. External support

d. Impact of the unit

e. Exceptional blue-skies research

# a. Research Strategy

- Does the unit have a research strategy?
- How does it relate to the institutional strategy?
- How realistic is the strategy?
- Does the strategy link research to teaching?
- What policies serve as a lever to support the strategy?
- How is the strategy supported at unit and institutional levels?
- Is strategy effectively monitored?
- Is the research environment designed to support the strategy?
- Does the research strategy take account of issues of equality, including gender?

## b. Management of Research Outputs

- How do academic units evaluate and manage the quality of their research output?
  - Refers to unit's mechanisms for monitoring and managing the quality of its research outputs.
  - The quality of outputs should be defined in relation to the application of good practice methodologies and the critical robust judgements, directly or indirectly, of respected peers or users of outputs who are in a position to make informed professional judgements of quality

## c. External Support

- How to HEIs seek external support in line with their research strategy?
  - Additional state funding for research outside of block funding
  - Competitive funding
  - Commercial funding



## d. Impact of the Unit

- What is the reach and significance of the research output of the unit?
  - Impact is to be interpreted broadly to include impact on: the subject area; on policy and practice related to the subject area; on significant developments in culture; and, importantly, on the local or national economy or society more generally.
  - Local, national and international dimensions should be considered

## e. Exceptional Blue-skies Research


- Are there particularly exciting and innovative forms of/areas of research open up which are difficult to encapsulate within existing paradigms for recognizing the significance of research?

# What else is new in QEF2?

- Research Evaluation Advisory Committee
- A student member appointed to the Quality Board
- A student observer attends Quality Board meetings
- Increased distance between HEIs and Quality Board

# What else is new in QEF2?


- An explicit complaints and appeals system



# What else is new in QEF2?

- Explicit links between SLRs and IWRs
- Explicit reference to previous reviews in IWR


Figure 2. The QEF cycle



# What else is new in QEF2?

- Increased practical guidance on implementing aspects of the QEF

Figure 3. Submission and review of RA



# Annex 10:

## Sample Table of Contents for Institution-Wide Review Report

### 1 Introduction: The review in context

- 1.1 Overview of review process
- 1.2 About institution
- 1.3 Funding/resourcing
- 1.4 Staff
- 1.5 Students
- 1.6 Key committee and managerial structures
- 1.7 The Reflective Analysis
- 1.8 Summary evaluation

### 2. Learning from prior reviews

- 2.1 Learning from previous IWR
- 2.2 Learning from SLRs
- 2.3 Learning from other reviews

### 3 Managing Standards

- 3.1 Institutional approach to the management of standards
- 3.2 Relevance of Case Study to managing standards (if appropriate)
- 3.3 Admissions criteria
- 3.4 External reference points and benchmarks
- 3.5 Resources for safeguarding standards
- 3.6 Design, approval, monitoring and review of programmes
- 3.7 Assessment policies and regulations
- 3.8 Consistency in grading and assigning ECTS
- 3.9 Collaborative provision
- 3.10 Staff induction, appraisal and development
- 3.11 Using SLRs to safeguard standards
- 3.12 Summary evaluation of security of standards

### 4 Student Learning Experience

- 4.1 Overview: Institution's management of standards of student learning experience
- 4.2 Relevance of Case Study to enhancing student learning experience (if appropriate)
- 4.3 Resources for enhancing student learning experience
- 4.4 Student recruitment and induction
- 4.5 The student voice and engagement of students in QA
- 4.6 Student support services
- 4.7 Student-centered learning, teaching and assessment
- 4.8 Use of sessional/adjunct teachers
- 4.9 The language experience
- 4.10 Internationalisation
- 4.11 Links between research and teaching
- 4.12 Postgraduate programmes

- 4.13 Collaborative Provision
- 4.14 Serving needs of different student populations
- 4.15 Management of information
- 4.16 Public information
- 4.17 Using SLRs to enhance student learning experience
- 4.18 Summary evaluation of the student learning experience

### 5 Management of Research

- 5.1 Research policy and strategy
- 5.2 Relevance of Case Study to managing research on an institutional level (if appropriate)
- 5.3 Monitoring of scientific quality of outputs
- 5.4 External support
- 5.5 Impact of the unit
- 5.6 Institutional enhancement of research management
- 5.7 Benchmarks
- 5.8 Collaboration
- 5.9 Teaching-research balance
- 5.10 Support for grant-getting activities and grant management
- 5.11 Using SLRs to manage research on an institutional level
- 5.12 General comments on the management of research

### 6 Managing Enhancement

- 6.1 General enhancement context
- 6.2 Strategic planning and action planning
- 6.3 Committee structure
- 6.4 Evidence base
- 6.5 Benchmarks
- 6.6 Internal sharing of best practice
- 6.7 Drawing on international experience
- 6.8 Domestic co-operation
- 6.9 Evaluation
- 6.10 Summary evaluation of managing enhancement

### 7 Conclusion

- 7.1 General summary, including overview of management of research
- 7.2 Summary of strengths
- 7.3 Summary of areas for improvement
- 7.4 Judgment on managing standards of degrees
- 7.5 Judgment on managing standards of student learning experience

Please note that the above is intended only as an indicative outline of a possible structure and topics for a Reflective Analysis. It is by no means definitive or exhaustive, and institutions should adopt the structure that allows them to most effectively provide an analysis of their management of quality and standards.

# What else is new in QEF2?

- *Frame of Reference* for confidence judgments
  - Anchored to ESG
  - Provides a preamble to put each ESG Standard in an Icelandic context
  - Followed by bullet point lists of specific areas of emphasis (Frame of Reference) related to each Standard



# Icelandic Preamble to ESG 1.3

- As part of this Standard, institutions are encouraged to adopt a **learning outcomes approach**. Adoption of a learning outcomes approach entails that institutions have policies and procedures for determining that academic units: 1) define learning outcomes at course and programme level that are fit for purpose; 2) ensure a good fit between programme learning outcomes and learning outcomes of individual courses; 3) ensure a good fit between learning outcomes and approaches to teaching and learning, 4) ensure that methods of assessment are appropriate in the light of intended learning outcomes; and 5) result in the continuous improvement of teaching and learning methods/strategies.
- This standard also applies to institutions' **active engagement of students as decision-makers and co-creators in teaching, learning and assessment, as well as engaging students in the development and implementation of quality processes around these activities.**
- Finally, this standard is intended to ensure **equality of opportunity** in learning for all students and take into account the needs of a diverse student population in terms of *physical or mental health status, gender, sexual orientation, skin colour, nationality, religion, residence or financial situation*.

# Sample FoR for ESG 1.3

- Institution provides some formal training and support for students to take part in learning and teaching quality management.<sup>ST</sup>
- Learning outcomes are defined for all programmes.<sup>ST</sup>
- Criteria for and methods of assessment are published in advance.<sup>ST</sup>
- The learning outcomes approach is sensitive to diversity of the student body in terms of physical or mental health status, gender, sexual orientation, skin colour, nationality, religion, residence or financial situation.<sup>ST</sup>
- Institution provides internal development and dissemination of best practice in teaching, learning and assesment.<sup>ST</sup>
- Institution provides guidelines for incorporating learning outcomes for transferable skills into curriculum.<sup>ST</sup>

# Sample FoR for ESG 1.3

- Marking is transparent, while double-marking and/or externality is used as appropriate and resources allow.<sup>ST</sup>
- Institution has a policy that addresses the incorporation of innovative methods of teaching and learning into curriculum (including those which encourage active and interactive engagement of students in their learning), and monitors follow-up.<sup>LE</sup>
- Institution uses some of the following methods to gauge the extent of co-creation of learning experiences with students: questionnaires, interviews, surveys, focus groups, opinion polls and/or discussion groups.<sup>LE</sup>
- Institution has clear, fair and accessible policies and procedures on complaints and appeals that are applied consistently across institution.<sup>LE</sup>
- Institution allows for flexible/individualised learning paths, as resources permit.<sup>LE</sup>

# Challenges

- HEIs underfunded compared to other Nordic countries
- Limited data sets
- Resources for internal and external QA

Thank you!



FINNISH EDUCATION  
EVALUATION CENTRE

# FINEEC – Recent developments

**NOQA Annual meeting in Oslo**

**8 September, 2017**

Helka Kekäläinen, Head of Unit

Hannele Seppälä, Counsellor of Evaluation

# New Audit Model 2018-2024



KANSALLINEN  
KOULUTUKSEN  
ARVIOINTIKESKUS


# Goals of the new audit model

- To assess whether the quality work in the higher education institution is in accordance with the **European principles** of quality assurance
- To assess whether the quality system produces information that **is relevant for continuous development**
- To encourage HEIs to improve procedures that **support internationalisation, encourage experiments** and **contribute to a creative atmosphere**
- To accumulate information on the quality work carried out in HEIs and **to increase openness and transparency.**



# The new audit model enhances societal impact

- Operational culture promoting impact and innovation
- Student-centred approach
- Examples of successful development work



# Areas of evaluation

## **I HEI creates competence**

- The planning of education
- The implementation of education
- The enhancement of education

## **II HEI promotes impact and renewal**

- Managing societal interaction and impact
- Impactful research, development and innovation activities and artistic activities
- Promoting impact through the operational culture

## **III HEI enhances quality and well-being**

- Using the quality system in strategic management
- Using the quality system in the development of staff competence
- Functionality and development of the quality system

Example(s) of successful development activities in all 3 areas

# Promoting impact through the operational culture

Please describe briefly the procedures used by your HEI to promote the impact of the operations. Assess the functioning of those procedures.

- How does the HEI support the opportunities of students and staff members to participate in new experiments? How does the HEI support the establishment of an experimental operating culture?
  - How are experiments monitored and utilised in the HEI?
  - How does the HEI promote the staff's opportunities for collaboration?
  - How does the HEI foster lifelong learning in the society?
  - How do staff members, students and external stakeholders participate in the development of operations which promote an impact?
  - How does the HEI participate in developing the operations of national and international networks?
-


## IV Learning HEI

- An area of evaluation selected by the HEI

## Other Novelties

- Benchlearning is a compulsory part of the self-evaluation process.
- The areas of evaluation (I-III) are each assessed as one entity using the scale excellent, good, insufficient. If all of the evaluation areas I-III reach at least the level good, the HEI will pass the audit.
- Examples of outstanding development work awarded – Excellence quality label.
- To collect feedback from the students more efficiently a workshop will be arranged with them during the site-visit.

# Digital Platform



# Benefits of the Digitalisation

- Digital platform makes the publication process faster
- Allows searching for themes and keywords
- Helps disseminate good practices
- Information will accumulate in the digital platform
- Can also be used in the production of meta-analyses
- Transparency will improve with publication of the self-evaluation report.

# Administrative merger to the Finnish National Agency for Education - EDUFI



KANSALLINEN  
KOULUTUKSEN  
ARVIOINTIKESKUS

# EDUFI

- EDUFI is responsible for developing education and training, early childhood education and care and lifelong learning, as well as for promoting internationalisation. EDUFI is subordinate to the Ministry of Education and Culture.
- FINEEC and The Matriculation Examination Board will be attached to EDUFI from January 2018 onwards.
- The Matriculation Examination Board is a governmental bureau responsible for administering the examination, its arrangements and execution.
- The negotiations of the merger are on-going.




# Foresight and effective evaluation

- the strategy of FINEEC



KANSALLINEN  
KOULUTUKSEN  
ARVIOINTIKESKUS


# Strategic goals



# Mission

*FINEEC is a nationally significant and internationally desired evaluation partner in the field of education and an inspiring developer that produces evidence-based evaluation information that has an impact on the development of education.*

# Enhancing impacts of FINEEC



# Enhancing the impacts of evaluations

FINEEC aims to promote the impact of evaluation information and the dissemination of good practices by

- strengthening the knowledge base of FINEEC
  - compiling summaries on comprehensive evaluation themes, such as
    - *the overall functionality of the educational system*
    - *the smoothness of the learning path and preventing exclusion and drop-outs;*
    - *competence-based education and qualifications and working-life relevance;*
    - *educational equality.*
-

# Enhancing the impacts of evaluations

- Developing new interactive ways to enhance the more effective use of evaluation results
- Organising e.g evaluation forums and roundtable discussion for the parties using the information
- Developing e.g self-evaluation tools for education providers.

# How?

*Make good use of the FINEEC's competence and knowledge.*

*Enhance the know how of effectiveness.*

*Maintain a positive atmosphere and encourage each other to share knowledge.*

*Inside the FINEEC and with the partners and stakeholders.*



KANSALLINEN  
KOULUTUKSEN  
ARVIOINTIKESKUS

# Thematic evaluations in the higher education sector



KANSALLINEN  
KOULUTUKSEN  
ARVIOINTIKESKUS



# Thematic evaluations in the evaluation plan 2016-2020

## Functionality and development of the educational system

- Student transitions and smooth study paths at educational transition phases
- Profiling and enhancing the education range of higher education institutions
  - competence-based approach and working-life relevance of the degrees.
  - disciplines of social sciences, arts, technology and business economics.

## Themes which are central and critical in the society

- Changes in the role of teachers, and the capacity of teacher education and continuing education to respond to the changes

# Thank you for your attention!



FINNISH EDUCATION  
EVALUATION CENTRE