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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09:00-09:10 (10 min.) | Theodor Leiber (evalag) | *The Workshop Agenda*  
*Introduction to General Problems of Impact Analysis of QA*  
*(motivation; needs; basic concepts)* |
| 09:10-09:25 (15 min.) | Quick Working Groups | *QA and Its Impact Analysis: QA Agencies’ and HEIs’ Perspectives* |
| 09:25-09:45 (20 min.) | Theodor Leiber | *The EC-cofunded IMPALA Project and Its Methodology* |
| 09:45-10:00 (15 min.) | Heikki Malinen (JAMK) | *Creating Competence With a Finnish Touch.*  
*Evaluation of HE in Finland and Quality Management at JAMK* |
| 10:00-10:15 (15 min.) | Jouni Jurvelin (JAMK) | *EUR-ACE Accreditations and the IMPALA Study in JAMK School of Engineering* |
Why Impact Evaluation of (External) QA in HEIs?

Education as a Human Right and Public Good

• HEIs (and other education institutions) **more important than ever** as high achievers in globalized knowledge societies and economies: fundamental to permanent flow of people, knowledge, information, technology, products and financial capital (cf. Marginson 2006); decisive for **competitiveness** of national states as producers of innovative research and technology

Education for All (e.g., critical thinking, intellectual and moral development, self-determination of quality life; knowledge-based employability); profiled innovative research; economic, social and ecological **sustainability**; evidence-based organizational development and political **decision-making** (cf. Anderson 2008; Hamlin 2016; Innerarity 2012; Lingenfelter 2012; Välimaa & Hoffman 2008; van Weert 2006)

• Ergo: **systematic evidence-based QA** of HEI performances of **central importance**

• Ergo: **impact evaluation of QA** (as interventions) **required** (Deming cycle p-d-c-a)
Why Impact Evaluation of (External) QA in HEIs?

- More than two decades of (external) QA, further ex-/intensification
- (Some) HEIs complain about high evaluation workload and evaluation costs and need effective and efficient QA procedures (e.g., massification; economy measures in HE; national and global competition)
- (Some) governments complain about high evaluation costs

BUT

- Rather few ex-post impact analyses of EQA
- No simultaneous impact analyses (accompanying EQA)
- Students, teachers, QA staff not considered [focus on institutional leadership opinions (and peer assessments)]
- Need for competence development in impact analysis and meta-evaluation in QA agencies and HEIs (e.g., autonomous internal QA)

(see, e.g., Harvey & Williams 2010; Lillis 2012; Newton 2013; Shah 2012; Stensaker et al. 2011)
**Impact Evaluation of QA: Basic Concepts**

**Working Definition of Causality**

- Cause-effect (or causal) relationship: compared to the cause-event(s), the effect-event(s) occur(s) later in time; and, everything else being equal (*ceteris paribus*), the effect-event(s) would not have occurred in the same way without the said cause-event(s).

- Most plausible working definition of causality:
  
  “*C may be considered a cause of E if (and only if) it raises the probability of [the occurrence of] E [under ceteris paribus conditions]*”

  (Gerring, 2005, p. 169).

- Definition comprises two fundamental ideas: (1) event identified as a cause “makes a difference”; (2) causal relations of empirical world typically cannot be adequately modelled by strictly deterministic mono-causal relations – one cause determines one and only one effect – but only by multi-factorial probabilistic relationships (or causal networks) between causes and their effects (probabilistic causation).
Types of Effects: Outputs, Outcomes, Impacts

• For present purposes and in accordance with widespread usage, short-term, mid-term and long-term effects are differentiated; they are called outputs, outcomes and impacts, respectively, and are all subsumed under the umbrella term “effect”.

This is in opposition to the fact that many use “impact” as an umbrella term (as in “impact evaluation”, “impact analysis” etc.), thus undermining the conceptually preferable alternative. However, this dispute about use of concepts, which ultimately is merely a matter of definition, cannot be resolved here.
Causal Social Mechanisms

- Epistemological idea of causal networks or “causal social mechanism” (Gross 2009; Hedström & Ylikoski, 2010; Little, 2011; Little, 2015a; Steel, 2011) is “that we explain not by evoking universal laws, or by identifying statistically relevant factors, but by specifying [causal] mechanisms that show how phenomena are brought about” (Hedström, 2005, p. 24).

- “complexes of interacting individuals, [bodies and institutions] usually classified into specific social categories that generate causal relationships between aggregate-level variables. A mechanism will be said to be from the variable X to the variable Y if it is a mechanism through which X influences Y” (Steel, 2004, p. 59). It is “the [social] pathway or process by which an effect is produced or a purpose is accomplished” (Gerring, 2007, p. 178).
Complexity and Indispensability of Impact Studies

- Basic and big obstacle to impact analysis (causal analysis) of QA in HEIs: there is complexity of the problem: QA interventions, as a rule, do have complex and manifold cross-effects on different subsystems on the micro-, meso- and macro-level of HEIs (e.g., sets of intentional states of individuals; sets of psychological states of groups; organizational and institutional structures and processes). In particular, QA interventions in HEIs in total have many different aims and purposes, and they are in competition and interplay with various other causes such as changing environment; other QA procedures; changes in HEI organization; policy measures; etc. (also cf. Beerkens, 2015; Stensaker & Leiber, 2015). Therefore, e.g., non-intended and undesirable effects and long-term effects may occur, and, normally, none of these is easily grasped at all. In summary, it is generally very difficult to adequately model the corresponding complicated (probabilistic) cause-effect, interaction, or cross-impact network.
Complexity and Indispensability of Impact Studies

• Nevertheless, organization and understanding of any educational planning and reform, and, in the end, any social life would be impossible without causal mechanisms and attendant regularities (Phillips & Burbules, 2000, p. 92).

“Causation is one of the most important and contentious issues in social science. Any aspiration for a better social world, whether they concern the alleviation of inequities or the promotion of wealth, must explicitly or implicitly rely on beliefs about the causes and effects of government policies, social institutions, norms, or other phenomena that fall within the purview of social science” (Steel, 2011, p. 288).
GUIDING Questions all WGs (à ca. 5 minutes working time):

What is your motivation for impact analyses (of QA) in HE? About which effects of which activity, procedure or instrument would you like to learn more? Why?

Which experience do you have with impact analyses in HE? Which methods and procedures seem to be relevant in your view? Which strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats do you see?

How should HEIs and QA agencies deal with impact analyses of QA? Should impact analyses be carried out on a regular level (e.g., guided by regulations)? Who should be responsible, HEI-internally and HEI-externally? Which role in HEI policy do you see for QA impact analysis?
EC-cofunded IMPALA Project and Its Methodology

• How? (Methodology)
• The European IMPALA Project
  – Partners, Case Studies and Goals
  – Research Design
  – Preliminary Results
How Impact Evaluation of (External) QA in HEIs?

- **Before-after comparison** design (and *ex-post analysis*)
  Allows to analyse *if* and *when* and *how* an effect has been achieved

- **Causal mechanism hypotheses** (cf., e.g., Leiber et al. 2015; Little 2015; Stensaker & Leiber 2015)
  Allow to analyse how effects are achieved

- **Assessments of intervention effects** by participants, key informants, experts
  (e.g., via *standardised surveys* and *structured interviews* with *different target groups* such as academic staff, students, QA staff, leadership etc.)
  Allow to analyse goals, processes, structures, preferences, actions and institutional & programme change

- **Counterfactual self-estimation of participants** (Mueller et al. 2013)
  Allows to analyse change of personal variables (intentional states) related to preferences, decisions and actions (relevant to institutional & programme change)

- **Document analyses/observations**
  Allow to analyse goals, processes, structures, actions and institutional & programme change
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How Impact Evaluation of (External) QA in HEIs?

5 main impact areas

- Learning and teaching
- Research
- Third Mission
- Internationalisation of HE
- Inter- and transdisciplinarity of HE
- Institutional management
- Nationales HE and QA system
- Satisfaction with QA processes

Stakeholders

- Students
- Academic staff in learning and teaching
- Peers
- Employers
- QA agencies
- Study programme managers
- HEI managers
- Governments
- Society
- International community

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
**IMPALA – Partners, case studies and goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11 institutional project partners</th>
<th>4 QA agencies, 4 HEIs, further (external) experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different EQA procedures</td>
<td>Institutional &amp; program evaluation, EUR-ACE program accreditation, program pre-accreditation, evaluation of program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating stakeholders</td>
<td>HEI governance/staff, HEI QA, students, HEI researchers, QA agencies, (HEI policy experts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project duration</td>
<td>36 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main project events</td>
<td>5 internal project meetings; 2 European/international conferences; 4 international workshops; publications (10 papers/QHE special issue; planned final publication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus policy priorities</td>
<td>Governance, Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPALA research design

(E)QA criteria
(e.g. intended goals)

(E)QA procedure

Interventions, e.g. self-assessment, site-visit, report

causal processes for change

Change in processes, structures, preferences, actions and institutional change

Baseline study
Status quo before (E)QA

Midline study
Status quo inbetween, after some (E)QA activity

Endline study
Status quo after (E)QA

Ex-post inspection
IMPALA research design

(E)QA procedure

Baseline study
- Before procedure
  - Online questionnaires
  - Structured interviews
  - Document analysis/observations

Midline studies
- During procedure
  - Online questionnaires
  - Structured interviews
  - Document analysis/observations

Endline study
- After procedure
  - Online questionnaires
  - Structured interviews
  - Document analysis/observations

Comparison of base-, mid- and endline of single case study

Comparison of different baseline studies

Comparison of different baseline studies

Comparison of different baseline studies

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
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IMPALA online questionnaires

• **Questionnaire items – generic**
  – Course types in study programmes
  – QA instruments used in programmes
  – Alignment of examinations and learning objectives
  – Frequency of development discussions of study programmes
  – Observability of QA effects and quality improvements
  – Transparency of responsibilities
  – Attitude towards internal QA
  – Attitude towards external QA
  – Perceived attitude of leadership towards QA
  – Assessment of cost/benefit ratio of QA
  – Plans for major programme changes
  – Suggestions for QA improvement

• **Questionnaire items – individual case study**
# IMPALA project plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description of activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Timeframe and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st project meeting (kick-off)</td>
<td>Introduction to projectAssignment of tasks Work plan Discussion of conceptual frame for methodology</td>
<td>All project partners (ca. 23 persons)</td>
<td>05-06 Nov 2013 Mannheim (evalag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACEA project meeting</td>
<td>EACEA project meeting (obligatory)</td>
<td>evalag</td>
<td>23-24 Jan 2014 Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd project meeting</td>
<td>Finalising methodology</td>
<td>Project focus group</td>
<td>10-11 April 2014 Bucharest (ARACIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European conference seminar</td>
<td>European conference seminar (in cooperation with ENQA) on the methodology developed</td>
<td>All project partners, International QA agencies; participants</td>
<td>19-20 May 2014 Mannheim (evalag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPER</td>
<td>Publication of a theoretical paper on methodology in reviewed journal (in German)</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPER</td>
<td>Publication of a theoretical paper on methodology in peer reviewed journal (in English)</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BASELINE STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Online surveys (focus groups: members &amp; students &amp; QA staff &amp; academic staff of HEI)</th>
<th>4 QA Agencies + 4 HEIs</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st project meeting (kick-off)</td>
<td>In-depth interviews (HEI leadership) Baselines for impact analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd project meeting</td>
<td>Interim meeting Stocktaking and discussion of previous results First inspection of data (baseline) for impact analysis Inductive adaptation of methodology (e.g., self-evaluation questionnaire, interviews, work plan, endline study)</td>
<td>Project focus group</td>
<td>11-12 Dec 2014 Helsinki (FINEEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>Progress Report at the mid-point of the project life-cycle</td>
<td>4 QA Agencies</td>
<td>March – April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDLINE STUDY</td>
<td>Online surveys (complete investigation: members &amp; students of HEI) In-depth interviews Midlines for impact analysis</td>
<td>4 QA Agencies + 4 HEIs</td>
<td>April 2014 – Jan 2016 (depending on HEI) Each HEI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## IMPALA project plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Issue of “Quality in Higher Education”, Vol 21/3 (2015)</th>
<th>Publication of seven papers on the state of the art of impact analysis in HE in a peer reviewed journal (in English)</th>
<th>Jan 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data</td>
<td>Analysis of data</td>
<td>Project focus group Oct 2015 – Jan 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th project meeting</td>
<td>Interim meeting Stocktaking and discussion of previous results Impact analysis on the basis of baseline and midline data Inductive adaptation of methodology (e.g., work plan, endline study) Planning of final conference</td>
<td>All project partners 25-26 Jan 2016 Barcelona (AQU Catalunya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data (continuing)</td>
<td>Analysis of data</td>
<td>Project focus group Jan 2016 – April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDLINE STUDY</td>
<td>Online surveys In-depth interviews Endlines for impact analysis</td>
<td>Agencies + HEIs Dez 2015 – June 2016 (depending on HEI) Each HEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th project meeting</td>
<td>Interim meeting Stocktaking and discussion of previous results (e.g., implementation of work plan) Impact analysis on the basis of baseline, midline and endline data Planning and marketing of conference</td>
<td>Project focus group 26-27 April 2016 Bucharest (ARACIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data (continuing)</td>
<td>Analysis of data</td>
<td>Project focus group February 2016 – June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE (in collaboration with ENQA)</td>
<td>Public conference to present and discuss project results</td>
<td>All project partners + keynote speakers + participants 16-17 June 2016 Barcelona (AQU Catalunya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT PUBLICATION</td>
<td>Publication based on project and conference “Impact analysis handbook”</td>
<td>All project partners + keynote speakers (June –) Sept 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro-Region training workshops</td>
<td>Four training workshops with QM managers, students, experts, and policy makers</td>
<td>evalag AQU Catalunya ARACIS FINEEC Sept 2016 Germany Spain Romania Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Final Report (at the end of the contractual period)</td>
<td>Project focus group Sept 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Published IMPALA outcomes so far


Leiber, T., 2016, Impact Evaluation of Quality Management in Higher Education. A Contribution to Sustainable Quality Development of the Knowledge and Learning Society, Qualität in der Wissenschaft, 10(1), pp. 3-12


For further information see http://www.impala-qa.eu/impala/
Further IMPALA outcomes in progress/planning

- One Euro-region training workshop (in Autumn 2017 in Oslo)
- Final (Conference) publication (2017) Special Issue *European Journal of Higher Education*
Creating Competence
With a Finnish Touch

JAMK University of Applied Sciences
Dr Heikki Malinen
Vice Rector

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
Finland

Education system

- high standard of education
- high scores in PISA assessment
- the Ministry of Education and Culture controls all educational institutions
- 14 universities and 24 universities of applied sciences
- equity in learning opportunities and outcomes

Education system

- Doctoral degree
- Licentiate degree
- University

- Master’s degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- University 3–6 years
- Bachelor’s degree
- University of Applied Sciences (UAS) 3.5–4.5 years

- Upper secondary or vocational education
- 3 years

- Basic education
- 9 years (compulsory)
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JAMK

University of Applied Sciences

Main tasks:
• education
• applied research, development and innovation
• regional development

Education:
• Business | Culture | ICT | Natural Resources and the Environment | Social Services and Health | Technology | Tourism and Catering Services | Teacher Education College

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
Focus areas

- Bioeconomy
- Applied cybersecurity
- Education expertise and business
- Automation and robotics
- Multidisciplinary rehabilitation

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
European Commission awarded JAMK the Erasmus award for excellence in Staff Mobility in November 2013 among 4500 higher education institutions in Europe.
FINEEC – THE FINNISH EDUCATION EVALUATION CENTRE

Independent government agency responsible for the national evaluation of education.

Vision
Finland develops education based on the versatile and up-to-date evaluation information produced by the Finnish Education Evaluation Centre.

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.

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
THE TASKS OF FINEEC

• To **evaluate** activities of education providers and higher education institutions

• To **undertake** evaluations of learning outcomes

• To **audit** quality systems

• To **conduct** thematic and system evaluations as well as evaluations of educational fields

• To **support** education providers and higher education institutions

• To **develop** the evaluation of education

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
FINEEC INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

• ENQA – European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (FINEEC’s external review in 2016)
• EQAR – European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education
• NOQA, INQAAHE – International networks for external quality assurance agencies
• EUR-ACE – European Accreditation of Engineering Programmes
• SICI – The Standing International Conference of Inspectorates
• Quality Audit Network
• Twinning projects (higher education) in Armenia and Azerbaijan
• Nordic Council of Ministers
• Nordiska evalueringsnätverket
• Nordiska nätverket för prov och bedömning
• PISA, Pirls, TIMMS etc.

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
Purpose of quality management at JAMK

Quality management is an essential part of the management at JAMK. Quality management supports the mission, vision and values of JAMK and promotes carrying out our strategy by:

- **reinforcing** the quality culture and skills of the academic community
- **producing** follow-up, feedback and evaluation information about the activities and results of JAMK
- **ensuring** continuous development of activities in all processes and at all operational levels and
- **developing** the activities of JAMK according to the changes in the operating environment while taking international quality requirements into account.

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
Quality System at JAMK

Operational environment
Globalisation, trends in the EU and Finland
Regional development, working life competence and development needs

Planning
- vision, mission, values
- strategy, pedagogical & RDI principles
- performance agreements, budget
- plans

Action
- organisation, management system
- personnel development
- partnership management
- processes and operational guidelines

Follow-up and evaluation
- indicators
- feedback
- evaluations

Quality improvement
- development projects
- making use of follow-up and evaluation
- daily improvement

Strategic steering processes
- vision, mission, values
- strategy, pedagogical & RDI principles
- performance agreements, budget
- plans

Core processes: education, RDI activities, services

Support processes
- indicators
- feedback
- evaluations

Continuous development and learning

Skilled labour
Innovation
Entrepreneurship
A successful and internationalising region

Plan
Do
Check
Act

Quality improvement

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
Basics of Quality Management in Core Processes

Education

Plan
- JAMK strategy
- Pedagogical principles
- RDI principles
- Performance agreement
- Curriculum, PLP

Do
- Education processes
- Degree regulations
- Study guide

Check
- Scorecard follow-up
- Course feedback
- Student feedback
- Follow-up surveys
- External evaluations

Act
- Development projects
- Making use of follow-up and evaluations
- Daily improvement

RDI and services

Plan
- JAMK strategy
- RDI principles
- Pedagogical principles
- Performance agreement
- Project plan
- Tender, contract

Do
- RDI processes
- Chargeable services processes
- Project instructions

Check
- Customer feedback
- Course feedback
- Project planning phase evaluation
- External evaluations

Act
- Development projects
- Making use of follow-up and evaluations
- Daily improvement

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
Recognitions of Quality

Recognition by the European Commission
- Diploma Supplement Label 2013–2016
- Erasmus Charter for Higher Education 2014–2020
- Erasmus Golden Award for Excellence 2013, first place in quality and staff mobility in Europe

Recognition by the Finnish Education Evaluation Centre (FINEEC)
- Audit certificate of the quality system 2013–2019. The audit was conducted by an international audit team.
- Centre of Excellence in Sexual Health Promotion
- Jyväskylä Team Academy named Centre of Excellence in Education

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
Recognitions of Quality

EPAS Accreditation
• Degree Programme in International Business

EUR-ACE Accreditation
• Degree Programme in Logistics Engineering
• Degree Programme in Mechanical Engineering

IUHPE European Health Promotion (EuHP) Accredited
• Master’s Degree Programme in Health Promotion

Recognitions by the Ministry of Education and Culture
• Performance-based funding for 13 years in recognition of high-quality work
• Nomination as a Centre of Excellence in Regional Impact

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
Thank You!

Dr Heikki Malinen, Vice Rector
JAMK University of Applied Sciences, Jyväskylä, Finland
heikki.malinen@jamk.fi
www.jamk.fi
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Background

• The impact evaluation carried out in the IMPALA Finland was connected to the EUR-ACE accreditation process of the JAMK’s Bachelor Degree Programme in Mechanical Engineering

• 240 ECTS, 4 years, full-time studies
• Product Development and Production Engineering
Engineering Programme Accreditations in Finland by FINEEC

- FINEEC was authorised to award the EUR-ACE label to 4 year Bachelor’s degree programmes in summer 2014

- Accreditations are voluntary for the institutions, offered by FINEEC as paid services

- 5 completed accreditations (2016)
Role of JAMK in IMPALA

• Partner of FINEEC in the project
• Participated in the development of study procedure and e.g. study questionnaires
• Participated in the project meetings
• Carried out the base-, mid- and endline studies in the university
• Analyzation of the data was mostly carried out by FINEEC
• Uses the study findings in the programme development

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
Schedule of the Accreditation Process and IMPALA Study in JAMK

- **Oct 2014:** The IMPALA baseline study
- **Nov 2014-Feb 2015:** The EUR-ACE self-evaluation phase
- **Mar 2015:** The EUR-ACE review team’s visit to JAMK
- **Apr 2015:** The IMPALA midline study
- **June 2015:** The review report and a formal decision on the result of the EUR-ACE accreditation
- **Autumn 2015:** Implementation of the development measures after the EUR-ACE accreditation
- **Nov 2015:** The IMPALA endline study
- **June 2016:** Presenting the first IMPALA findings

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
IMPALA Online Questionnaire

• Questionnaire items
  – Course types in study programmes
  – QA instruments used in programmes
  – Alignment of examinations and learning objectives
  – Frequency of development discussions of study programmes
  – Observability of QA effects and quality improvements
  – Transparency of responsibilities
  – Attitude towards internal QA
  – Attitude towards external QA
  – Perceived attitude of leadership towards QA
  – Assessment of cost/benefit ratio of QA
  – Plans for major programme changes
  – Suggestions for QA improvement
Some Results
EUR-ACE Accreditation Reached

- The Accreditation of the programme was awarded in June 2015 and it is valid for six years, up to year 2021
Questionnaire Response Rates in IMPALA (Base-End)

Baseline study

- Students: 41/61 = 67.2 % (partly compulsory)
- Teachers: 16/21 = 76.2 %
- Management and Quality Administration: 7/8 = 87.5 %
- Total: 64/90 = 71.1 %

Endline study

- Students: 11/60 = 18.3 % (voluntary)
- Teachers: 13/21 = 61.9 %
- Management and Quality Administration: 8/8 = 100.0 %
- Total: 32/89 = 36.0 %

7.2.2017
Something About Educational Process
Methods of Delivery

- Mech.Eng. uses mainly lectures

- Seminars, presentations and group work are used partly (students 85-81% / teachers 77-73%)

- Also project working and online studies are used
Changes during Process

• Slight development in amount of lecturing between baseline and endline studies (during accreditation process) was found out with the teachers
• Students did not totally agree
• The pressure for teachers to develope teaching methods is high and seems to come everywhere: students, other teachers as well as internal and external quality assurance
Something About Quality Management
Quality Procedures Used

• Student feedback questionnaires and quality indicators are used consistently

• Questionnaires to teachers and stakeholders, quality meetings and written reports are produced but less consistently

• Students are fully aware of only their feedback questionnaires
Attitudes Towards Quality Management

- Teachers and students reported positive or neutral attitudes towards quality work.
- Teachers showed increase in positive attitudes in the endline study.
Attitudes Towards Quality Work

- Change in attitude can be seen with teachers also here
- Change has been with no one negative

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
Impact of QM

- Students reported QM having growing impacts during the accreditation process (baseline 27% / endline 45%)

- Also teachers reported QM having growing impacts during the accreditation process (baseline 54% / endline 67%)
Suggestions Reported

• The students want feedback questionnaires early in the course, so they will also see the improvements.

• They would also like to see teachers taking the feedback more seriously.
Cost – Benefit Ratio

- Teachers’ assessment of the cost of QM rose during the process
- Also the assessment of the benefits rose
Quality Management in JAMK

• The role of university’s quality management is seen by the teachers (surprisingly) positive

• Based on the study, the teachers seem to experience that they have strong support from the JAMK top management in quality development work
Conclusions
• The quality management system of the JAMK seems to be fairly mature system: it seems to work even no high feelings have been involved in it
• The pressure for teachers to develop their teaching methods is high
• The involvement of the students in the quality management process as well as to make the quality management work more noticeable for them seems to be challenge as well as some individual teachers’ involvement to quality and education development processes
• The difference in knowledge and awareness of the development of the programme between average students and student activists seems to be big
Thank You!
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