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The Finnish Education Evaluation Centre has conducted an audit of the Metropolia University of Applied Sciences and has awarded the university of applied sciences a quality label that is valid for six years from 24 February 2017. The quality management system of the Metropolia University of Applied Sciences fulfils the national criteria set for the quality management of higher education institutions, and corresponds to the European quality assurance principles and recommendations for higher education institutions.

The object of the audit was the quality management system that the university of applied sciences has developed based on its own needs and goals. The freely selected audit target chosen by the university of applied sciences was Metropolia’s innovation projects, MINNO©.

The following were regarded as key strengths of the quality management system:

- The Quality Policy is comprehensive, well-conceived and designed to support both the strategic and operational needs of the institution. It promotes an inclusive approach with distributed responsibilities and actively includes contributions from staff, students and stakeholders. It is clearly communicated and explicitly provides the information, goals, targets, KPIs, structure, systems and resources required for quality management and enhancement.
- There is a clear commitment to quality management, critical self-reflection and the use of a proactive and continuous cycle of enhancement. A clearly structured management system supports the development of strategy for the institution and the roles and responsibilities are explicitly defined. Stemming from the strategy a range of development activities and targets are set in the annual action plans for each department or unit and the progress of core functions and attainment of objectives is monitored systematically to assure implementation. Of note is the development of predictive modelling and planning for the future.
- The quality system is comprehensively supported by a suite of online resources and tools. The recent focus on digitalisation and rationalisation of existing systems is to be commended and the development of OMA as a single portal to access key digital resources
will ensure greater accessibility and a more effective use of data in ‘real-time’ in support of core operations. This development will also provide an integrated online architecture and supporting tools to enable and ensure the systematic collection and analysis of data across all core functions.

Among others, the following recommendations were given to Metropolia University of Applied Sciences:

- There was some evidence of variability in the implementation of quality processes across the departments and of variations in local and individual practice. In supporting diversity where this is required, Metropolia is encouraged to explicitly define the core quality processes that should be implemented consistently across the institution. Where there is a clear rationale and local need for variance of practice, this should be supported but should also be formally approved and the adapted process recorded.

- The comprehensive amount of information and resources that support quality management is currently held in several locations online. The institution is strongly encouraged to collate, structure and catalogue all of the quality systems policies and related supporting resources to create a coherent and explicitly defined single set of information that is easily accessible and referenced from one place.

- Currently, Metropolia does not prescribe the internal local management structure of departments. The consequence of this is that it is not always possible to easily identify the key actors in each department with comparable quality management responsibilities. With the introduction of institution-wide quality coordinators and the anticipated further development of this role, Metropolia is encouraged to consider defining a set of key roles that would form the core of the management team structure in each department. Departments would still have the freedom to expand upon this as required.
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Auditoinnin kohteena oli Metropolia Ammattikorkeakoulun laatujärjestelmä, jonka korkeakoulu on kehittänyt omista lähtökohdistaan ja tavoitteidensa mukaisesti. Korkeakoulun valitsema vapaavalintainen auditointikohde oli Metropolia’s innovation projects, MINNO©.

Laatujärjestelmän keskeisinä vahvuksina pidetään:

- Metropolitanan laatupolitiikka on kattava ja suunniteltu tukemaan sekä korkeakoulun strategisia että operatiivisia tarpeita. Se edistää jaetun vastuun periaatetta ja osallistaa aktiivisesti henkilöstöä, opiskelijoita ja sidosryhmien edustajia. Laatupolitiikasta viestitään selkeästi ja avoimesti. Laatupolitiikka sisältää tarvittavan tiedon tavoitteet, mittarit, rakenteet, järjestelmät ja resurssit, joiden avulla laatu hallitaan ja kehitetään.


- Laatujärjestelmän toimintaa tukee kattava verkossa toimiva laadunhallinnan online- työkalujen ja resurssien kokonaisuus. Olemassa olevia järjestelmiä on digitalisoitu ja järkeistetty tavalla, joka ansaitsee erityiskiitokset. Kehitystyön tuloksena syntynyt yhteinen
verkkoarkkitehtuuri, OMA-portaali, mahdollistaa jatkossa kaikki ydintehtävät kattavan systemaattisen tiedon kierun ja analysoinnin. Tällä varmistetaan tiedon saatavuus ja saavutettavuus sekä reaaliaikainen käyttö ydintoimintojen johtamisessa.

Metropolia Ammattikorkeakoululle esitetään muun muassa seuraavia kehittämissuosituksia:

- Laadunhallinnan prosessien käytännön toteutuksessa todettiin olevan jonkin verran vaihteleva. Metropolia kannustetaan määrittelemään selkeästi ne laadunhallinnan menettelyt, jotka tulee toteuttaa yhtenäisellä tavalla läpi organisaation, mutta samalla tunnistaen ja tunnistaen alueet, joilla vaihtelun salliminen on tarkoituksenmukaista. Paikallisten alat tai yksikkökohtaisten menettelyiden soveltamisen tulee olla hallittua, dokumentoitua ja yhteisesti sovittua.

- Laatu- ja järjestelmä koskeva tieto on kattava ja laaja, mutta tietoa tuotetaan ja säilytetään tällä hetkellä useissa eri paikoissa verkossa. Korkeakoulua rohkaistaan edelleen kokoamaan, jäsentämään ja organisoimaan kaikki laatujärjestelmään liittyvät ohjeistus ja tuotemateriaali yhteen paikkaan, jossa tieto on helposti saavutettavissa ja löydetavissa.
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Sammandrag

Nationella centret för utbildningsutvärdering har genomfört en auditering av Metropolia Ammattikorkeakoulu och har beviljat högskolan en kvalitetsstämpel som gäller i sex år från och med den 24 februari 2017. Metropolia Ammattikorkeakoulus kvalitetssystem uppfyller de nationella kriterier för kvalitetshantering som fastställts för högskolor och motsvarar de europeiska principerna för och rekommendationerna om högskolornas kvalitetshantering.

Föremål för auditeringen var Metropolia Ammattikorkeakoulus kvalitetssystem som högskolan tagit fram utifrån sina egna utgångspunkter och mål. Auditeringsobjektet som högskolan kunde fritt välja var kvalitetshanteringen av Metropolia’s innovation projects, MINNO©.

Kvalitetssystemets viktigaste styrkor är:

- Kvalitetssystemet stöds av omfattande nätbaserade resurser och verkt tyg. Högskolan har på ett berömligt sätt digitaliserat och rationaliserat befintliga system. Ett resultat av utvecklingsarbetet är OMA-portalen som kommer att stöda kärnverksamheten genom
bättre tillgänglighet till och en mer effektiv användning av data i realtid. Detta kommer att möjliggöra och säkerställa en systematisk insamling och analys av data för kärnverksamheten.

Bland annat följande rekommendationer framläggs för Metropolia Ammattikorkeakoulu:

- Det finns en del bevis på avvi spel i hur kvalitetsprocesserna genomförs i olika enheter och lokala och individuella lösningar förekommer. Metropolia uppmuntras att tydligt definiera de centrala kvalitetsprocesserna som ska införas på ett enhetligt sätt inom hela högskolan. Lokala behov av avvikande tillämpning med ett tydligt syfte bör stödjas där det är lämpligt. Detta bör i så fall också godkännas formellt och den anpassade processen bör dokumenteras.

- Det finns en mängd information och resurser som stöder kvalitetshantering men de finns för närvarande på flera olika platser på nätet. Högskolan rekommenderas varmt att sammanställa och organisera alla kvalitetssystemets anvisningar och stödresurser så att det skapas en gemensam och tydligt definierad informationsbank som är lättillgänglig och kan nås på ett enda ställe.

- För närvarande har inte Metropolia fastställt den interna ledningsstrukturen för enheterna. På grund av detta är det inte lätt att få jämförbar information om enhetsspecifika roller och ansvar gällande kvalitetshantering. Genom att utnämnla kvalitetskoordinatorer har högskolan tydligt haft som avsikt att göra ansvarsfördelningen enhetlig inom högskolan. Metropolia rekommenderas att utveckla dessa roller och i samband med detta överväga att införa gemensamma definitioner och principer för uppgifterna inom de enhetsspecifika ledningsstrukturerna. De enhetsspecifika behoven kan även i fortsättningen tas i beaktande.
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1.1 Audit targets

The target of the audit was the quality system that Metropolia University of Applied Sciences (Metropolia, the UAS) has developed based on its own needs and goals. The focus of the audit was the procedures and processes that the institution uses to maintain, develop and enhance the quality of its operations. In accordance with the principle of enhancement-led evaluation, the audit did not evaluate the higher education institution’s (HEI) objectives, the content of its activities or its results. The aim of the audit was to help the institution to identify strengths, good practices and areas in need of development in its own operations.

FINEEC audits evaluate whether an institution’s quality system meets the national criteria (Appendix 1) and whether it corresponds to the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area\(^1\) (ESG). Furthermore, the audit evaluates how well the quality system meets strategic and operations management needs, as well as the quality management of the HEI’s core duties and the extent to which it is comprehensive and effective. In addition, FINEEC audits focus on evaluating the institution’s quality policy, the development of the quality system, as well as how effective and dynamic an entity the system forms.

Metropolia chose ‘Metropolia’s innovation projects, MINNO©’ as its optional audit target. As samples of degree education, Metropolia chose the Bachelor’s Degree Programme in Music and the Master’s Degree Programme in Rehabilitation. As the third sample of degree education, the audit team chose the Bachelor’s Degree Programme in Information Technology in English.

---

\(^1\) Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area is available at http://www.enqa.eu/index.php/home/esg/
The audit targets of Metropolia University of Applied Sciences:

1. The quality policy of the higher education institution
2. Quality system's link with strategic management
3. Development of the quality system
4. Quality management of the higher education institution's core duties:
   a. Degree education
   b. Research, development and innovation activities (RDI), as well as artistic activities
   c. The societal impact and regional development work
   d. Optional audit target: Metropolia’s innovation projects, MINNO©
5. Samples of degree education:
   i. Bachelor’s Degree Programme in Music
   ii. Master’s Degree Programme in Rehabilitation
   iii. Bachelor’s Degree Programme in Information Technology in English
6. The quality system as a whole.

A set of criteria that is based on a scale of four development stages of quality management (absent, emerging, developing and advanced) is employed in the audit. The development stages have been specified for each audit target and they are determined individually for each audit target. The optional audit target is not taken into account when evaluating whether the audit will pass.

1.2 Audit process

The audit is based on the basic material and self-evaluation report submitted by Metropolia, as well as an audit visit to the institution on 8–10 November 2016. The audit team also had access to electronic materials which are essential in terms of the institution's quality management. The key phases of the audit process and the timetable are included as Appendix 2 of this report.

As chosen by Metropolia, the audit was conducted in English by an international audit team. Prior to the appointment of the audit team, Metropolia was given the opportunity to comment on the team’s composition, especially from the perspective of disqualification.

2 Including social responsibility, continuing education, open university of applied sciences education, as well as paid-services education.
The audit team:

Chair:
**Ian Pirie**, Professor Emeritus, University of Edinburgh, Scotland

Members:
**Rediet Abebe**, Doctoral Student, University of Tampere  
**Maja Jukic**, Director, National Centre for External Evaluation of Education, Croatia  
**Annikka Nurkka**, Quality System Manager, Lappeenranta University of Technology  
**Kari Ristimäki**, Rector, Centria University of Applied Sciences

**Johanna Kolhinen**, Senior Advisor from FINEEC, acted as the responsible project manager and  
**Hilla Aurén**, Evaluation Expert from FINEEC, as the backup for the project manager.

The audit visit to Metropolia was conducted over a three-day visit. The purpose of the audit visit was to verify and supplement the observations made based on the audit material of Metropolia's quality system. The visit's programme is included as Appendix 3 of this report. The audit team drafted a report based on the material accumulated during the evaluation and on the analysis of that material. The audit report was written collaboratively by the audit team members and by drawing on the expertise of each team member. Metropolia was given the opportunity to check the factual information in the report before the report was published.

1.3 The Finnish higher education system

The Finnish higher education system is comprised of universities and universities of applied sciences (UASs). All universities engage in both education and scientific research and have the right to award doctorates. The UASs are multi-field, professionally orientated higher education institutions. They engage in applied research and development (R&D) that supports education and regional development. The UAS system was established in the early 1990s. Higher education institutions (HEIs) operate under the governance and steering of the Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC). Universities and UASs receive most of their funding from the MoEC, and the activities of HEIs are steered in practice by four-year performance agreements with the Ministry. The only exceptions are the National Defence University under the Ministry of Defence and the Police University College under the Ministry of the Interior, as well as Åland University of Applied Sciences under the local government of Åland (Landskapsregering).

Finland has not yet adopted a national qualifications framework (NQF). However, the Government Decree on University Degrees (2004) and the Government Decree on Polytechnics (2014) define the objectives, extent and overall structure of degrees. HEIs select their own students in Finland. However, national regulations stipulate some general principles for student admission (e.g. the equal treatment of applicants).
The educational responsibilities of the UASs are stipulated in their operating licenses. Universities of applied sciences provide bachelor’s and master’s degrees. The UAS bachelor’s degree consists of 180, 210, 240 or 270 ECTS credits (equivalent to three to four years of full-time study), depending on the study field. It comprises basic and professional studies, elective studies, a practical training period and a bachelor’s thesis or final project.

The UAS master’s degree consists of 60 or 90 ECTS credits (one or one-and-a-half years of full-time study). Applicants eligible to apply for a UAS master’s degree programme must hold a relevant bachelor’s degree with at least three years of relevant work or artistic experience. The UAS master’s degree comprises advanced professional studies, elective studies and a final thesis or final project. The focus of the educational provision of universities of applied sciences is on bachelor’s degrees. UASs also provide vocational teacher education leading to a teacher qualification. Their teacher education is aimed at those who already have a higher education degree in the relevant field.

UASs decide on the detailed content and structure of the degrees they award. They also decide on their curricula and forms of instruction. In addition to this, some fields (e.g. midwife education) have detailed regulations to some extent for the structure and/or content of the degrees awarded. UASs also actively cooperate on curricular issues under the Rectors’ Conference of Finnish Universities of Applied Sciences.
The organisation of Metropolia University of Applied Sciences

Founded in August 2008, Metropolia is the largest University of Applied Sciences in Finland with approximately 16500 students and 1050 staff members (2015 figures). Metropolia offers education in the fields of Culture, Business, Health Care and Technology in 67 degree programmes, of which 15 are offered in English. The largest study field is Technology, with 25 degree programmes and around 8500 students. Health Care and Social Services has 22 programmes with 4500 students, Culture 12 programmes with 2100 students and Business 6 programmes with 1700 students. In Metropolia, there are around 1400 foreign degree students of nearly 90 different nationalities.

Metropolia operates a horizontal line management structure with a Director for each of the core operations in Education, Research Development and Innovation (RDI), and Business Solutions (see figure 1). The degree programmes are implemented in 17 Departments lead by a Head of Department. Metropolia is owned by the cities of Helsinki (42 %), Espoo (27 %), Vantaa (26 %), Kirkkonummi (4 %), and Kauniainen (1%).
Metropolia’s Board of Directors decides on the key targets, strategy and guidance principles with regard to the UAS’s operational and financial matters, and approves Metropolia’s Regulations that define its quality policy, quality system targets and basic principles. The Board of Directors consists of the representatives of the owner cities, the staff and the students.

The purpose of the Management Group is to strengthen and develop operations based on Metropolia’s values and strategy and the competence of its staff. The Management Group supports the Managing Director and President in decision-making. The members of the Management Group are chairwoman, Managing Director and President, and Directors of Education, Research and Development, Business Solutions, Development and Finance and Administration and Head of Communications. The Manager Forum at Metropolia promotes uniform operations and the achievement of Metropolia’s strategic goals. The Forum consists of all directors and managers as well as staff and student representatives.
In the autumn of 2016, Metropolia was operating on 20 campuses located in Helsinki, Espoo and Vantaa. At the time of the audit Metropolia was preparing to rationalise and concentrate its operations to four campuses located in Arabia (Helsinki), Leppävaara (Espoo), Myllypuro (Helsinki) and Myyrmäki (Vantaa).

### TABLE 1: Basic statistics of Metropolia. Source: Audit material, national Vipunen database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students (Full-time equivalent) *</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>13191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees awarded **</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>2470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff (Full-time equivalent) ***</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>582,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research staff</td>
<td>31,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff</td>
<td>336,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistics from Metropolia, 2016.
** Annual average of past three years, national Vipunen database 2013–2015
*** National Vipunen database, 2015
The quality system at Metropolia adopts the principle of continuous development and is managed and implemented using a Plan, Do, Check, Act (PDCA) cycle. The Quality Policy is widely communicated and understood across the institution and engenders a culture of shared accountability and distributed responsibility. The rationale, objectives and division of responsibilities are explicitly defined and are the result of a thorough process. The systematic collection, analysis and communication of information to facilitate quality management are supported by a comprehensive system and set of online tools and resources. The Quality Policy is directly linked to and clearly supports both the strategic and operational management of the institution.

The quality policy of Metropolia is at an advanced stage.

3.1 Rationale, objectives and division of responsibility

The Quality Policy of Metropolia is stated in its regulations. It describes the objectives and principles of the quality system, key procedures to improve quality and the division of duties in quality management in a concise format. As included in the Regulations of Metropolia, the Quality Policy is of prime importance in the management system and is revised on a regular basis. The Quality Policy has remained consistent since 2013 when it was first defined and this has ensured the continuity and systematic development of quality work.

Metropolia’s quality system is based on the principle of continuous development according to a Plan, Do, Check, Act (PDCA) cycle (figure 2). The principle is widely communicated and understood across Metropolia. This was verified in discussions during the audit visit and the approach is used across all operations commencing with the development and implementation of the strategy.
FIGURE 2: The PDCA cycle serves as a practical approach to development of Metropolia as used for strategic management

PLAN: The targets of Metropolia functions are defined in Metropolia’s strategy 2020, in strategic action plans for prioritised development targets and for objectives of basic functions. The targets are set for all operating levels of the organisation, institutional, departmental and personal. A culture of experimentation has been encouraged where new approaches are planned and implemented.

DO: Implementation is based on common instructions and shared practices, for example, in meetings and training sessions and documented on the Tuubi Intranet, which is very widely known and used by both personnel and students. There is still room for improvement in implementing common quality procedures consistently throughout the institution.

CHECK: According to Metropolia’s Quality Policy a key method for improving quality is to regularly assess and document operating practices and results. Information on the results of assessment is collected systematically in the reporting systems, for example, the Reporting Portal and Tsemppi, and they are accessible on Tuubi. In recent years, Metropolia has invested significantly in developing its enterprise architecture and information systems to collect and share follow-up data on core operations. This work is still on-going, and in some of the developments Metropolia has worked collaboratively with other Finnish higher education institutions.

ACT: According to the Quality Policy, the responsibility for quality belongs to all members of the UAS. The board of Metropolia, top management (Management Group) and the heads of the departments have a crucial role in making the decisions and leading the development actions. The documentation and communication of strategic action plans and their progress is conducted routinely and systematically and is commended as a good practice by the audit team.
Distributed responsibility is an important principle of the Quality Policy

According to the Quality Policy, the development of a quality culture and approach is a shared responsibility of all Metropolia employees with regard to their work duties. Its management is the responsibility of the Managing Director and President of Metropolia. Directors in the Management Group are directly responsible for their area’s operational results and for the smooth running, assessment and development of its operations, in addition to the practical implementation of new operating practices and communicating them to the staff and students. The staff in leading positions at Metropolia must ensure that their units operate at a high quality and apply the quality management practices defined by Metropolia. The top management team is highly committed and involved in developing the quality assurance of the institution.

According to the audit interviews, it is clear that the definition of a distributed quality system has been widely shared. It was often seen as the most important principle in the Quality Policy. The strength of the distributed responsibility model is that the same people must both lead and be accountable for the development of quality assurance and enhancement. Conversely, this has led to local differences in quality assurance practices across the departments. Metropolia is fully aware of this challenge and has recently appointed three quality coordinators to ensure that the quality management of core operations is carried out horizontally throughout the organisation and quality management procedures are further developed and unified. The roles of the quality coordinators are still new and under development, but the heads of department considered that the coordinators have already made a positive impact to their quality assurance duties. It is recommended that the role of the coordinators be developed further according to the Quality Policy and the needs of the institution and departments. In a large institution, it is a strength that there are three part-time coordinators instead of one fulltime coordinator: together the coordinators can have a remarkable impact in systematising the quality assurance procedures across the institution. The work and oversight of the quality team, in which students are also represented, is commended as a good practice to support and guide the development of quality procedures and the work of the quality coordinators.

3.2 Communication of the quality policy

Transparency is one of Metropolia’s core values. The institution has invested heavily in supporting their approach to making communication and sharing of information and practises open and transparent, which is appreciated by the audit team.

The Quality Policy is defined in Metropolia’s Regulations and it is available on Tuubi as well as on Metropolia’s website. The intranet Tuubi currently serves as the main communication platform for the quality system. All the objectives of Metropolia’s education, RDI and business solutions as well as instructions and operating practices are communicated on Tuubi. The outcomes, follow-up data and feedback and the core operations’ development plans are also documented there. Tuubi is an important means for internal communication in Metropolia and it is well known and widely used amongst the personnel and students. In preparing the institution for the FINEEC
external audit, the Quality Policy was actively communicated on Tuubi in several ways such as announcements, questionnaires and reports on the audit exercise. Tuubi serves also as a portal to several additional tools now needed in a higher education institution.

At the time of the audit a new portal called OMA (oma.metropolia.fi) was being introduced to bring together the previously disparate range of online tools and services and make them accessible in one place. This single portal will now provide even more effective real-time monitoring and reporting of operations and is particularly relevant to the quality processes supporting education.

Although Tuubi serves the internal communication at Metropolia well, the required internal quality assurance procedures that concern, for example, all departments, all degree programmes and all RDI-projects are not documented in a consistently coherent manner across Metropolia. The information on quality management is scattered throughout Tuubi and as such it does not serve the development of the quality assurance awareness of staff or students as well as it could. It is recommended that the institution describes the core procedures common to all and makes this available as a coherent document (or set) accessible in one place. For example, the quality coordinators could collect the procedures currently held in separate locations and use them to rationalise, unify and systematise the core processes to ensure consistency of practice.

The Quality Policy is communicated to external stakeholders mainly via the UAS’s website. It is recognised, however, that the most efficient way to communicate with external partners is ‘face-to-face’. In addition to the formal meetings of the Metropolia Board of Directors and Advisory Councils, informal discussions occur in the contexts of managing internships, supervising theses and during collaborations on innovation and other projects. These informal networks are seen as valuable in discussing quality matters, focus and standards of curricula.

3.3 Link between the quality policy and the institution’s overall strategy

Metropolia’s strategy was revised in 2016. The revision process began with every department using the evaluation data provided by the quality system to analyse their operating environment and identify their own strengths and weaknesses. The joint state analysis of Metropolia’s operating environment was derived from these. In addition, feedback and views of other internal and external stakeholders were collected. The audit team views this development work as clear evidence of a functioning Quality Policy. Metropolia’s strategy 2020 was defined as a process of multiple phases using these analyses. In annual action plans, the strategy is operationalised in actions that are monitored systematically according to the principles of the PDCA cycle.

High quality is one of the core values of Metropolia and it serves as a basis for both quality assurance and strategic management. Metropolia’s Quality Policy is closely linked to the strategy. Both aim to achieve the strategic and operational goals with high quality and to improve the operations according to a continuous development principle. The Management Group is responsible for both strategic management and quality management. The audit team commends Metropolia’s approach to quality and strategic management which are clearly and effectively integrated.
Metropolia has a well-designed quality system with online tools and procedures in place to support and inform both the needs of operational management and the strategic aims of the institution. There are established and systematic processes built around the PDCA cycle for annual monitoring, review, planning and enhancement activity, and the PDCA model and approach is also used independently for managing and evaluating both small and large projects and initiatives. Departments are required to provide indicative plans and priorities for four years ahead and there is clear evidence that the quality system and the data produced is used to inform decision making and alignments to strategy. There is evidence that the quality system functions at all organisational levels, although there is a need to further harmonise some of the procedures or to more formally clarify the approved processes and rationale where different approaches are required. Based on the audit visit, there is a clear engagement with quality work across the Metropolia community.

The quality system’s link with strategic management is at a developing stage.

4.1 Information produced by the quality system for strategic management

Metropolia’s strategy (figure 3) has recently been revised and now extends to 2020. The strategy indicates that the institution aims to be ‘a bold reformer of expertise and an active builder of the future’ and places emphasis on the need to provide high-quality learning and professional life cooperation. Key aims of the strategy to 2020 are to achieve growth in RDI and Business Solutions, renewal in operating culture and rationalisation of campus locations and digitalisation in support of the focus on high-quality learning and the relationship with professional life.
FIGURE 3: Metropolia’s strategy and values

The quality system has been developed to incorporate several information systems and outputs from a range of practices to create and provide information and data for strategic management. Metropolia stresses that a key aim is to ensure that the information, data and its corresponding analysis from the quality system is freely available and accessible to stakeholders to support effective operational management and quality enhancement. Based on the audit material and interviews, it is clear that the priority to unify and develop online systems has been successful and the information and data produced by the quality system supports and enables Metropolia to achieve their strategic goals more effectively.

The quality system is viewed as an integral part of Metropolia’s management approach and overall operating culture. It is a distributed quality system and all employees are expected to take responsibility for implementing quality management and contributing to the continuous development within the extent of their duties and role(s). Staff are supported to develop their understanding and expertise in quality matters and, in the variety of staff development approaches
available, the Metropolia Academy concept has proved to be popular with staff and is commended by the audit team as a good practice. Metropolia Academy is an internal tool for training staff and building competence in various expertise areas of managing and developing higher education operations.

The Managing Director and President is supported by the Management Group and the management system operates horizontally with each of the key areas having their own Director who is directly responsible for quality within their area. A Manager Forum is used to promote a uniform approach to all operations in support of achieving the strategic goals. The forum consists of all directors and managers along with student and staff representatives, and aims to develop collective responsibility and ownership. The Management Group and Manager Forum are seen as active tools in the strategic and operational management and the system aims to be inclusive in promoting a unified approach to leading and developing the organisation overall. The audit visit interviews confirmed that the recent organisational change has more effectively established clear structures, roles and responsibilities, and departments now plan in advance for the future in four year phases with clear alignment to the overarching priorities and strategic aims.

The Board of Directors are responsible for deciding key targets, strategy and guiding principles, and also approve the regulations that define the Quality Policy, quality system targets and basic operating principles. Board members confirmed their direct involvement with guiding the strategy and that they felt well informed and had access to the information they required.

The quality system is designed to support the aims of the institution through adopting a Plan, Do, Check, Act (PDCA) continuous development and aims to achieve its strategic goals through offering flexible, continually updated learning opportunities, services and solutions.

The cycle of continuous development has been in operation since 2008 and is a core part of Metropolia's approach to quality management. As a result of changes to the UAS funding model, evaluation and monitoring have become a greater priority along with the development of predictive tools. Staff are also encouraged to contribute directly to the cycle of improvement through identifying areas and/or processes that they believe should and/or could be improved and enhanced.

The annual action planning, targets and performance reviews are captured online and the information is made widely available via Tuubi. Additional feedback is also gathered via student feedback systems, staff surveys and from stakeholders. The results and progress made are also systematically evaluated as part of periodic comprehensive self-assessment with external expert scrutiny, which Metropolia has undertaken in 2009 and again in 2015.

The development and implementation of a unified quality culture is supported via Metropolia's organisational model, management system and the active management and support of staff-competence, performance and well-being.
The quality system supports communication and sharing of practice

The Reporting Portal has been developed to provide real-time information. The portal combines information from a number of sources to provide easier access, analysis and more effective use and operates at department and project level, enabling distributed responsibility. In addition, Metropolia's operations, the ongoing status of development projects and the annual action planning process is documented in Tsemppi, an operational, planning and monitoring system. All identified actions have a designated person responsible for their implementation and for reporting progress to the quarterly reviews provided by the Management Group to the Board of Directors. They are also responsible for identifying the urgency and priority of any corrective measures, should this be necessary.

To ensure effective use of resources and in response to the changes to UAS funding, predictive modelling has become increasingly important. Metropolia has developed and implemented their own predictive modelling tool in addition to being a member of the Finnish Prediction Cooperation Network of Universities of Applied Sciences.

Sixteen operational indicators have been established for each department and the UAS as a whole. Progress against targets is published quarterly and submitted to the Board of Directors in the Indicator Report. Interviews confirmed that the Management Group subsequently follow up on the results of the quarterly reports which are used as the basis for discussion in both the Management Group and the Manager Forum. Where actions are deemed necessary, a member of staff is nominated and is accountable for reporting on their progress and conclusion.

The quality system also produces the information required for the Board of Directors’ annual report and end of year financial statements. Once produced, the information is made freely and publicly available to external stakeholders and the wider community. This transparency and open approach to information and communication is stated as one of Metropolia's core values and is commended as a good practice by the audit team.

To ensure that information is of value and effectively utilised, Strategy and Development Services and Finance and Administrative Services are working actively and closely with the departments and, as a consequence, a Metropolia Academy in Knowledge Management was established at the beginning of 2016.

Metropolia believes that the information produced by the quality system provides a sound basis for strategic management, resource planning and reporting. The various systems (Tsemppi, Reporting Portal and Indicator Report) provide useful information on progress against targets and the use of predictive modelling tools enable Metropolia to plan for various scenarios regarding future financial sustainability.

The results are regularly analysed and communicated via the Manager Forum to the wider UAS community.
4.2 Functioning of the quality system at different organisational levels and units

A holistic approach to periodic internal audits is now well established and requires the involvement of staff from different organisational levels and with various areas of responsibility from across the organisation.

The 2016 internal audit comprised 65 degree programmes, 17 departments and service and support areas. The process was managed by an 'audit project group' who was responsible for analysing the audit outputs and department submissions.

The 2011 internal audit had identified that a focused approach to the systematic application of the quality system needed to be adopted. Metropolia’s own 2016 internal audit evidenced that significant progress had been made but also recognised that the consistent application of quality system procedures still remains a challenge. This was confirmed by the external audit team as an area for further development and it is recommended that Metropolia develop a discrete set of information (accessible in one location online) in support of the quality system which defines the core requirements that must be implemented in the same way across all departments. Where differences are required and acknowledged, for example, as a consequence of pedagogical approaches, discipline or programme-based needs, the rationale for this should be clearly defined and the adapted quality system process to be followed formally approved.

The audit team appreciates the rigour evident in the self-assessment audits and that the issues highlighted are being addressed systematically. These have resulted in significant organisational and staff changes and the appointment of Quality Coordinators designated to core operations with a remit to put into practice systematic quality management and assurance. The appointment of dedicated Quality Coordinators is also commended by the audit team.

4.3 Quality culture

The UAS has set out clear aims and expectations for its employees based around a set of core values aimed at embedding good leadership and working cultures supported by developing high-levels of professional competencies for all. The philosophy and approach is supported in practice by HR planning, the recruitment and induction of new employees and the annual target and performance reviews for all employees. Staff felt well supported in their personal development and in their ability to access training and contribute to their development needs.

The students are also directly involved in the ongoing development of a quality culture (including the development of online systems such as Pakki, the student desktop), and this is also manifested in the systematic development of student feedback and open debates on learning, teaching and quality of operations. Students are also represented on the degree programme Advisory Councils.
and the Manager Forum. Matters raised by METKA, the student union, are discussed directly by Metropolia’s Management Group. Students were confident in their abilities to raise and discuss issues, however, actions taken could be more formally communicated back to students.

Metropolia is commended for their innovative developments and progress on ‘digitalisation’ and the focus on providing a unified portal in support of their open and transparent communications policy. The new OMA system provides a future-ready communications and information platform to enable and support the active engagement of the whole Metropolia community, including external collaborators and stakeholders.

Metropolia recognises that more systematic gathering, analysis, synthesis and sharing of local innovation and good practices to inform and prioritise institution-wide developments would be beneficial and the audit team would support and encourage this development, given that the OMA system will make this much easier to achieve in practice.
Metropolia has put in place well-functioning procedures to evaluate and develop the quality system. It is able to identify the system's strengths and areas in need of development. The development of the quality system after the first audit has been systematic. The system works better than before. However, Metropolia is recommended to accord due attention to making the implementation of the quality system more systematic and comparable across the entire institution and the scattered campuses.

The development of the quality system is at a developing stage.

5.1 Procedures for developing the quality system

Metropolia's management system actively leads and supports the quality system. The President, Board of Directors, Directors and quality coordinators of core operations as well as the offices of Stakeholder Relations and Communications and Marketing play active roles in evaluating activities and setting action plans for developing the quality system. As a crucial part of Metropolia's management system, the Manager Forum serves as an important channel through which discussions are held on matters related to the quality of operations. The audit team acclaims the fact that the Management Group is at the forefront of the development of the quality system. It has succeeded in mobilising the Metropolia community towards the implementation of the quality management at various levels. The audit visit confirmed that top management is accessible and supportive of students and staff.

The designation of quality coordinators for each core operation of the UAS is also seen by the audit team as a good practice. The degree of emphasis that quality management has been accorded in this regard is exemplary.
Metropolia’s core operations are well-supported by quality management procedures

Metropolia has developed well-functioning procedures for evaluating and developing its quality system. The main procedures in use include the feedback system, institutional self-assessments, internal and international benchmarking, and digitalisation and information system services. The audit visit confirmed that the quality management system in place is a crucial tool in identifying the strengths and areas in need of development in Metropolia.

Metropolia has a culture that welcomes feedback. The feedback system generates a significant amount of useful information. It has helped departments in being better informed about the quality of their operations and what actions to take in order to improve performance. It is now easier for departments to check the satisfaction of their students. The audit team commends the practice of ‘feedback on feedback’ sessions, whereby feedback is discussed together with staff, students and management, and produce development plans for improving operations.

However, Metropolia is encouraged to consider further strengthening and systematising the link between feedback and development actions, and developing a systematic approach for processing and communicating feedback. Metropolia could work on developing a more robust connection between feedback and concrete development actions. The students indicated that although the issues they raise are usually listened to, acting on these suggestions has not been consistent throughout Metropolia. It would be beneficial for the institution to pay more attention to closing the feedback loop and actively addressing concerns raised in feedback. The audit team also found that Metropolia currently lacks formal procedures by which follow-up information on the processing of feedback could be communicated to those who conveyed the feedback. In this regard, Metropolia could also consider adopting the practice of reporting to stakeholders on the improvements taken following feedback. This could help consolidate stakeholders’ trust in the capacity of institutional mechanisms in responding to issues raised. It would also be useful to develop a structured procedure for documenting and sharing information generated through feedback systems.

Continuous self-assessment of operations is a key strength

The cross-assessment of degree programmes as an internal benchmarking method has led to the identification of good practices and areas in need of development within Metropolia’s degree-level education. The audit team confirmed that the institutional self-assessments have led to reforms in organisational and management systems, pedagogical policies and quality assurance of teaching and learning. The restructuring of the management system has supported expanding the stretch of the quality management to each of Metropolia’s core operations. The culture of conducting continuous self-assessment of operations is a key strength of the UAS. The practice of international benchmarking has also enabled the institution to learn from best practices on quality assurance in teaching, student feedback, and student services.

The quality management procedures have contributed to structuring operations in degree programmes. The lessons from RDI activities have been used by departments in improving degree education (for instance, in proactively assessing the type of skills that may be required in the future working life contexts).
The audit team noted that the variety of information system services and well-developed digitalisation of processes have enhanced Metropolia’s capacity for a robust system of communication and flow of information across the entire institution. It has also allowed for the systematic gathering of feedback from internal and external stakeholders. However, the audit team encourages Metropolia to work on developing more structured procedures for managing and utilising good practices. The audit team commends efforts committed to developing a structured platform to help systematically guide the sharing, prioritising, deciding on which ones to introduce across Metropolia, and monitoring the implementation of good practices. Such measures could contribute to further improving the quality of operations. The audit team recognises Manager Forum has been a useful platform for sharing good practices. Metropolia is encouraged to explore and develop more platforms for such exchanges, and enhance its capacity for effectively harnessing the currently underutilised potential for internal learning. The goal here would be to make the quality management system a self-reflective, responsive and continuously learning one.

Making the quality system more consistent and comparable throughout Metropolia is recommended

The Quality Policy promotes a shared approach towards carrying out the responsibilities for quality management. Support services, heads of departments, teachers, students, and external stakeholders take part in the quality work. The Policy has enhanced the active participation of internal and external stakeholders in the development of the quality system. The audit team confirmed that internal and external stakeholders are aware of the principles of the quality management system and their respective responsibilities.

In spite of the advantages of the approach towards quality management as a shared responsibility of every member of the Metropolia community, the audit team strongly encourages the UAS to pay attention to making the quality system more systematic and comparable throughout the institution. The audit team appreciates the efforts targeted at making the practice of quality management more systematic, where the understanding of quality and procedures used to assure, enhance and manage it at various levels, across departments and physically scattered campuses are synchronised into a consistent and comparable system. The self-evaluation report and the audit visit confirmed that despite the core principle put forth in the Quality Policy towards engaging the entire institution in quality management, quality assurance was in practice approached slightly differently in different units and departments. Although the interviews held with department heads and teachers indicated that departments value the authority they have over planning and implementing their education provision, any variation and flexibility would, however, need to be managed within the limits of ensuring sufficiently comparable practices.

5.2 Development work after the previous audit

Metropolia has significantly improved the quality management of its operations after the previous audit. The recommendations received in 2011 provided the basis for undertaking several development activities. Accordingly, Metropolia has been devoted to its efforts to clarify and
improve its quality management system, linking this system with core operations and developing systems for feedback management and has designated quality coordinators for each of its core operations. It is clear that the quality system in Metropolia has been oriented towards supporting the institution in achieving its strategic objectives.

Metropolia also has been committed to continuously improving the quality of its operations. It has restructured its management system, improved documentation and reporting of activities, digitised its operations and developed information system services, directed efforts towards addressing societal impact, conducted benchmarking, and obtained the ECTS quality label from the European Commission. The requirements of this label have supported degree programmes in evaluating the quality of curricula.

In general, the development work of the quality system has been carried out systematically after the previous audit. The audit team commends the strong institutional will and commitment to developing the quality system and improving the quality of operations.

Ongoing plans to further improve overall institutional quality

Metropolia is committed to undertaking a number of activities targeted at developing and improving its quality system. Some of these development plans include:

- restructuring campuses
- continuing efforts in ensuring the establishment of new pedagogical policies and the student feedback system in all degree programmes
- improving the information management system in accordance with the new organisational structure and operation model, and streamlining previously separate information system services through OMA
- improving the RDI activities including developing the entire process, establishing linkage with final projects of Master’s Degree students, commercialising RDI results and measuring their societal impact
- developing the activities of the Business Solution unit, including developing business plans and working on exporting education
- student feedback systems are currently being reformed, with a shift in focus from assessing student satisfaction to evaluating student learning.

In the meantime, the institution is committed to continuing investment on improving the competence of its staff. Metropolia Academies serve as professional training platforms for building staff expertise in developing core operations according to strategic objectives. The staff capacity-building practices of Metropolia Academy have been utilised successfully. It has clearly formed a crucial platform for integrating knowledge, quality and strategy into the theme-based training provided to staff, who are at the forefront of the quality management responsibilities.
6.1 Degree education

Metropolia’s quality management procedures are functional and advance the development of degree education. The quality management of degree education is clearly aligned with strategy and the continuous development supports the achievement of the goals. The Individual Learning Track (ILT) policy has been created to underpin the main principles of the collaborative learning and teaching in Metropolia. However, the policy is not yet well known throughout Metropolia. The quality system produces relevant information for Metropolia’s development work in degree education and there is proof of the information being used. The internal and external stakeholders are included in the quality work. The key support services are functioning purposefully.

The quality management of degree education is at a developing stage.

Functioning of the quality management procedures

Clear objectives form the basis for degree education

According to Metropolia’s strategy 2020 Metropolia is concentrating on high-quality learning and professional life cooperation which is achieved for example through ‘flexible, continually updated learning opportunities, services and solutions’. The annual action plans for education are set and their implementation is monitored and documented in a systematic way by the Management Group. After every Management Group meeting, the Manager Forum is held where the decisions and topical issues are discussed with all heads of departments/units. Manager Forums and Metropolia Academy, a specific and widely appreciated concept for personnel training in Metropolia, are key mechanisms in supporting the implementation of decisions and changes. However, the audit team found that there was some level of inconsistency in the implementation of changes across the departments.
The objectives agreed with the Ministry of Education and Culture form the basis of the educational activities. The objectives are set at both institutional and departmental level and progress is evaluated against the indicators in the funding model. The digital data systems support the monitoring of these indicators well and the real-time monitoring and progress can be explored easily by the managers. The system also provides forecast information which is highly valued by the top management.

*Individual Learning Track policy aims at setting the education guidelines*

The key principles concerning the development of degree education are set in the Individual Learning Track (ILT) policy approved by Metropolia's Board of Directors in 2014. Metropolia's ILT policy is a concrete example of a tool supporting the development work towards the strategic goals.

ILT policy has set the guidelines for the curriculum reform introduced in 2014 and covers, for example, the degree structure and pedagogical approach of teaching and learning. The reform is still under implementation. The policy sets the guidelines for the planning, implementation, assessment and development of education and it is well documented and easily accessible on *Tuubi*. As such, the policy could function as a quality handbook for education. However, the audit interviews highlighted that the policy is not yet well known across Metropolia and its function is not completely understood: in many cases it was considered to be concerned primarily with students’ individual study plans (ISPs).

The policy’s primary purpose is to guide staff and students to implement different aspects of collaborative learning and teaching. This development target has been successfully achieved throughout the institution and was clearly evidenced in the audit interviews. Both the teachers and students gave several examples of the practices of collaborative working methods in use. The related courses have been merged in order to form larger entities and periods of learning. These larger courses provide a more natural platform for cooperation between teachers. Teaching personnel considered this as a big cultural change with a positive impact on teaching practices.

The first students experiencing the renewed curricula will graduate in 2018, but the positive impact of the reform can already be seen: the results have clearly improved in the progress of studies, and the dropout rate has decreased. It is expected that the new organisational structure implemented at the beginning of 2016 will also further support the reform. The students, however, seemed to be confused by the old and new curricula and the effects of the reform on their studies. For example, the reasons for clustering the courses in larger modules were not always understood by students; in some cases it makes the course descriptions too abstract and difficult to comprehend. The audit team highlights that through this transition phase students need to be carefully informed and guided.

*Curriculum work is at the centre of quality management of education*

The curriculum sets the objectives for teaching personnel as well as for students, stating what is supposed to be taught and learned. The curriculum is defined according to European competence-based ECTS quality label standards and the heads of department are responsible for curriculum development work, which is reviewed annually.
The students and external stakeholders are involved in curriculum work in Advisory Council meetings, and are nominated to represent them at the department or programme level. However, in some departments the concept of the Advisory Council has not yet been established while in others the systematic procedures are in place. According to the audit interviews, there is room for improvement in the role of students in the Advisory Councils. The students could, for example, analyse and present the results of the student feedback surveys at the Advisory Council meetings.

The Director of Education approves the curricula and any significant amendments. He also checks that the curriculum and course descriptions meet the required standards. Teaching personnel use the Peppi tool in course implementation planning. The workload of studies and progress of students as well as teaching personnel resources are taken into consideration in curriculum work. Curricula are published in electronic form and study guides are produced in Finnish and English on Metropolia’s website according to ECTS requirements on course implementation descriptions. The study guide is easy to access and the structure is quite clear. The scheduled progression of studies for some degree programmes is well described in the study guide. However, in some cases the course information is lacking and, for example, the learning outcome descriptions are not written with the level of clarity needed, so as a consequence students do not find them useful. It is recommended that more attention be given to developing clarity and quality in course descriptions to ensure consistency across all programmes.

In addition to the degree and course descriptions, the electronic study guide includes general information for students. Also, Tuubi provides additional information for students. In many courses, the Moodle learning platform is used actively to inform students about course or programme specific issues and activities. For students, however, it is not clear what the functions of the different information sources were and often the most effective way to get information concerning their studies is to contact teachers or teacher tutors, who seem to serve students well. It is recommended that the roles of the different information channels for students are clarified and that they are developed and implemented consistently across the institution.

*Education at Metropolia is closely connected to the professional life*

Close contact with professional life is emphasised and is integral to the design of Metropolia’s education activities. This was consistently highlighted throughout the audit visit. Work placement is an essential part of the studies at the UAS. In principle, the work placements are guided and assessed by teachers and workplace supervisors, and also students are expected to assess their own learning throughout the whole of the work placement period and reflect on this in their internship report. The audit team found that consistent practices on the management of work placement are not well established, and discrepancies, for example, in course descriptions and procedures concerning guidance, were observed during the audit visit. Metropolia should ensure that unified and systematic procedures concerning course descriptions, student guidance and learning assessment on work placements are in place for every student.
According to the Individual Learning Track policy at Metropolia, students are offered a variety of flexible and individual opportunities for completing their studies. The procedures of recognition of prior learning and ISPs are in place and described for students on Tuubi, and confirmation of their use was demonstrated during the audit visit.

The study guidance network is comprehensive and the support is delivered by several persons; tutor teachers, subject teachers, tutors and head of degree programme. Metropolia's common guidelines for study guidance have been developed and they are available on Tuubi. The study guidance procedures and resources in practice seem to be quite variable across departments; however, students consider the individual study guidance provided by their teachers to be the most important means of academic support for their studies. Metropolia has detected the need for development in study guidance and an active study guidance model has been identified for development as a target in Metropolia's strategic action plan for 2017.

Student feedback system is under major development

Evaluation of student performance and learning is executed according to Metropolia’s guidelines for the evaluation of learning and is available in Tuubi. The teacher is responsible for giving the grade although in many cases, like work placement and theses, representatives from working life take part in evaluating student performance. According to the audit interviews, students indicated that they were aware of how they were assessed and what was expected of them. However, this sometimes relied upon dialogue with their teachers and it was not always clear that the assessment criteria were formally and explicitly communicated.

The degree programmes are encouraged to share their practices and evaluate activities every term on the Individual Learning Track’s Moodle evaluation platform. However, the audit team did not receive any evidence of the consistent use or effectiveness of this.

The results and quality of education are evaluated according to the indicators on UAS’s funding model and student feedback, and includes course feedback, second-year student feedback and the national graduation survey. The indicators and feedback are monitored and utilised at the institutional, departmental and teacher level. Some feedback reports with comments and conclusions are available on Tuubi and departments arrange ‘feedback on feedback’ meetings with students. These meetings are not always very successful due to the poor level of student participation.

A new learning feedback system was introduced in autumn 2016 and a new approach to student feedback has also been developed. The aim has been to actively support student learning and not simply to collect feedback information. The audit team commends this kind of development and encourages the institution to ensure the thorough and consistent implementation of the new feedback system across the institution. Also, the institution should define the systematic procedures and steps regarding how and when every student receives feedback on his/her progress on learning and performance.
The feedback from working life partners is emphasised at Metropolia and the employability of graduates is monitored systematically. Feedback from the workplace and external stakeholders is gathered from work placements and industry related projects (e.g. thesis projects) as well as in Advisory Council meetings. However, the audit team is concerned that in many cases the feedback from external stakeholders is received in an informal manner and remains undocumented.

In addition to the student feedback information, some degree programmes have been active in applying for assessment from international accreditation agencies or participating in cross-assessment with international partner institutions to deepen the information base for development work.

**Participation in quality work**

In Metropolia, there is a culture of open communication which provides several communication and feedback channels for different internal and external stakeholders to engage with the development of education activities. The intranet Tuubi supports involvement and participation by delivering information. The student union METKA ensures that the messages from students are received and progressed. Student representatives are largely satisfied in their role and position in different administrative organs, but the work of Advisory Councils should be supported and developed further. The teaching personnel are mainly involved with the development work of their own teacher team and/or programme/department. Students as well as teaching personnel are represented in Manager Forum meetings.

Metropolia’s regulations and organisation structure do not prescribe the local organisation of the departments, so the official means to participate in the development work of the department is dependent upon the head of the department. Only Advisory Councils are compulsory, but they can work at either programme and/or departmental level. This kind of structure can lead to a situation where the possibilities to participate in development work vary significantly across departments. To the audit team this poses a risk from the point of view of consistency, transparency and continuous development. The audit team recommends that Metropolia considers defining the key quality management roles at the department level in addition to the distributed responsibility approach. This core quality management structure would assist the Heads of the Departments in their institutional responsibilities and achieve greater consistency of practice where this is required.

**Quality management of key support services**

Student services (Admissions and Student Affairs Offices) are a part of Metropolia’s Academic services. The services follow the common principle of continuous development, the responsibilities and processes are well defined and support the quality management of the activities. The students interviewed expressed their satisfaction with the Library and Information Services and the support they received.
Education development services are in place to support the UAS in developing education policies and quality management procedures in education. The development of the support services is conducted in very close connection with strategic development since support services have a crucial role in implementing the strategic objectives and action plans. The central and key role of the education development team was specifically highlighted and commended by the teaching personnel participating in the audit interviews.

Student well-being is supported by many actors including the well-being team, two psychologists, two well-being advisors and a crisis hotline. A Substance Abuse Programme and Non-discrimination Policy are in place. The Student Union METKA plays an important role in supporting student well-being and student participation in the development of the UAS. Student tutor activities are also provided by METKA. Student feedback mechanisms Viestikissa and the feedback platform KOPPI are endorsed as good practices.
6.2 Samples of degree education

6.2.1 Bachelor's Degree Programme in Music

The Bachelor's Degree Programme in Music has systematic quality management procedures in place that provide relevant information for curriculum planning and development. The implementation of the programme is student-centred, highly personalised and supportive. Curriculum planning and review is consultative and students, staff and stakeholders are actively involved in quality processes. The content, learning competencies and standards are benchmarked internationally and there is a clear commitment to quality management and continuous improvement and the positive impact of quality work is demonstrated in the enhancement priorities set for the programme. Developing a unified approach to the implementation of quality processes and achieving explicit clarity in learning outcome description and their related assessment method and assessment criteria is identified for enhancement.

The quality management of the Bachelor's Degree Programme in Music is at a developing stage.

The new degree in music was created in 2014 and combines Pop, Jazz and Classical music into one programme: the merged department of music is now the largest in Finland. Students graduate with a Bachelor of Culture and Arts specialising in either music education (music educator) or music performance (musician). The 240 ECTS music degree is classified in the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) as level 6 (1st-3rd year of study) and EQF level 7 (4th year of study).

Quality management related to the planning of educational provision

The quality management follows Metropolia's PDCA cycle, but at this early stage in the development of the merged department (implemented in 2014), it was recognised that a new curriculum development process needed to be designed to fully support the pedagogy and structure of a degree programme in music and this was fully deployed in 2016. With the merging of the department the competency goals for the Degree Programme in Music were fundamentally revised in 2013.

The defining of intended learning outcomes

Interviews with students confirmed that the nature of the ‘one-to-one’ and small-group teaching ensures that they are quite clear about their individual learning goals, how these would be assessed and the outcomes and standards expected of them. They are also very satisfied with the personalised, detailed and constructive feedback that they received.

It was highlighted, however, that the clarity of information, criteria for assessment, quality and frequency of meetings and formal recording of feedback is largely dependent on the individual teacher/student working partnerships. The department is therefore encouraged to establish baseline requirements for the number of formal progress discussion meetings and the structured recording and communication of feedback to all students.
At the outset of the programme, each student’s personal competency profile is discussed and, through their ISPs, can be tailored and personalised. It was established, however, that only some students had their ISP and progress discussed routinely or annually. A scheduled meeting to discuss the ISP should also be established as part of the recommendation above.

Planning and quality management

Metropolia has identified that previous practices regarding curriculum planning and development in the Music programme needed to be more formalised, but also recognise that the launch of Metropolia’s new organisation and the introduction of the new curricular structure, in addition to establishing a merged department, placed a significant strain on staff and their ability to fully engage with and embed the processes and requirements of the quality system. A significant focus has therefore been placed on successfully implementing the new study planning tools, which in turn will require greater clarity and definition of roles and responsibilities. Once fully operational, this should greatly assist and lessen the pressures on staff resources.

Systematic quality processes are in place and it is evident that significant progress is being made both in merging the cultures of the previous departments and in developing a unified and structured approach to delivering and managing music education. The focus on fully implementing the new curriculum planning tools is fully supported and encouraged by the audit team.

Quality management related to the implementation of educational provision

Teaching methods and learning environments

The learning environments and pedagogic approaches are designed to closely simulate the professional context and a range of teaching methods and current pedagogic practices are being used by the music department to encompass the following:

- Individual Learning Track – enabling students to personalise aspects of their studies
- Authentic learning experiences – project-based / performance
- Peer interaction
- Individual and joint teaching
- Exploratory learning
- Flipped-classroom
- Digital platforms – Tuubi’s work spaces, WordPress, YouTube, Moodle and Google Docs

The nature of music education enables a continuous dialogue with students and this is used to collect qualitative feedback on teaching methods and learning environments. This is formally collated and evaluated semi-annually and feeds into subsequent enhancements. Students are very complimentary about the highly-personalised and supportive nature of their studies and appreciate the student-centred, dialogic-based approach.
It was confirmed by students that the Individual Learning Track, opportunities for them to study other subjects and, for example, engage in cross-disciplinary, team-based innovation projects such as MINNO©, are not so well developed in the music programme. This is an area recommended by the audit review team as a key enhancement to ensure the structured development of wider generic and graduate employability skills.

Methods used to assess learning

The complexities in assessing artistic activities is recognised and assessment with numerical grades has mostly been abandoned. The new department is currently evaluating previous practices and intends to implement a trilateral approach involving the student, final projects’ process supervisor and content supervisor for all major projects. Given that a grading scale is no longer in use, it becomes even more critical to clearly and explicitly establish the pass/fail assessment criteria for each of the learning outcomes being assessed and to develop a shared understanding of these for both students and staff. The intention to involve students directly in the assessment process is a very positive development and will help students to more effectively evaluate their personal progress and standard achieved. This approach is commended by the audit team.

The department is encouraged to continue with this work to ensure that all learning outcomes, their associated assessment criteria and method(s) of assessment are made more explicit to enable and develop shared values and understanding between all teachers and students.

Effectiveness of quality work

The performance of the programme has remained consistent during a significant organisational change and has either met or exceeded the UAS norms and scoring above the Metropolia average in OPALA and AVOP feedback.

It is also clear that key quality processes and systems are in place to evaluate the current provision and to inform future enhancements. The management team have set out the following critical areas for development to comprise:

- curriculum development (adoption of the process model)
- implementation of teaching
- development of the department’s joint work
- financial and strategic work

A strategy and key priorities have been established and the department is now actively working towards defining, agreeing and embedding unified working practices within the single department.

Assessment has been identified as an area of ongoing work and is fully supported as a key priority for development by the audit team.
There is clear evidence that the quality system has enabled Metropolia and the Music department to identify their strengths and areas for enhancement and that it has provided the information upon which to make decisions and prioritise development.

**Participation in quality work**

The interviews confirmed that students and stakeholders are actively involved in the development of the programme. There is a clear focus on student-centred learning, which is also highly personalised and students were confident in participating in the development of their programme and studies. The closeness to 'working life', the profession and music industry was also evident and there is systematic involvement and a high-level of engagement from external stakeholders in contributing to the future direction and enhancements of the programme.

There is a clear commitment by staff to ensure that the learning competencies achieved by graduates, along with the content and structure of the degree, are benchmarked internationally to provide another, additional form of qualitative measure and is commended by the audit team.
6.2.2 Master's Degree Programme in Rehabilitation

The quality management procedures related to the planning and implementation of the educational provision provides excellent support for the Master's Degree Programme in Rehabilitation. The quality management procedures are systematic and well-established along with staff and students participating actively and with commitment in quality work. The development of the curriculum is well connected with working life and RDI activities. External stakeholders are also systematically involved. There is clear evidence of the enhancement effect of the quality work. Co-creation gives base to the enhancement-led approach applied to all the operations in the programme.

The quality management of the Master's Degree Programme in Rehabilitation is at an advanced stage.

The Master's Degree in Rehabilitation was launched in 2008. The entire programme is 90 credits, and comprises advanced professional studies, elective studies and a final project (Master's Thesis). The duration of the programme is 1.5 years, and it is organised into 3 terms. The studies give due emphasis to building core rehabilitation competences such as rehabilitation development, management and research, among others. Students graduate with a Master of Rehabilitation.

Quality management related to the planning of educational provision

Curriculum development is well connected with working life and RDI activities

There are systematic procedures in place in the degree programme for developing curriculum, defining competence goals and accommodating lifelong learning. The practice of co-creation enables teachers, students, alumni, rehabilitation professionals and the programme's steering group to actively participate in the curriculum preparation and development work. The audit team recognises this as a strength of the programme. The current and future rehabilitation competences and intended learning outcomes are clearly defined in due consideration of the requirements of the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) level 7. The entire process is evidence-based. The procedures in place support the periodic reviews and development of the curriculum.

The audit team noted that the programme's quality management procedures ensure strong relevance to working life. The programme has put in place mechanisms to ensure that the nature and mode of delivery of its studies are strongly connected to the needs and contexts of working life. In the interviews the teachers, students and alumni confirmed that they are convinced that the learning outcomes of the programme strongly correspond to the demands of the professional working life. A diverse range of competences are covered in the programme delivery. The skilful integration of professional life and multidisciplinarity with the programme learning environments is a key strength of the programme.

The audit visit revealed a robust link between RDI and education in the degree programme. The programme has been able to transfer knowledge and skills, produce publications, involve teachers and students in a number of international projects and collaborations, and benefit financially through its engagement in RDI activities. The audit team sees the practice of joint publication of research
work between teachers and students as a good practice. The programme has a designated person who coordinates its RDI activities. Master’s theses of students have been linked to projects and external funding. The audit team is convinced that the RDI activities and research collaborations of the programme fit well with its educational provision.

*Common guidelines for the recognition of prior learning are effectively translated into actions*

The recognition and accreditation of prior learning works well in the programme. Guidelines for recognition of prior learning exist at the Metropolia level. The audit team confirmed that the programme effectively translates these general guidelines into action in systematically addressing the issue of prior learning and lifelong learning. The evidence of this was found in a number of cases where prior learning has been successfully recognised and accredited. The entire process is well-documented.

As discussed above, the procedures for managing quality are well established, and they function systematically and strongly support the planning of the programme.

*Quality management related to the implementation of educational provision*

The programme has put in place well-established and systematic procedures that ensure the quality management of teaching methods, learning environments, student learning, and well-being of teachers and students. The procedures are found to be suitable to the nature of the programme. They function well, and properly support the implementation of educational provision. Co-creation is the powerhouse of the quality management system.

*Teaching methods and learning environments are diversely used*

The programme uses diverse teaching methods and learning environments. Teaching is conducted in multidisciplinary student groups and teams of teachers, and it targets building multidisciplinary rehabilitation competences. In contrast to other programmes and departments, the Moodle learning platform in Rehabilitation is used efficiently to support students and their learning, and the audit team is convinced that this could become a model for other degree programmes in Metropolia.

The programme focuses on using professional life as a key learning environment and platform where students learn, test and develop core rehabilitation competences. The development and evaluation of the learning environments is carried out jointly through co-creation.

*Assessment of student learning is based on reflexivity*

Students are assessed against clear and consistent criteria that correspond to the core competences defined in the curriculum, and the criteria are made visible to the students in both courses and assignments. Teachers, students and representatives of professional life participate in the assessment of learning outcomes. The process is continuous and enhancement-led in nature.
Structured mechanisms are in place to ensure the provision of detailed, personalised and constructive feedback to students on their progress against the achievement of learning outcomes. One good practice has been that students actively evaluate their own learning progress throughout the programme. They are required to write their own personal reflections on their learning. This enables them to identify their strengths and areas in need of development, and to continuously update their study plans accordingly. The self-evaluation is then summarised by tutors and reported to teachers, and target areas for future improvement are identified and development plans are developed jointly. Another good practice in Rehabilitation has been the exceptional transparency in assessment and feedback, which allows students to read each other’s assignments and feedback received from teachers. The discussion held with students suggested that this novel practice contributes to the enhancement of mutual learning among students.

Another point worth mentioning is that the programme has succeeded in institutionalising collaborative learning among its students. It frequently uses group work and peer assessment. The audit visit confirmed that such practices have facilitated mutual learning and a culture of team working among students. The same was observed among teachers of the programme.

*Student and staff well-being is supported by clear and structured mechanisms*

There are clear and structured mechanisms for systematically addressing the issue of student well-being and professional development of teachers. The practice of individual and group tutoring has been an important part of cultivating students’ well-being. Students have teacher tutors (who, in the students’ own words, were referred to as ‘diamonds’) who follow-up, consult and support the individual competence developments and professional growth of students throughout the duration of their studies.

Students also have access to facilities and support provided at other units established for such purposes in Metropolia. On the other hand, the interview held with teachers indicated that teamwork and co-creation support the development of their pedagogical and professional competences. The production of publications has, in this regard, been given emphasis. Staff also receive feedback from group discussions and individual performance reviews conducted each semester with the department head. Training organised by Metropolia is also accessible to staff.

*Participation in quality work*

The audit team confirmed that the pedagogical solution of co-creation has enabled the programme to secure the active participation of internal and external stakeholders in the quality management efforts related to planning, implementation, evaluation and development of educational provision. Students, alumni, teachers, rehabilitation professionals in working life, the steering group of the programme, Metropolia Master’s development network and the national network of Master’s degree programmes in rehabilitation play active roles in the quality management of the programme. The work of the Steering Group is structured. The head of department has been supportive in the development of the programme. There is also an ongoing plan
to engage rehabilitees in enriching the development of studies. The quality work facilitates multidisciplinary and multi-professional cooperation and active involvement of stakeholders. This is a key strength.

Student feedback is collected regularly and used to systematically improve various aspects of the programme. The teachers’ team takes the responsibility for implementing suggestions and improving studies accordingly. Students' voices are heard and they are satisfied with the actions taken as a result of their feedback. Another exceptionally good practice has been that teachers discuss the feedback from previous cohorts of students with current ones. There is high transparency and systematic flow of information. The programme seems to be content with its smaller size, which was seen to have been convenient for the implementation of co-creation.

**Improving information package of the programme enhances the cooperation with working life partners**

Although the transparency and flow of information within the programme has been excellent, the audit team encourages the programme to pay attention to clearly informing potential students and their employers about the requirements of the programme concerning workplace assignments. The audit team notes that workplace assignments have been integral aspects of the frequently used teaching and learning methods of the programme. This, however, would need to be taken into account when recruiting potential students.

The audit team understood from their discussions with students that bringing innovative practices from class to the workplace has not always been easy for them; students found it demanding to frequently use their workplaces for their assignments and to implement tools taught in the classroom. It has been even more difficult and stressful for those students who are unemployed to fulfil the requirements of workplace assignments. It is therefore very important to clearly inform both potential students and their employers how intensively the workplace is used in the programme. The programme could consider preparing an information package that properly explains these issues for applicants and their employers, and systematically addressing this during the process of admission.

**Effectiveness of the quality work**

The programme is committed to an enhancement-led evaluation, and has the practice of evaluating the effectiveness of its quality work against proper indicators. The indicators include the number of UAS Master's degrees completed, attractiveness of the programme, dropout rate, and satisfaction in the national UAS graduate feedback survey (AVOP), satisfaction in Student Feedback System for UASs (OPALA), and number of publications. The evaluation comprised diverse qualitative and quantitative assessments. Jointly discussing the results of evaluations and systematically following-up the impacts of development works has taken place.

The quality system was found to have been orientated towards supporting the achievement of the programme goals. Co-creation has enhanced the capacity of the programme for continuous reflection and enhancement-oriented evaluation. The performance of the programme has been
significantly improving over the years. The audit team noted that the programme is well aware of the impact it has been having on improving professional practices in the field of rehabilitation and enhancing the career prospects of its graduates.

The efficient integration of programme-based, Metropolia-wide, national and international knowledge and experiences shows that the programme is committed to continuously developing the quality of its operations. There is clear evidence that the quality system has enabled the identification of strengths and areas in need of development. It has clearly supported the programme to become a high quality, self-reflective and attractive one that stands out from other Master's programmes in Metropolia. Its impact on the achievement of programme goals has been largely positive. As evidence of this, the Master's programme in Rehabilitation was awarded the recognition of Metropolitan Menestyjä (Metropolia Success Story) in 2015.

The audit team acclaims the quality of the programme's quality management system. The audit team commends the evidence-based planning and implementation of educational provision. The audit team is convinced that the Master's Degree programme in Rehabilitation could become a model for other degree programmes in Metropolia. Its quality management procedures, their implementation, the active engagement of stakeholders and the lessons from its co-creation philosophy could be recognised as a good practice and emulated throughout Metropolia.

Co-creation is a uniquely successful pedagogical solution

The practice of co-creation is the greatest asset and key strength of the Master's Degree Programme in Rehabilitation. It is this concept, philosophy and practice that make this programme truly unique. Its service as a pedagogical solution has trickled down to other operations of the programme. It is in this system of practice where the extraordinary capacities of the programme lie for collaborative planning, development, implementation and enhancement-led evaluation of educational provisions. It is the engine of the quality system. The audit team confirms that this innovative method has led to the development of a feeling of ownership of the programme and a spirit of 'doing things together', especially on the part of teachers, students and alumni.

The audit team learned that students, in their own words, love co-creation, and that they transfer the culture of collecting feedback, regularly assessing own performance, reflective thinking, team working and openness to new ideas to the workplace and everyday life. The principle could become a unique feature of Metropolia degree education. It may also be possible to productise this model as a trademark of the Metropolia's Master's Degree Programme in Rehabilitation, and market it nationally and internationally to other programmes.

Sharing good practices contributes to quality of operations in other units and programmes

The audit team commends the efforts put by the programme on sharing best practices. The audit team is convinced that the programme has duly recognised the importance of sharing its innovative practices, and hence has been making a diligent effort in utilising the mechanisms at its disposal towards this goal. The teachers of the programme have been publishing books, journal and news articles on the lessons learned from co-creation and other innovative approaches in
the field of rehabilitation, in an attempt to share their experience with other departments, fellow researchers in academia and the public. Another example is the contribution of the programme in creating an understanding of the need for incorporating adequate modules that help build the competence of students in research, development and management into the curriculum of each Master's degree programme in Metropolia. Such kinds of efforts could contribute to enhancing the visibility and image of the programme, and quality of operations in other departments and Master's degree programmes.
The quality management procedures related to the planning and implementation of the educational provision are not found to fully support the further development and management of the Bachelor's Degree Programme in Information Technology (in English) at its best. The staff, students and external stakeholders participate in quality work, but the participation is uneven and depends on the activeness of individuals. Students are not completely aware of the importance of their contribution and participation in programme development, commitment in quality work and the benefits of a multi-disciplinary approach. External stakeholders are involved in the development work through formal and informal interaction. Altogether there is not sufficient evidence of the effectiveness and impact of the quality work related to the programme.

The quality management of the Bachelor's Degree Programme in Information Technology is at an emerging stage.

The Bachelor's Degree Programme in Information Technology (BEng) comprises of 240 ECTS credits at EQF level 6 (1st to 3rd year of studies) and EQF level 7 (4th year of studies). It was established in 1992 and has been modernised or merged several times since its establishment (in 2001, 2008, 2013, 2014, and in 2016). It is organised to be delivered as a full or part-time degree and it was the first Bachelor of Engineering Degree Programme in Finland to also be implemented in English.

The degree programme is highly international and currently has students from over 50 different nationalities. There are four major subject options for full-time studies: Software Engineering, Smart Systems, Mobile Solutions and IoT and Cloud Computing. There are two major subject options for part-time study: Software Technologies and Internet Technologies. In a Conceiving, Designing, Implementing and Operating real-world systems and products (CDIO) – based syllabus, there are four main themes: Disciplinary Knowledge and Reasoning, Personal and Professional Skills and Attributes, Interpersonal Skills: Teamwork and Communications, and the Innovation Process.

Quality management related to the planning of educational provision

The development and implementation of the degree programme is carried out by the Department of Information and Communications Technology’s management team (comprising the head of the department, the heads of the degree programme, senior lecturers and the programme coordinator). The curricula are developed in collaboration with the professional life, steering and expert groups, programme Advisory Councils, local community representatives, other stakeholders and students. Stakeholders also have an opportunity to give feedback to Metropolia through the internet site and social media enabling them to contribute directly to the quality work.

The Metropolia self-evaluation report states that the curriculum of the BEng and their preparation are based on Metropolia's Individual Learning Track (ILT) policy. It also describes that the approach combines a problem-based and project-based approach and includes multidisciplinary courses. The audit visit confirmed the general curriculum planning guidelines and procedures such as Metropolia's Annual Clock are followed in the BEng but that there is a need for developing deeper understanding of the ILT and the connection between quality and the quality management at the programme level.
During the interviews with the programme teachers it was confirmed that there is a procedure to collect feedback from stakeholders, Metropolia Alumni Network and students but the audit team did not see evidence of the systematic use of collected information for the planning of educational development and enhancement. There is a long history of the programme having an Advisory Council, however the focus of this seemed quite general and did not appear to specifically assist with the development of the degree programme. In curriculum planning and implementation, the teachers referred to personal networks and reliance on their own subject expertise and autonomy rather than proactively using the quality tools and procedures developed by Metropolia.

Quality management related to the implementation of educational provision

The degree programme is implemented with a blended learning approach using project-based learning and development assignments along with traditional lectures and independent studying as well as virtual learning environments. Through the interviews with staff and students, the audit team established that the programme would benefit from adopting a more systematic approach to quality management and enhancement.

During the audit visit, a fully embedded ILT and multi-disciplinary approach was not evidenced either by the teachers or by the students. The self-evaluation report’s statement, 'The competence goals are reviewed regularly and frequently in relation to changing society, professional life and the Information Technology paradigm shift' was confirmed only as regarding core IT competences. The audit team sees there is a need to thoroughly embed the principles of ILT and provide structured opportunities for the students to engage with cross-disciplinary team-based activities outside their own department to enhance the development of the generic working life and transferable graduate skills.

With a high proportion of international students, the programme team are involved in supporting a diverse range of additional student needs to enable successful integration with Finnish society and higher education practices and the Degree Programme coordinator plays an important role in cooperation with the teachers and heads of the degree programme.

International students start their studies with an orientation course including team working skills, learning methods, topics in mathematics and ICT, Finnish society and culture, practical matters in Metropolia, project working skills and communication skills. The Head of each major option is in charge of monitoring study progress in accordance with teachers and the degree programme coordinator.

During the audit visit it was established that the monitoring and discussion of the ISPs remain unsystematic. The students interviewed reported that although tutoring systems are in place the actual guidance depended on the individual teacher or student seeking it. The audit team recommends that the institution’s tools and resources used to monitor and support ISPs and student progress are fully utilised and are systematically and pro-actively used as part of managing the quality at the programme level and to also ensure the implementation and support for the education philosophy embedded in ILT.
The structure of the programme, as well as the effect of each part of the student learning assessment, is described in the implementation of the courses and presented to the students at the beginning of each course. The students interviewed were satisfied with the accessibility and amount of information provided. In project-based learning, peer review and feedback are used to support and deepen the learning process, but the audit team sees room for improvement in ensuring the systematic support of learning.

**Working life connections are personal and close**

Links between research, development and innovation activities, as well as artistic activities and BEng degree education, are realised in the joint projects together with the professional life, cooperating with international partners, through innovation projects and work placement as part of the degree studies as well as through Innovation Projects (such as MINNO©); although intended to provide cross-disciplinary experiences for students, these seemed to have been working mainly within their own field of science.

The programme is delivered and supported by a highly-qualified group of teaching staff (many of whom are drawn directly from industry) and who are aware of the need to maintain absolute currency in their subject knowledge given the fast-pace of change in their sector. Approximately one week of the annual workload of lecturers is reserved for the development of their core competences in IT and expertise. Apart from Metropolia Academy as a possibility to enhance teachers' pedagogical and professional competences, other options were not mentioned by lecturers although there are many possibilities for their continuous professional development. There is a practice of recruiting lecturers and teachers directly from the ICT industry which maintains the close connection with the world of work as well as ensuring the up-to-date content of the studies.

The degree programme's working life relevance is enabled by the 20-week work placement (30 ECTS) which is a mandatory part of studies for all students. Students find placements in Finland or abroad and gain experience of the job search process. Students also participate in EU projects (e.g. Erasmus student exchange) and the ICT summer school. The quality of work placement tasks and companies are monitored by a placement coordinator. Although work placements and internships are considered an essential part of the degree, students are not required to be formally assessed to receive the 30 ECTS credits towards their degree. Clearly, the placement experience itself is considered valuable, and the process is well-coordinated by Metropolia. However, the audit team would recommend and expect that all students should evidence the learning acquired and that the learning outcomes have been met before credits are awarded.

**Participation in quality work**

In general, the students’ participation in the quality work occurs via the Advisory Councils and by giving feedback about the courses. In the BEng programme, however, there is no international student representation in the Advisory Council. Students in the BEng programme did not seem to be aware of the possibilities or of the need to proactively contribute to Programme planning and development. The audit team felt that they were possibly not motivated, encouraged or supported to fully participate in the quality work and further development and enhancement of their programme.
The external stakeholder connections are close and the channels are effectively in use with the surrounding environment. The information gained through various kinds of interactions and via joint RDI projects contributes to the planning and implementation of the degree. The partly informal nature of the quality work with the external stakeholders could however result in a loss of information and effectiveness. For example, ensuring the tracking of work placement experiences from both sides of the process could result in a deeper understanding of the relevance and development needs of the programme outside of subject competences. The Advisory Council could, for example, provide the formal tool for systematic stakeholder interaction in quality work.

Effectiveness of quality work

The key indicators are showing good results, but the audit team remains concerned about the actual effect of the quality work in it. Furthermore, this raises the question whether the programme is able to keep up the good level when the procedures seem informal and more ad hoc than systematic. It is recommended that the quality management procedures developed in Metropolia and used in other degree programmes be implemented after sharing good practices. Especially in following, monitoring and supporting student learning there is a need to pay more attention to the implementation of common quality procedures.

The self-evaluation report states student feedback is collected through Metropolia's feedback systems: course feedback, a satisfaction survey for the second year students, annual ‘feedback on feedback’ session, and through a nationwide graduate feedback questionnaire AVOP. In practice, however, it seems that students are not sufficiently encouraged to bring forward their development ideas related to course offerings and policies affecting the student community. The students could be encouraged to take part more in developing the programme. This would also require a reflexive and open attitude from the teaching staff. Students interviewed during the audit visit were aware of METKA, the student organisation, and their opportunity to participate in its work, although this was less attractive to international students because of language barriers.

Various studies and surveys are carried out regularly to obtain stakeholders’ views on Metropolia’s operations and any needs for more information or development. Although Metropolia has invested in the collection of stakeholder feedback in the BEng programme, it still needs further development in terms of extensiveness.
6.3 Research, development and innovation activities, as well as artistic activities

RDI and artistic activities are identified in the Metropolia 2020 strategy as a key area for development and growth, and are central to Metropolia’s vision for societal impact and engagement. The systems for the collection of information and quality management processes for developing and supporting RDI activities are in place and the information is used for development purposes. A real strength is the link between RDI and education at Master’s level. The MINNO© innovation project concept has enabled internal and external stakeholder participation in development work and building bridges between the core activities. A more structured approach to sharing good practices and communicating success in RDI would be beneficial and is identified as an area for development.

The quality management of research, development and innovation activities, as well as artistic activities, is at a developing stage.

Functioning of the quality management procedures

Metropolia identifies growth as a key focus in RDI activities for its 2020 strategy and the strategic aims guide the priorities, types of activity and quality management procedures for RDI and artistic activities.

The self-evaluation report highlights the following aims and principles to underpin RDI activity:

- Significant and current challenges are tackled.
- Activities are carried out in networks of top experts applying the shared value creation model.
- Users are involved at all stages.
- Quality management procedures agreed upon in the scientific and artistic community are followed.
- Metropolia or its partners actively harness the results, and the results have an impact.

The Ministry of Education and Culture funding model forms a base for the key figures and indicators in Metropolia and the targets are agreed upon in the performance agreement negotiations with the Ministry. This includes also the indicators for artistic activities such as artistic publications and international exchange of staff. In addition, Metropolia is developing its own RDI indicators based not only on financial results but also on societal impact.

The RDI Director is in charge of managing the quality of Metropolia’s RDI activities and, in addition, one of the Quality Coordinators is also designated to the quality management of RDI operations. The heads of department also play an essential role since they are ultimately responsible for the quality management of their departments’ core operations. For departments in charge of artistic degree programmes, this also means responsibility for quality management in artistic activities.
In each of the departments there are also RDI experts supporting the staff in conducting their RDI activities. The annual objective discussions taking place between the Metropolia’s management and the departments set the targets for RDI and guide the planning of the activities. The departments are required to set their own goals and objectives and set the procedures to follow regarding how they are met. The RDI coordinator supports the discussions across departments to enable sharing of good practices and knowledge. It is evident from the interviews that there is a significant amount of RDI activity, but it was also clear that there would be significant benefit from a much more structured approach to systematically recording, evaluating and sharing the processes, outputs and impact across the departments. The audit team encourages Metropolia to develop their approach to this.

**RDI Project Portfolio ensures common procedures in RDI**

The suitability of every RDI project is critically evaluated at the planning stage and the process and assessment tools are described on Tuubi where they are available to all RDI actors. A summary of current RDI projects is promoted externally on Metropolia’s website and the RDI Project Portfolio and document templates are also shared on Tuubi to encourage and support uniform practices. Central coordination of RDI project management practices and good communication with the RDI Director is appreciated among the staff. The assessment of RDI is based on feedback gathered from different sources and includes the initial suitability and aims identified at the planning phase, self-assessment during three-phases of the project and outputs measured against selected indicators to include those from the Ministry of Education and Culture. All project workers, the project steering group and Metropolia management are involved in the evaluation process.

The Management Group’s quarterly reviews on the status of the projects in Metropolia enable systematic monitoring of the RDI project activities in a large scale. The impact of RDI and usability of their results is also monitored with Light Report statistics (by the network of RDI Directors of UASs). Metropolia’s RDI activities will undergo an external review in 2019 and subsequently every three years after that.

The RDI competences are developed and enhanced via the internal training concept of Metropolia Academies. For example, an RDI expert training programme common for all the UASs is organised through a Metropolia Academy. The Management Group discuss RDI matters frequently in their meetings and collect the information from a range of different sources including media tracking to potentially inform and gauge levels of reach and impact.

**The artistic activities are carried out and developed in close connection with degree education**

The quality management of both RDI and artistic activities follows the PDCA cycle of continuous development. Metropolia’s strategy, objectives and action plans give the artistic activities a direction in the planning phase. Implementation of artistic activities contains specific field-related quality management procedures, for example, the entrance exams. Altogether, the implementation of artistic activities is in the core of teaching and learning, but also carried out in connection to RDI projects and through multidisciplinary innovation projects, like MINNO©.
Artistic activities are coordinated by a producer and the Productions and Artistic Activities team: the team is also responsible for event planning. Teachers of different majors from the Music programme are also members of this team.

As an essential part of core operations in artistic study fields, the artistic activities and feedback loops are closely connected to the degree education. Assessment of artistic activities is part of each Individual Learning Track and feedback is frequent from and to students. It is highly informal in nature, but also structured around common procedures such as course feedback. Typical examples of measures in the field are the ‘feedback on feedback’ events. The impact of the artistic activities is also tracked, for example, through the coverage and frequency of visibility in the media.

New quality practices have emerged from the artistic activities

The quality of artistic RDI has been a forerunner in the development of RDI evaluation and assessment in Metropolia. The 3x3 self-evaluation model has been piloted and used in the field of Culture and it is being developed to also be used in other fields. However, it was established that it is still in the piloting phase and is not so well recognised yet among RDI actors across the organisation. It was also evident that progress is being made in this challenging area and that the 3x3 model of critical self-reflection and assessment clearly has potential. The approach has already been successfully introduced to external agencies and has also been adopted for a major European collaborative research project indicating its emerging value as an evaluation tool for artistic activities. This development is commended by the audit team.

The intranet Tuubi as the internal quality guide and storage for quality management works well for RDI purposes. According to the interviews, it is useful for avoiding overlapping activities and sourcing examples for practical work. In the future, the information system OMA will create an efficient platform for the systematic collection of data and for sharing and discussing RDI activities. This is a significant development for RDI and has the potential to provide single portal access to the collation and analysis of key data sets.

The challenge of evaluating the societal impact of RDI and artistic activities is universally recognised and Metropolia is working to develop their own qualitative impact measures and supporting quality management infrastructure to enable this. The Business Solutions initiative aims through the introduction of Customer Relationship Management (CRM) software to more effectively support RDI and artistic activity and develop the ability to more easily produce the type of information and data needed for qualitative as well as quantitative impact measures.

Participation in quality work

An important tool for making RDI accessible to all is the MINNO© project concept which enables students to engage with innovation and creativity as part of their studies in some form. Often this will mean working in cross-disciplinary teams with external partners on ‘real-world’ problems or topical issues. Students following the earlier curriculum recognise the innovation project as an essential part of their studies. In general, the RDI placement opportunities are announced on Tuubi where students can find the necessary information.
In the innovation projects (such as MINNO©) the students, teachers and the stakeholders create the setting, goals, and methods and evaluate together the outcome of the project. In this way, all the internal and external stakeholders have the opportunity to influence the development work of the RDI activities.

The majority of students’ final projects and theses will normally include some element of RDI. This is especially the case for Master’s level programmes, where the research activities are natural, the link between education and RDI strong, and where the staff have an academic role and applied research focus.

*The teaching staff is actively taking part in the development work*

RDI activities are an integral part of the responsibilities of all teaching staff and new kinds of solutions and services are being developed in the departments to fulfil field-specific needs. The teachers and staff working in RDI projects are primarily responsible for selecting the appropriate partners for the projects. In the interviews, it was confirmed that the financial situation had changed significantly during the last decade and that securing research funding was becoming increasingly difficult. This poses a challenge also for quality management to ensure that the nature and focus of RDI activities are both suitable to stimulate meaningful research and align with the strategic aims of Metropolia. According to the interviews, the RDI project staff exchange ideas together locally and aim to accumulate and build upon knowledge from previous projects. More structured information sharing and joint development opportunities are supported by Metropolia-wide activities such as RDI specific Metropolia Academy events. The audit team encourages Metropolia to continue efforts in harmonising the quality management across the different fields and units.

A direct relationship to quality work occurs through the actual management and implementation of the RDI projects and feedback procedures and relies on good communication between the various stakeholders and project teams. The programme-specific Advisory Councils are used for collecting feedback on RDI development in addition to their primary focus on education, but the practices of how often they meet and the focus and aim of their discussions vary significantly. Clarifying the role of programme Advisory Councils in relation to RDI activities is recommended as an area for development by the audit review team.

*The external stakeholders take various roles in developing RDI and artistic activities*

The external stakeholders can take different roles in RDI, from actual project partners to financiers through to end users and it is often the case that students are employed in the companies after the RDI projects are finished, indicating both the value placed on the quality of graduates and the benefit of formally linking RDI with education.

Metropolia recognises the need for more systematic evaluation for developing their RDI operations. Central Metropolia-wide monitoring of RDI and artistic activities is active and reaches the department level operations, but harnessing the actual development suggestions from the ‘grass-roots’ level and reaching the actors’ experiences is more informal and relies significantly on personal relationships.
The piloted 3x3 self-evaluation model improves the stakeholder and student participation in the systematic quality work. Followed by sharing events, as Metropolia has suggested, this would improve the participation of the RDI actors also, not just in the implementation but, also in the development work overall. The audit team encourages Metropolia to further enhance the use of the 3x3 model for harmonising operational level quality management in RDI and artistic activities.

Quality management of key support services

The project management activities are well supported and developed across Metropolia. In the interviews it was explained, for example, how in the field of Culture new RDI staff are introduced to the activities through peer-support teams giving structured guidance for RDI personnel at different levels from beginners to more experienced project managers. Based on the nature of their own RDI activities, which vary significantly between the subject and discipline fields, each department finds their own meaningful ways of supporting RDI competences and of sharing practice at the discipline and departmental level.
6.4 Societal impact and regional development work

Effective societal impact is one of the key targets of Metropolia and their quality system has been built to systematically develop and improve their role and influence regarding regional development work. As the biggest UAS in Finland they are aware of their responsibilities for participation in continuing education, open-university of applied sciences education, based on interactive work and cooperation with both external and internal stakeholders. Since the last audit Metropolia has focused on building a sustainable quality system to support innovation, societal impact and regional development for Metropolia as whole.

The quality management of societal impact and regional work is at a developing stage.

Functioning of the quality management procedures

Societal impact has been raised to a strategic level at Metropolia. In Metropolia’s strategy 2020 webpage it is stated 'We want to strengthen the development of expertise, increase competitiveness and societal impact, and promote Metropolia’s unity'.

The quality system produces fairly comprehensive information to inform the enhancement of societal impact. Media monitoring, an event with the strategic communications partners to establish the perception of Metropolia’s position in the field of higher education, regular team meetings and the topical reviews produced in management workshops, provide the basic material for the development work. Annual evaluation of the results is a key quality tool and very useful for development. Core messages are carefully formulated in management workshops. The related quality management procedures are developing and are in the process of becoming an established part of the operation.

The aim of Metropolia’s strategic objectives is to develop their own indicators that do not only deal with the financial measures, but also evaluate quality and impact. From the perspective of the PDCA cycle of continuous development, the societal impact team that meets regularly and the strategic partnership with a communications agency, ensures currency and topicality of the objectives and a more systematic focus and implementation. The information produced by the quality system, however, needs to be processed and engaged with more frequently in department meetings to make development work more systematic.

Stakeholder feedback is collected and used widely

Other information that may be useful for evaluation purposes is made available through standardised systems, such as student feedback systems, staff feedback and general feedback from stakeholders. Metropolia’s quality system has been improved with a real-time Reporting Portal. Various studies and surveys are carried out regularly to incorporate stakeholders’ views on Metropolia’s operations and requirements for more information or development. A key source of information has been the ‘Towards a Better Working Community’ survey (ParTy®, Parempi Työyhteisö) which is conducted bi-annually to assess staff satisfaction with communication from management and superiors and
in general with the flow of information within the organisation. Matters raised by the student union METKA are also regularly discussed in Metropolia's Management Group. The RDI linked support activities like Project Portfolio are an important tool also for societal impact.

Based on audit interviews, it is evident that Metropolia has included many active stakeholders such as representatives of the cities of Helsinki, Vantaa and Espoo, the Helsinki Region Chamber of Commerce, the Engineers’ Association, other universities across Finland and internationally, vocational education training schools, enterprises and companies, alumni students, alumni Lecturers, and different societal actors in national administration in its development work.

The roles enacted by stakeholders vary and range from membership in the Advisory Board and in the Advisory Councils in degree programmes to allocated formal positions in developing MINNO©, placement of students’ practical part of studies, external lecturers, presenters of own career paths and other important issues related to working life, participation in the formulation of the new Metropolia strategy, financers of the project and project partners, members of target groups, membership in developing project teams, for example, on the Robotic bus project and its presentation in national and international papers, through social media and other types of media.

As a result of cooperation with the local community, Metropolia ensures different services to the local community, e.g. providing education to the city of Vantaa personnel, being a partner with the city of Helsinki to deliver education to refugees or a solution model of the new power distribution system for the Metropolitan area which was developed by Metropolia students and teachers. Especially with health care and social services, Metropolia started a project called 'teiniMINNO©talkoot' (teenager MINNO© workshop) with secondary level students, applying the MINNO© ideas especially with students who have dropped out of school.

Participation in quality work

The societal impact team are recognised as a real strength in terms of the quality management of Metropolia’s societal impact efforts. Its role definitions, dynamic way of working and development of professional networks that complement each other, facilitate a high-quality operation. The strong commitment of the Managing Director, President and Metropolia’s financial input contribute to the effectiveness of the team’s work. Metropolia has clearly defined roles for different actors in the establishment, implementation and development of the societal impact strategy. The Managing Director, President has overall responsibility. The Director of Stakeholder Relations is responsible for steering the implementation of the agreed measures and the Coordinator of Stakeholder Relations has a critical role in the monitoring, assessment, development and maintenance tasks.

An important factor is the perceived strength of the core messages in conducting societal impact work and these are prepared carefully, ensuring the Management Group’s commitment to them and their effectiveness is evaluated annually. The position of Metropolia's Managing Director, President in Arene, the conference of UAS Presidents, serves to promote the efforts to bring forth the needs of the UAS as a whole in societal impact work.
To improve the efficiency of its societal impact work, promote the commitment of networks and secure its position as a trailblazer strategically among universities of applied sciences, Metropolia has decided to establish a voluntary Advisory Board. The purpose of the Advisory Board is to provide information on the development of different aspects of society in relation to higher education, offer support in different societal impact-related needs and also bring forth Metropolia's competence potential and needs in their own channels. The composition of the Advisory Board has been mainly agreed on in the societal impact team. It takes into account the most important stakeholders and different societal actors in national administration, the corporate world, the field of higher education and various other organisations as mentioned previously. The most important stakeholders have been assigned manager level persons with whom to liaise.

The systematic building of a corporate partnership model was launched in 2014, resulting in a manual on uniform ways of building customer relationships and partnerships. Metropolia is also currently participating in an international innovation expertise-development project, creating practices and procedures for innovation activities between Metropolia and businesses. Processes and projects that are important in terms of operational development, such as strategy creation processes, use collaborative methods to take into account stakeholders’ views.

Feedback by students and the labour market and overall project assessments produce a comprehensive range of information on what has been successful and what must still be improved. The feedback is used in the development work and in curriculum planning and in most cases in cooperation with the Advisory Board after feedback from all stakeholders has been collected and analysed. Although improvements in the use of Metropolia's feedback system are visible, systematic collection and analysis of feedback should be further developed.

MINNO© is recognised as an efficient tool activating different stakeholders for societal impact

It is evident that lively cooperation with stakeholders is established as well as the system for collecting information from stakeholders regularly on different boards. MINNO© is an important tool developed by Metropolia for developing societal impact. In the audit interviews, it was apparent that the external, but also internal stakeholders see great opportunities in developing MINNO© more internationally, also as a product. The audit team sees this development approach as positive, but also reminds that the quality management of MINNO© in the local context should first be taken care of in more detail (see Chapter 7 for more detailed analysis).

Through the Advisory Board, Manager Forum and Societal Impact team Metropolia has developed an effective quality management system to support their strategic goals for societal impact and regional development. The next step is to ensure the consistent implementation of quality procedures at all departments within Metropolia.

Quality management of key support services

Metropolia has established a Business Solutions approach that aims to commercialise the services, products and solutions created by the departments and through bringing different fields together. The Business Solutions team supports the departments in the pursuit of developing products
responding to customers’ needs, based on the contacts made by departments and the Business Solutions team. It was confirmed during the audit visit that the approach is widely accepted and carried out in different forms. Although in tailored corporate training the customers usually participate, the process is not systematic, and could be further enhanced.

Metropolia’s Communications Unit demonstrated effective use of quality management procedures in fulfilling their main task of enhancing communications, for example, monitoring and active use of social media to enhance visibility in key areas. Additionally, they have developed various ways of connecting with Metropolia’s partners such as producing newsletters and hosting networking events. The project results are reported online via a website; seminars and campus projects are organised and open to the public so local people are invited to them. On the Tuubi workspace, a societal impact platform is opened for the entire Metropolia, and the stakeholder interaction is encouraged through a feedback forum on Metropolia’s website.

In Metropolia’s self-evaluation report, it is stated that the Education Director, RDI Director, Business Solutions Director and Financial Manager discuss the progress and outputs of Business Solutions on a monthly basis. It is also reflected how well the Business Solutions as a function supports the departments in their core activity of societal impact and regional development. Based on the interviews, the audit team was convinced that the development work conducted by Business Solutions is well-connected and systematic.

Metropolia has reached a shared understanding about the societal impact of the institution as well as the levels of satisfaction regarding engagement of internal and external stakeholders. There is still an awareness however of what can be improved.
Metropolia’s innovation project concept MINNO©, introduced in 2008, integrates and links RDI activities directly with education to the benefit of students, teachers and external organisations. The model has been continuously developed and now forms a key role in Metropolia’s strategy. Students, staff and external partners are involved in the quality work to develop and enhance the concept and recognise the benefits derived to each of the stakeholder groups. Quality management would be further enhanced through a more systematised and harmonised approach, and the OMA and CRM online tools will enable and support this.

The quality management of Metropolia’s innovation projects, MINNO© is at a developing stage.

7.1 Functioning of the quality management procedures

Metropolia introduced the MINNO© concept in 2008 to ensure that all students gained experience of working on innovation-based projects with a focus on topics arising from the needs of the area, professional life and other social activities. The approach integrates RDI activities conducted with external partners directly with education and aims to expose students to the challenges and rigour of working in cross-disciplinary-teams on ‘real-world’ issues and problems.

Since 2008, all the Bachelor’s Degree Programmes have included a mandatory 10 credit point course based around an innovation project (process described in figure 4). The innovation project concept (now branded as MINNO©) is regarded as an important vehicle for integrating RDI and education as well as regional development activities in Metropolia.

It is evident to the audit team that the students benefit from learning to plan, implement, assess and create projects that closely relate to the development needs of organisations and industry, and teachers develop a deeper understanding of and expertise on current issues in the labour market. Since the introduction of the innovation project concept, Metropolia students have carried out
many thousands of innovation projects (circa 1000 annually) and MINNO© plays a key role in Metropolia’s contribution to regional development and societal impact. The networking benefits that students gain from the projects are invaluable.

Innovation projects are carried out in small groups, with more than 140 teachers supervising the small teams, developing services, operating practices and products. The objective is that innovation projects are multidisciplinary and include cooperation with labour market partners. Innovation projects are normally carried out during the third year of studies and focus on real life problems. MINNO© is seen as a stepping stone to RDI activities and has the potential to create sustainable long-term RDI partnerships with external collaborators.

The MINNO© pages on Tuubi act as a guide and manual for new actors and the MINNO© online tool was created to harmonise the documentation of the projects and their results. According to the self-evaluation report and the interviews, the level of use is still low and not yet systematic. Increasing the commitment of the labour market partners to use the system more is also a challenge according to Metropolia. The audit team also recommends that Metropolia ensures that the selection, guidance and induction of the external MINNO© partners is developed systematically.

FIGURE 4: MINNO© process diagram
The audit team established that connecting with potential MINNO© partners could also be more systematic. The informal and personal level connections are important, but the procedures could be harmonised and more systematic. The introduction of CRM software as part of Business Solutions could also be beneficial in supporting the development of MINNO©.

The ways of implementing MINNO© vary significantly across the departments, and the level of multidisciplinarity is realised in different forms. Feedback and self-evaluation during and after the project is an integral part of the process. Both the students and the working life partners give feedback about the success of the project, but in different ways. Course feedback, final discussions, learning journals and self-evaluations are examples of feedback mechanisms for MINNO©. The supervising teacher also gives feedback to the student as an overall evaluation at the conclusion of the project.

The MINNO© concept has been developed continuously from the beginning. The most recent development action, conducted in autumn 2016, was to pilot an intensive method of operation. During a 5 week period, the students do not have any other studies and the project-based learning is experienced as a coherent block. The aim is to harmonise the process and increase the multidisciplinary cooperation between fields and programmes by reserving a common slot in the schedules and student timetables.

In the interviews, it was highlighted that innovation projects are valuable in many ways. They are tools for cooperation between Metropolia and various types of organisations and industries including other HEIs. Staff also confirmed their support for and belief that MINNO© holds a competitive advantage with the potential to be developed internationally. This was also confirmed by the external stakeholder interview during the site-visit. The audit team appreciates the commitment of the management but also of the different internal and external stakeholders to MINNO©. The international potential of the concept is appealing and is an area to explore further, but first the audit teams wants to encourage Metropolia to thoroughly review and strengthen the quality management of the concept prior to implementation within different settings and contexts.

Different actors across Metropolia are very satisfied with the concept, especially the external stakeholders who see it as a real source of innovation. Teachers who have adopted the philosophy of MINNO© are equally enthusiastic. They see it as beneficial to all parties and specifically in improving graduate opportunities for employment.
During the innovation project, the students’ learning (see figure 5) is the focus and a facilitated-learning model is adopted with teacher being more in the role as a mentor and coach.

Students in general have a positive attitude towards ‘real-life’ innovation projects, but there is also criticism of the guidance and in preparing the students for the type of learning expected in MINNO©. As described in the interviews, MINNO© takes students out of their comfort zones and this can be both challenging and stressful. The active information seeking role of the student, in the place where the teacher does not have all the answers, is not always easy to handle. The audit team recommend this as an area for further development to ensure that all students are fully inducted and prepared to undertake this type of student-led learning prior to commencing their MINNO© project.

Some of the students and teachers reported some signs of frustration during the interviews. At times, the students also feel that the setting is somehow artificial and the multidisciplinary approach is not genuinely realised. The audit team believes it is also important to focus on the induction and training of the teachers responsible for supervising the innovation projects to ensure a shared understanding of their role and the philosophy and aims of MINNO© to avoid any confusion.
It was confirmed that it was not possible for students to fully participate in cross-department teams as a consequence of timetabling and scheduling issues and Metropolia has attempted to address this issue by developing and piloting an intensive mode of MINNO© involving 700 students in the study. Metropolia has clearly recognised the structural issues challenging the multidisciplinary execution of the innovation project concept and made steps to overcome them. The audit team commends this development and, given the central and strategic importance of the MINNO© learning concept, would encourage Metropolia to actively consider the development of a common programme architecture to enable all students to fully participate in cross-disciplinary teams during their innovation projects.

The audit team also found that there is further potential in enhancing the entrepreneurial learning-base created through MINNO© and, for example, possibly developing more systematic follow-up modules with entrepreneurship studies and concrete pathways to entrepreneurial activities.

### 7.2 Participation in quality work

The supervising teacher’s role is essential and holds the key to the success of MINNO©. The teachers’ participation in the quality work is realised through the principle of distributed quality responsibility – everyone is responsible for developing their own work. The site-visit proved that many of the MINNO© teachers are very enthusiastic in applying the student-centred, collaborative learning approach and also in developing their own work and working style continuously. Not all of the teachers, however, are necessarily fully committed to the philosophy of the MINNO© concept and a harmonising of operating culture and belief will be central to the progress of MINNO©. The development of common guidelines for teachers would support and enhance the development of learning activities.

Students already participate as feedback givers, but their role in developing MINNO© could also be increased. The students play a central role as they are given the active information and solution-seeking position in the learning process. Innovation-based project learning impacts high numbers of students each year and they provide a significant resource for promoting and developing the concept more widely.

External stakeholders give feedback, participate in planning and implementation of the project but do not use the online system yet to document and record the progress and results. The audit team sees it as being vital to ensure that the knowledge and information gained from the external partner is not lost due to the underuse of the system.

The development and introduction of the OMA system and CRM software will enable all actors to interact and support the MINNO© projects online. The audit team recommends that this development is taken as an opportunity to introduce more harmonised and systematic approaches to managing, evaluating, enhancing and promoting the MINNO© concept.
The quality system as a whole

The quality management of Metropolia UAS is comprehensive and supports all key aspects of strategic and operational business. The quality system employs a shared and distributed model of responsibility and the roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, articulated and communicated. There is an expectation of collective ownership and the quality system is devised and developed by all stakeholders to include contributions from students, staff and external groups. There is a focus on developing quality in all operations and Metropolia is developing its procedures and infrastructure to ensure the systematic collection and analysis of data to further embed and develop a quality culture across all areas and levels of the institution.

The quality system as a whole of Metropolia University of Applied Sciences is at a developing stage.

8.1 Comprehensiveness and impact of the quality system

The quality system at Metropolia is comprehensive and supports all the core duties of the institution. The annual clock cyclical process, based on PDCA cycle, ensures a systematic and structured approach to identifying and addressing any issues which may arise and informs subsequent priorities and enhancements.

All departments use the PDCA cycle annually to reflect on previous practice, to evaluate performance against Key Performance Indicators and targets and to set priorities and the development of future action plans. The model is also routinely used as the default for managing and evaluating ‘short-life’ or time-limited projects and initiatives.

The procedures of and data produced by the quality system supports both strategic and operational matters. Members of the board are actively involved in the development of the strategy and goals for Metropolia and this is communicated widely across the institution. There is a quarterly cycle of formal reporting which is acted upon by both the Management Group and Manager Forum where student representatives are also involved. The board members felt well informed and engaged and could readily access information when required.
Currently, the policies and procedures supporting the quality system are managed and accessed via the Tuubi intranet and during 2016 this will move to OMA which will provide a single access point to the suite of online resources and tools that support quality management. This enhanced system will provide near ‘real-time’ reporting and the ability to analyse and interrogate data at different levels throughout the organisation.

The quality system produces significant quantities of data and with the new OMA development Metropolia will have a comprehensive online infrastructure in place to enable more systematic data collection, analysis and subsequent use. The near ‘real-time’ reporting, for example, will provide teachers with information on student performance and progress during the year and any issues raised can be acted upon quickly. The aim and approach is impressive and is to be commended.

The quality management procedures and the online infrastructure and tools effectively support the core operations and development activities. Metropolia in their self-reflective analysis identified that there is a need to ensure a more consistent implementation of quality procedures across the institution and this is confirmed by the audit team. The particular needs of the sectors and disciplines however are recognised and, where appropriate, these differences need to be formally acknowledged and supported. Where there is a need to harmonise quality processes across the institution this process should be mindful of the cultural and pedagogic difference and needs of the sector/discipline and, where a valid rationale is provided, an amended quality process is approved. In support of this, the institution would benefit from formally defining those institution-wide processes which should be identical in practice and those where a different approach is appropriate or required.

Numerous examples of the positive impact of the quality system were evident in the documentation provided and in discussions during the audit. In addition to annual incremental enhancements across all core operations, collectively the systematic annual processes have been particularly successful in identifying the need for key institution-wide initiatives. This resulted in each department conducting a critical self-evaluation and applying the PDCA model of continuous development to inform the development of Metropolia’s new strategy 2020 with a resultant focus on high-quality learning, professional life co-operation, operating culture, campus rationalisation, digitalisation, RDI and Business Solutions.

8.2 Quality culture

Metropolia subscribes to a distributed model of responsibility for quality management and expects all members of the community to be involved and to contribute as appropriate to their role. Since 2009, Metropolia has placed an emphasis on developing an operating culture based upon clearly defined principles and values. The approach to daily operations and building of staff culture and good practice is guided by the ‘Good Leadership’ and ‘Good Working Community’ models and in turn this has engendered a spirit of collective ownership and building of a quality culture.
Student and staff representation is established throughout the organisation and is fully embedded within the quality system. However, in practice staff representation in particular can be ad-hoc since there is no structural alignment across the management teams in the departments. During the audit visit, students confirmed how they provided feedback, how this was acted upon and also that they were confident in raising issues and contributing to the development of their educational experience overall.

Similarly, staff felt well supported and were particular positive about the Metropolia Academy model, which provided opportunities for their professional and personal development.

Metropolia identified that the concept and purpose of the continuous cycle of development was not always fully understood across the institution. However, it is clear that significant progress has been made towards fully embedding this approach and the appointment of dedicated quality coordinators across the core areas of education, RDI and Business Solutions will further harmonise and consolidate this.

8.3 The quality system as a whole

Since the previous audit, Metropolia has embarked upon a significant organisational restructure, a major digitalisation initiative, a deliberate shift of focus and emphasis from teaching to learning and a strengthening of the 'work-related' and 'professional life' innovation type projects and experiences embedded in all programmes. The quality system has been developed in parallel with this and has been a significant factor in the institution's ability to effectively and successfully manage change.

The MINNO© concept was presented as the optional audit target and provided a clear example of strategically focussed institutional change. Through fully embedding this model in all degree programmes, all students would by default experience working in cross-disciplinary teams on research-led, innovation/entrepreneurial type projects, while gaining experience of specialist/expert input and 'working-life' practices. MINNO© is not yet fully established or implemented in the same way across all degree programmes. In practice, however, it would be exceedingly difficult to know what progress had been made or what each department had achieved without the comprehensive and supportive infrastructure now in place and provided by the quality system.

Although the institution has identified that further harmonisation of procedures and of how they are implemented locally is still required, it is clear that there is a shared vision across Metropolia of the goals and of what needs to be achieved.

The quality system and online infrastructure has been well conceived and is designed to support and enable Metropolia achieve its goals, both operationally and strategically, and forms a functioning and unified system.
9.1 Strengths and good practices of the quality system

Strengths

1. The Quality Policy is comprehensive, well-conceived and designed to support both the strategic and operational needs of the institution. It promotes an inclusive approach with distributed responsibilities and actively includes contributions from staff, students and stakeholders. It is clearly communicated and explicitly provides the information, goals, targets, KPIs, structure, systems and resources required for quality management and enhancement.

2. There is a clear commitment to quality management, critical self-reflection and the use of a proactive and continuous cycle of enhancement. A clearly structured management system supports the development of strategy for the institution and the roles and responsibilities are explicitly defined. Stemming from the strategy, a range of development activities and targets are set in the annual action plans for each department or unit and the progress of core functions and attainment of objectives is monitored systematically to assure implementation. Of note is the development of predictive modelling and planning for the future.

3. The quality system is comprehensively supported by a suite of online resources and tools. The recent focus on digitalisation and rationalisation of existing systems is to be commended and the development of OMA as a single portal to access key digital resources will ensure greater accessibility and a more effective use of data in ‘real-time’ in support of core operations. This development will also provide an integrated online architecture and supporting tools to enable and ensure the systematic collection and analysis of data across all core functions.

4. The philosophy and strategic aims of the MINNO© concept are specifically highlighted as a key strength. The approach provides a cross-institution platform to effectively integrate Education with RDI and Societal Impact and provides a vehicle to develop research-led and innovation focussed projects that expose students to ‘real-world’ problems and issues effecting society and communities while working alongside industry experts and their teachers.
Good practices

1. The Metropolia Academy model for building staff capacity through integrating knowledge, quality and strategy into theme-based training provided to staff to develop a shared understanding, expertise and a culture of quality management.

2. Establishing three quality coordinators across the core functions of the institution to support the development of a more consistent approach to the implementation of quality processes across all departments and units.

3. The practice of ‘feedback on feedback’ sessions where student feedback is discussed together with student, staff and management representatives to produce development plans for improving operations in response to student feedback.


5. Intensive and systematic reporting of attainment of strategic action plans and transparent communication via Tuubi.

6. The approach and introduction of Customer Relationship Management (CRM) software to more effectively support and manage the development of RDI and artistic activities, and their subsequent analysis and evaluation of impact.

7. The creation and piloting of the 3x3 self-evaluation model with the aim of developing more qualitative and effective measures for evaluating artistic activities and their societal impact.

8. The introduction of Peer-support teams to provide structured guidance, mentoring and support to staff who are new to engaging in RDI activity.

9.2 Recommendations

1. There was some evidence of variability in the implementation of quality processes across the departments and of variations in local and individual practice. In supporting diversity where this is required, Metropolia is encouraged to explicitly define the core quality processes that should be implemented consistently across the institution. Where there is a clear rationale and local need for variance of practice, this should be supported but should also be formally approved and the adapted process recorded.

2. The comprehensive amount of information and resources that support quality management is currently held in several locations online. The institution is strongly encouraged to collate, structure and catalogue all of the quality systems policies and related supporting resources to create a coherent and explicitly defined single set of information that is easily accessible and referenced from one place.

3. Currently, Metropolia does not prescribe the internal local management structure of departments. The consequence of this is that it is not always possible to easily identify the key actors in each department with comparable quality management responsibilities. With the introduction of institution-wide quality coordinators and the anticipated further development of this role, Metropolia is encouraged to consider defining a set of key roles that would form the core of the management team structure in each department. Departments would still have the freedom to expand upon this as required.
4. The institution has recently undergone a significant amount of organisational change and curricular reform. Students were not always clear regarding the difference between the new and old curriculum or of the intended impact of this reform: the UAS should ensure that students are fully informed, supported and guided during any transition phase.

5. There are several information channels where students can find information on their studies, programmes and courses. It is recommended that the purpose of the different information channels for students should be clarified and developed accordingly and systematically across the institution. Attention should also be paid to the quality and consistency of course descriptions, which varied considerably in practice regarding the amount, detail and type of information conveyed.

6. It was clear that work placements play an important role in the design of the degree programmes and provide students with the opportunity to engage with ‘real-life’, ‘research-led’ or innovation focussed projects and the expectations of professional practice. Metropolia should ensure that unified and systematic procedures concerning course descriptions, student guidance and assessment of work placements is comparable across the institution and in place for all students. A common approach to the formal assessment of the learning gained during work placement should be established and should clearly define the assessment criteria and expected outputs required for assessing and grading the 30 credit work placement modules.

7. A new learning feedback system has been introduced in autumn 2016 and a new approach to supporting student learning will be developed. The institution should take care to ensure the thorough implementation of the new feedback system across the institution and should also define the systematic procedures and steps of how and when every student will receive feedback and have the opportunity to discuss progress on their learning and performance. A record of this should be formally maintained and be accessible centrally.

8. During the audit, the team were made aware of the significant amount of innovation and good practice occurring throughout the institution. It was not clear, however, how these were systematically collated, analysed and shared, or how good ideas became a strategic priority. Metropolia is encouraged to consider developing a systematic platform where good practices could be shared within the institution, and strategies to overcome common challenges could be developed collaboratively. The prioritising of good practices across all core areas, decisions on which ones to implement across the institution and monitoring of the implementation of these could further enhance the quality of operations.

9. The students and external stakeholders are involved in curriculum work through Advisory Councils meetings which can operate at both department and/or programme level. In some cases, the concept of Advisory Councils has not yet been fully established while in others systematic procedures are in place. It was also clear that the focus of the Advisory Councils varied and that they discussed and contributed to a wide range of issues. It is recommended that Metropolia establish a primary focus and remit for the work and activities of Advisory Councils around which departments can expand upon for their specific needs.

10. The MINNO© concept has been identified above as a key strength and is of strategic significance for Metropolia. To maximise its potential the institution is encouraged to explore and/or develop the following:
   a) A required induction and training session for all participants in MINNO© projects to include students, staff and external partners prior to commencing.
   b) A more harmonised and systematic approach to managing, evaluating, enhancing and promoting the MINNO© concept utilising OMA and CRM facilities.
c) The opportunity for students to take ‘follow-up’ modules in entrepreneurship studies and concrete pathways to entrepreneurial activities to enable students to build on their MINNO© experience.

d) The potential in developing a common programme architecture across Metropolia to enable all students to fully participate in multi-disciplinary teams during their MINNO© innovation projects.

These developmental recommendations should be considered carefully prior to engaging with international collaborations around the MINNO© concept.

9.3 The audit team’s overall assessment

The quality system of Metropolia University of Applied Sciences fulfils the FINEEC criteria for the quality system as a whole and for the quality management as it relates to basic duties. None of the audit targets are at the absent stage, and the quality system as a whole (audit target 6) is at the developing stage.

The audit team proposes to FINEEC Higher Education Evaluation Committee that Metropolia University of Applied Sciences passes the audit.

9.4 Higher Education Evaluation Committee’s decision

In its meeting on 24 February 2017, the Higher Education Evaluation Committee decided, based on the proposal and report of the audit team, that the quality system of Metropolia University of Applied Sciences meets the FINEEC criteria for quality systems as a whole and quality management of the higher education institution’s core duties. Metropolia University of Applied Sciences has been awarded a quality label that is valid for six years beginning on 24 February 2017.
### APPENDIX 1: Table of the audit targets and criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETS</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality policy</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The quality policy shows an absence of or major shortcomings in the:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• rationale and definition of the quality system's objectives and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• accessibility of the quality policy to internal and external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• linking to the institution's overall strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGETS</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality system’s link with strategic management</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality system and quality work show an absence of or major shortcomings in the:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ability to meet the information needs of strategic and operations management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• procedures for the use and communication of quality information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• functionality at different organisational levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• division of responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• commitment in the execution of roles and responsibilities in the institution’s quality work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The quality system and the information it produces serve only partially the needs of strategic and operations management.</td>
<td>• The quality system and the information it produces serve strategic and operations management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procedures for the use of and communication of quality information are weak or uneven.</td>
<td>• The system works evenly across different organisational levels and units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The quality system functions unevenly across the institution.</td>
<td>• The division of responsibility is effective, and roles and responsibilities in the institution’s quality work are executed with commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The division of responsibility is only partially effective, with variable commitment in the execution of roles and responsibilities in the institution’s quality work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGETS</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development of the quality system</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HEI shows an absence of or major shortcomings in the:</td>
<td>The HEI has in place procedures for evaluating and developing the quality system but these procedures may not always be fit for purpose and/or effectively used for the system's further development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• procedures for evaluating or developing the quality system or</td>
<td>• Institutional oversight of the functioning of the quality system needs to be strengthened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• overall view of the functioning of the quality system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up section for the HEIs subject to the second audit:</td>
<td>The HEI shows an absence of or major shortcomings in the:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HEI shows an absence of or major shortcomings in the:</td>
<td>The development of the quality system after the first audit has not been systematic or effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• development work following the first audit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fulfilment of the following criteria is reviewed separately for each core duty and optional audit target:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETS</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality management of the core duties, including essential services supporting these</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a) Degree education</td>
<td>The quality system shows an absence of or major shortcomings in the: • quality management procedures used to achieve the goals set for the core duties • participation of the institution’s personnel groups, students or external stakeholders in quality work related to the core duties • quality management of essential services supporting the core duties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fulfilment of the following criteria is reviewed separately for each degree programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETS</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Samples of degree education: degree programmes</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning of the programme</td>
<td>The quality system shows an absence of or major shortcomings in the:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intended learning outcomes and their definition</td>
<td>• quality management procedures related to the planning of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Links between research, development and innovation activities, as well as artistic activities, and education</td>
<td>• quality management procedures related to the implementation of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relevance of degrees to working life.</td>
<td>• participation of the institution’s personnel groups, students or external stakeholders in the development of the programme or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teaching methods and learning environments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Methods used to assess learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students’ learning and well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teachers’ competence and occupational well-being.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participation of different personnel groups, students and external stakeholders in quality work related to the degree programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of quality work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Suitability of key evaluation methods and follow-up indicators and their impact on the achievement of goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quality management procedures related to the planning of educational provision provide excellent support for the planning of the programme. They are systematic and well-established.

The quality management procedures related to the implementation of educational provision provide excellent support for the implementation of the programme. They are systematic and well-established.

The quality management procedures related to the planning of educational provision provide excellent support for the planning of the programme. They are systematic and well-established.

The quality management procedures related to the implementation of educational provision provide excellent support for the implementation of the programme. They are systematic and well-established.

There is clear evidence of the enhancement effect of the quality work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETS</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. The quality system as a whole</strong></td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The HEI has only individual and unrelated quality management procedures.</td>
<td>• The HEI has only individual and unrelated quality management procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no evidence of the procedures' impact on the development of the operations.</td>
<td>• The quality system encompasses some of the HEI's core duties but there is little evidence of the system's impact on the development of the core duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The institution's quality culture is only just emerging.</td>
<td>• The development of the operations is based on an existing quality culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2: The stages and timetable of the audit process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement negotiation between the HEI and FINEEC</td>
<td>20 January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of the audit team</td>
<td>14 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the audit material and self-evaluation report</td>
<td>16 August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and discussion event at the HEI</td>
<td>18 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit visit</td>
<td>8–10 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Evaluation Committee’s decision on the result</td>
<td>24 February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of the report</td>
<td>24 February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding seminar</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up on the development work of the quality system</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TARGETS CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>absent</td>
<td>• The HEI has only individual and unrelated quality management procedures. • There is no evidence of the procedures' impact on the development of the operations. • The quality management procedures do not yet form a functioning and unified system. • The quality system encompasses some of the HEI's core duties but there is little evidence of the system's impact on the development of the core duties. • The institution's quality culture is only just emerging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emerging</td>
<td>• The quality management procedures constitute a functioning system. • The quality system covers the essential parts of the core duties of the HEI and provides support for the development of the operations. There is evidence that the system has an impact on the development of the core duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing</td>
<td>• The development of the operations is based on an existing quality culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanced</td>
<td>• The quality management procedures form a dynamic and coherent system. • The quality system covers all the core duties of the HEI and provides excellent support for the institution's overall strategy and the development of the operations. There is clear evidence that the system has an impact on the development of the core duties. • The institution has a well-established quality culture, characterised by wide participation, commitment and transparency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tuesday 8 November 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30–9.40</td>
<td>Interview with the Top Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10–10.50</td>
<td>Interview with the UAS Board representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10–12.00</td>
<td>Interview with the selection of Heads of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00–13.50</td>
<td>Interview with Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20–15.10</td>
<td>Interview with Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.40–16.30</td>
<td>Interview with Quality Coordinators and quality actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00–17.50</td>
<td>Thematic interview: MINNO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wednesday 9 November 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30–9.20</td>
<td>Interview with RDI personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.50–10.40</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Programme in Music: interview with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10–12.00</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Programme in Music: interview with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00–13.50</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Programme in Information Technology in English: interview with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20–15.10</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Programme in Information Technology in English: interview with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.40–16.30</td>
<td>Interview with Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00–17.50</td>
<td>Interview with External Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thursday 10 November 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30–9.20</td>
<td>Master’s Degree Programme in Rehabilitation: interview with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.50–10.40</td>
<td>Master’s Degree Programme in Rehabilitation: interview with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10–12.00</td>
<td>Thematic interview: Societal Impact activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20–15.10</td>
<td>Interview with and preliminary feedback to the Top Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audits of the quality systems of higher education institutions have been implemented in Finland in accordance with the principle of enhancement-led evaluation since 2005. The objective of the audits has been to support Finnish institutions in developing quality systems that correspond to the European principles of quality assurance and to demonstrate that functional and consistent quality assurance procedures are in place in Finland both in institutions and on the national level. In the audits, institutions are supported in their efforts to reach their strategic objectives and in directing future development activities in order to create a framework for the institutions' continuous development.

This report presents the audit process of the Metropolia University of Applied Sciences and the results of the audit.