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‘Impact’ in higher education QA

- A prominent theme in QA networks and agencies:
  - ENQA working group on impact
  - ESG: “continuous improvement within the agency”
  - INQAAHE: effects of the QA and how do we know it

- Academic papers on the ‘impact of quality assurance’
  from 7 in 2000 to 84 in 2015
Development towards ‘impact’

Reasons behind increased interests:
- ‘Enthusiasm’ replaced by ‘realism’ in QA (Stensaker)
- Professionalisation of the field
  QA as a technical expertise instead of a political instrument
- Evidence-based policy movement
  extending from medicine and social work (‘interventions’!)

Key challenges for impact studies:
- Measuring effects (measuring what matters, counterfactuals)
- Not constant effects (changing over time and in context)
- Multi-dimensionality (on learning, but also political legitimacy and accountability)
What do we know about the ‘impact’?

• Ex-post impact evaluation “in infancy” but ....

Insights on effects:
- the position of the teaching task
- more collegial discussion about teaching/curriculum (coherence)
- reflective practice
- alienation of teachers
- professionalization (specified procedures, paper trail)
- administrative burden
- power shifts: more power to administration, to students
...
The use of evidence in QA

• Evidence about the effects of a QA instrument (‘impact’ studies)

• Evidence-based approach as the object for QA
  e.g. CACREP, TEAC in the US: Does the program collect and respond on relevant data on learning and graduates? (ESG as well)

• Evidence as input for QA procedures
  What is being evaluated and does it make a (proven) difference for learning?
  e.g. effects of contact hours, benchmarking practice

• Evidence-driven QA instruments
  - e.g. National Survey of Student Engagement, explicitly based on research on what matters for student learning (e.g. Pascarella and Terenzini): time spent on studies, use of high impact practices (research based learning, interaction with staff, etc.)
Challenges in ‘evidence-based policy’

• Impact evaluation and the nature of the issue
  - ‘easy issues’: discrete, bounded, linked to particular information and actors -> technocratic
  - ‘difficult issues’: complex, inter-linked, cross-cutting -> relational and negotiated decision making

• Why expectations often fail?
  - Goals are ambiguous, means uncertain
  - Decision less about expected consequences, but more about process and legitimation
  - Policy making rarely a rational process from information to solution
How is evidence and policy linked?

- Knowledge driven model:
  research leads policy

- The problem solving model:
  policy issues shape research policy

- Interactive model:
  research and policy influences mutually, shaping within ‘policy community’

- The political/tactical model:
  policy outcome of a political process, studies commissioned on political purposes,

- Enlightenment model:
  research at a distance, to help to set the context for policy makers, providing a frame of thinking.

(Young et al. 2002)
Multiple evidence bases

Authoritarian vs democratic ‘truth’?
- cost-benefit approach
- impact measurement: objective, quantifiable
- multiple evidence bases

Multiple evidence bases:
- Scientific (research) evidence
  gold standard: experimental, quantitative
  complex environment: hermeneutic, ‘action-research’,
  policy/program assessment part of iterative social learning
- Practical knowledge
  practical wisdom of professionals in their communities of practice
- Political knowledge
  communication, ideological spin, menu of possible alternatives, key actors
=> policy communities, policy networks  

Head (2008)
Beyond straight-forward EBP

- Research findings (ex-post evaluation) only one kind of evidence to show what works
  ... even then, how/why something works is the key knowledge

- Insights from various research needed
  - experience in different applications may give insights how and when it works
  - theoretical insights e.g. from organizational and behavioral theory
  - knowledge from similar attempts abroad
  - need for a good synthesis of evidence

- ‘What works’ is not the only policy relevant question
  - What is the problem, what is going on, what might be done about it?
  - Therefore also good descriptive, analytical, diagnostic, theoretical and prescriptive research needed, not only evaluative.
A political dimension in EbP

• Evidence and power
  Interest of academics: demonstrate the usefulness of (social) science
  Interest of practitioners:
    - to demonstrate the efficacy of particular practices, perhaps as a result of the loss of public confidence in many professions in recent years.
    - pragmatism replaces ideology (efficiency and effectiveness in the NPM)

• QA is difficult to push into a ‘technocratic’ corner
  - but evidence on ‘impact’ is a valuable input for a societal discussion
  - shift towards network approach
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