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FINEEC

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.
JAMK University of Applied Sciences (Jyväskylä, Finland)

- Established in 1992, permanent licence 1997
- Limited Company (Ltd)
- Three campus in Jyväskylä, one campus in Saarijärvi (70 km to north)
- Main tasks: education, applied research, development and innovation, regional development
- Working in the fields of Business | Culture | ICT | Natural Resources and the Environment | Social Services and Health | Technology | Tourism and Catering Services | Teacher Education College
- Bachelor level degree programmes 19 + 3
- Master level degree programmes 9 + 2
- Teacher education: vocational teacher education, vocational special needs teacher, study counsellor
JAMK University of Applied Sciences (Jyväskylä, Finland)

- Degree Programme in Mechanical Engineering, Bachelor of Engineering
- Production management
- Mechanical Engineering Design
- EUR-ACE Accredited
- Valid for 6 years, up to 2021
Engineering Programme Accreditations

- FINEEC has the right to conduct EUR-ACE accreditations

- An accreditation confirms that a programme operates according to the standards; so that the programme outcomes are achieved

- ENAEE gives the license to award the EUR-ACE label to national accreditation agencies, ENAEE does not conduct accreditations by itself
Schedule of the accreditation

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 findings
Engineering Programme Accreditation

• FINEEC’s own interpretation of the EUR-ACE standard

• Voluntary for the institutions, offered as paid services

• New process for FINEEC
  • FINEEC was authorised to award the EUR-ACE label to 4 year Bachelor’s degrees in summer 2014, following an external evaluation by ENAEE
  • 5 completed accreditations
EUR-ACE in 2016

- Renewed standard

- 13 quality assurance agencies are authorised to award the EUR-ACE Label

- Around 2100 accredited programmes
  (650 in Germany, 400 in France, 250 in Turkey, 200 in UK, 150 in Russia)

- Mutual recognition of EUR-ACE accreditations by the accreditation agencies
Results
Response rates

Baseline study

Students: $41/61 = 67.2\%$ (partly compulsory)

Teachers: $16/21 = 76.2\%$

Quality Administration: $7/8 = 87.5\%$

Total: $64/90 = 71.1\%$

Endline study

Students: $11/60$ (voluntary) = $18.3\%$

Teachers: $13/21 = 61.9\%$

Quality Administration: $8/8 = 100.0\%$

Total: $32/89 = 35.96\%$
General observations

- Very small number of responses, caution advised
- Concentrating on the Baseline and the Endline
- Voluntary questionnaire yields limited responses
- No-one answers questions about what caused changes
- Interviews probably would have been better tool for attracting information on impact of evaluations
Education
Methods of delivery

- **MechEng uses mainly lectures**
  (students 70-72% teachers 77-73%)

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

- **Also project work and online studies used**
Changes

• Teachers report less lecturing and more presentations and group work

• Students have failed to notice

• Initiatives come partly from students, teachers, internal and external quality assurance
Quality management
Quality procedures used

- Student feedback questionnaires and quality indicators used consistently
- Questionnaires to teachers and stakeholders, quality meetings, written reports produced occasionally
- Students are fully aware of only their feedback questionnaires
Attitudes towards quality work

Teachers and students report positive or neutral attitudes towards quality work.

Teachers show increase in positive attitudes in the endline study.

Students' and Teachers' attitudes towards QM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive | Neutral | Negative | No Answer
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Attitudes towards quality work

All report that their attitude has not changed
Impact of QM

- About half of the respondent students reported QM having improvements.

- 20-30% of teachers didn’t see any improvements either.

### Students' experience of QM having an impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43.90%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29.27%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>26.83%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=41 and 11

### Teachers' experience of QM having an impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=13 and 15
Improvements

• The students wanted 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.

Fortunately, also the assessment of the benefits rose..

N=13 and 15
Quality Management Staff

More positive towards quality management

No change in attitudes from Baseline to Endline

Strong support experienced from the UAS top management
Overall

- Fairly mature quality system, no great feelings involved
- Student feedback rates and teachers motivation to quality management appears challenging
- Evaluation brings QA to the forefront and that appears to be the most important impact