Abstract

Published by
Finnish Education Evaluation Centre (FINEEC)

Name of Publication
Audit of Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences 2017

Authors
Asta Wahlgren, Birgit Kraus, Malcolm Hoare, Miia Kinnunen, Gramoz Shpendi,
Kati Isoaho and Karl Holm

The Finnish Education Evaluation Centre has conducted an audit of Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences and has awarded the institution a quality label that is valid for six years from 16 June 2017. The quality system of Haaga-Helia 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 system that the University has developed based on its own needs and goals. The freely selected audit target chosen by the institution was the quality management of the StartUp School.

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

- Haaga-Helia’s strategic management functions well and is clearly linked to the quality management, especially in the internal steering operations. The annual internal steering process exploits a wide range of the data and information produced by the quality system. The degree programmes reviewed as a part of the audit clearly reflect institution’s strategic focus areas.

- Community engagement in quality work has evidently been one of the key priorities from the very beginning of Haaga-Helia and beyond. The current good level of engagement offers a solid foundation for further embedding the shared quality culture into Haaga-Helia’s units and campuses. Communication on the quality system and its results is extensive and versatile. Haaga-Helia has systematically developed its internal communication by creating the intranet Quality Portal for the all the quality-related information. The amount of information available on the web pages for the external stakeholders is also high.

- Haaga-Helia has a very strong pedagogical approach. Pedagogical innovations are systematically applied across the institution. The institution as a whole, as well as its units, actively seeks new teaching and learning solutions that advance integral connections to working life. The in-house expertise of vocational teacher education is exploited in an excellent manner in quality management and in teachers’ further education and training, such as in the HH-PEDAALI training programme.
Among others, the following recommendations were given to Haaga-Helia:

- The quality system and especially its components that produce data and information should be critically reviewed and sparsened in order to make the system more efficient and effective. Furthermore, the institution's working-body architecture should be reconsidered and therefore, be simplified appropriately. Finally, Haaga-Helia is advised to stress prioritizing, coordination and realistic timing in its development activities, to avoid the situation where several improvements were started simultaneously.

- The role of the recently established RDI Services unit still requires clarification, as well as the RDI operations in general. The top management needs to define, what research and innovation are supposed to be like in Haaga-Helia. Furthermore, the RDI should be more deeply linked to the internal steering, such as the annual performance evaluation. In addition, the research dimension of the RDI could be strengthened in various ways: for example, via staff training opportunities, encouraging the staff to publish project results and creating a clear space for the integration of the staff’s own research as well as institutional projects.

- The number of surveys and other feedback tools is currently too high; in particular in degree education. Haaga-Helia is advised to develop a mixed-methodological approach where both qualitative and quantitative data and information are effectively gathered and analyzed. In addition, there is a great deal of direct, partially undocumented student and stakeholder feedback, the use of which should be extended, including a sufficient documentation.
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Auditoinnin kohteena oli Haaga-Helia -ammattikorkeakoulun laatujärjestelmä, jonka korkeakoulu on kehittänyt omista lähtökohdistaan ja tavoitteiden mukaisesti. Korkeakoulun valitsema vapaavalintainen auditointikohde oli StartUp Schoolin laadunhallinta.

Laatujärjestelmän keskeisinä vahvuksina pidetään seuraavia:


- Pedagogiikka on vahvasti läsnä Haaga-Helian toiminnassa. Pedagogisia innovaatioita sovelletaan systemaattisesti koko organisaatiossa. Sekä korkeakoulu että sen yksiköt etsivät aktiivisesti uusia opetuksen ja oppimisen tapoja, jotka edistävät koulutuksen kiinteää työelämäsuhtedetta. Korkeakoulun omaa osaamista ammattilaisessa opettajankoulutuksessa hyödynnetään erinomaisella tavalla laadunhallinnassa ja henkilökunnan täydennyskoulutuksessa. Tästä esimerkkinä on Opettajuuden kehittämisohjelma HH-PEDAALI.
Haaga-Helianne annettiin muun muassa seuraavia suosituksia:
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1 Audit Targets and process

1.1 Audit targets

The target of the audit is the quality system that Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences 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 is 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 Area¹ (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.

Haaga-Helia chose “Quality management of StartUp School” as its optional audit target. As samples of degree education, Haaga-Helia chose the Bachelor’s Programme in International Business and the Master’s Programme in Hospitality Management. As the third sample of degree education, the audit team chose the Bachelor’s Programme in Business Information Technology.

The audit targets of Haaga-Helia comprise the following aspects:

1. The quality policy of the higher education institution
2. The 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 (including first-, second- and third-cycle education)\(^2\)
   b. Research, development and innovation activities (RDI)
   c. The societal impact and regional development work\(^3\)
   d. Optional audit target: Quality management of StartUp School
5. Samples of degree education:
   i. Bachelor’s Programme in Business Information Technology
   ii. Bachelor’s Programme in International Business
   iii. Master’s Programme in Hospitality Management
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 Haaga-Helia as well as an audit visit to the institution on 7–9 February 2017. 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 Haaga-Helia, the audit was conducted in English by an international audit team. Prior to the appointment of the audit team, Haaga-Helia was given the opportunity to comment on the team’s composition, especially from the perspective of disqualification.

---

\(^2\) First-cycle degrees include bachelor’s degrees, and second-cycle degrees include master’s degrees. Third-cycle degrees include postgraduate licentiate and doctoral degrees.

\(^3\) Including social responsibility, continuing education, open university education, as well as paid-services education.
The audit team:

Director Asta Wahlgrén, JAMK University of Applied Sciences, Finland (Chair)

Quality Manager Birgit Kraus, Aschaffenburg University of Applied Sciences, Germany (Vice-chair)
Professor Malcolm Hoare, University of Derby, UK
Development Manager Miia Kinnunen, Kesko Ltd., Finland
Student Gramoz Shpendi, Hâme University of Applied Sciences, Finland

Kati Isoaho, Senior Advisor from FINEEC, acted as the responsible project manager and Karl Holm, Counsellor of Evaluation from FINEEC, as the backup for the project manager.

The audit visit to Haaga-Helia was conducted as a three-day visit. The purpose of the audit visit was to verify and supplement the observations made based on the audit material of Haaga-Helia’s quality system. The programme of the visit 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, drawing on the expertise of each team member. Haaga-Helia was given the opportunity to check the factual information in the report before the report was published.
Haaga-Helia started operations in the beginning of 2007. The operations were initiated by combining two different universities of applied sciences: Helsinki Business UAS (Helia), and the Haaga Institute UAS. Measured by total number of students, Haaga-Helia is the second-largest University of Applied Sciences in Finland. Haaga-Helia is directed by the Board of the Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences. The President leads the Management Group and in the Group all operational units are represented.

Haaga-Helia provides education for professionals in business and service. Research and develop expertise and activities are related to these domains. The main focus of Haaga-Helia lies in the needs of businesses and fulfilling this Haaga-Helia provides professionally oriented higher education. In addition to the bachelor’s and master’s degrees Haaga-Helia supplies its students with the knowledge and skills required for lifelong learning and development in the workplace. Campuses of Haaga-Helia operate in Helsinki in three separate locations – Pasila, Haaga, and Malmi. Outside Helsinki there is a campus in Vierumäki specialised in sport education, and in Porvoo specialised in tourism. The School of Vocational Teacher Education of Haaga-Helia is located on Pasila Campus.

Haaga-Helia is part of the Finnish public educational system. It is privately run but steered and co-funded by the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC). Haaga-Helia is, like all the Finnish universities of applied sciences, operating under Act on Universities of Applied Sciences. The current organisation of Haaga-Helia was introduced in August 2015. The educational units are as follows:

- Business Programmes
- Experience and Wellness Economy
- Digital business
- School of Vocational Teacher Education.
The Business Programmes unit includes all the business related degree programmes on the Pasila and Malmi campuses. The Experience and Wellness Economy unit provides links between hospitality and tourism, sports and business education on the Porvoo Campus and it operates on three campuses – Haaga, Porvoo and Vierumäki. The Digital Business unit combines ICT, management assistant education and journalism education and the unit operates on the Pasila Campus.

There are two units in a matrix with the educational units. The Research, Development and Innovation Services unit forms a cross-organisational unit supporting RDI work in every educational unit. The second unit operating in a matrix with the educational units is the Commercial Services unit. It covers domestic and overseas businesses, partner management, the eMBA programme as well as Career, Recruitment and Alumni services.

The Organisation of Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences

FIGURE 1: The organisation chart of Haaga-Helia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students (full-time equivalent)</th>
<th>10 783</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>9 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational teacher education students</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees awarded</th>
<th>1 894</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>1 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff (full-time equivalent)</th>
<th>601,3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>383,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDI staff</td>
<td>14,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td>203,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haaga-Helia has designed a quality system, which is coherent with its strategy and operations. The quality policy of Haaga-Helia is the outcome of an extensive and inclusive process, in which both staff members, student representatives, and external stakeholders participated. Haaga-Helia has adapted a modified version of the Deming cycle. By replacing “Act” with “Learn & Develop”, the model is well suited to a higher education institution. The quality system embraces the whole institution, and is an integral part of the management system and the strategy supporting and strengthening the strategy-led approach of the institution. The rationale and the objectives of the quality policy are defined explicitly, and the roles and responsibilities of the actors are clearly stated. However, the number of different working bodies is high, which may decrease the efficiency of the quality system. The quality policy is carefully documented, variously communicated and easily available to the external stakeholders on the website of the institution and to internal stakeholders on the institution’s intranets. Haaga-Helia actively communicates its policy through everyday actions, which is typical for the institution. Information available on the quality system and quality policy to the external stakeholders is notably extensive.

The quality policy of higher education institution is at an advanced stage.

3.1 Rationale, objectives and division of responsibility

Haaga-Helia’s quality policy is built on the idea that each member of the organisation works towards the identified goals and takes responsibility for the quality of personal work activities and results. As a principle, quality is created in everyday practice. The quality system of Haaga-Helia is based on the modified Deming’s PDCA cycle, the European EFQM Excellence Model, and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). Instead of ‘Act’, the institution has chosen to use ‘Learn & develop’. As stated in the audit material, this choice reflects the special needs of a higher education institution as a learning institution, and highlights that there is also room for innovations and creativity. The audit team considers that this approach is well suited to a higher education institution such as Haaga-Helia and gives an innovative touch to the quality system.
The purpose of Haaga-Helia’s quality system is to

- Support the management in implementing the strategy
- Support continuous assessment and improvement of operations by providing tools and highlighting areas in need of improvement
- Produce reliable monitoring and assessment data for operational planning purposes
- Clarify and harmonise procedures in order to promote quality
- Support approaches that promote creativity, learning and innovation
- Disseminate and establish good practices

Furthermore, the quality policy consists of five key principles:

- Strategy guides everything Haaga-Helians do
- Everybody is responsible for the quality of his or her work and its results
- Haaga-Helians work according to the principle of continuous improvement
- Haaga-Helians develop their activities together with their stakeholders
- Quality work is part of normal management and activities.

The objectives of the quality system derive from the strategy, mission, vision and values of the institution. The quality system of Haaga-Helia provides a framework for quality management and definition of responsibilities and procedures. The quality system consists of the mission, vision, value foundation and strategy, the quality policy, processes, indicator data, surveys, and evaluation procedures and feedback tools. The yearly internal steering process is described in detail in Chapter 4.
With regard to the division of responsibility, the quality system emphasizes both individual and team responsibilities. According to the audit material, the top and middle management are the key stakeholders of the quality system. Division of responsibility regarding all the institution’s activities is clearly defined in the intranet Quality Portal. The Management Group is responsible for the development of Haaga-Helia as a whole as well as for the monitoring of the strategy. Members of the Management Group comprise the President, two Vice Presidents, and directors of educational units as well as directors of support services, thus ensuring that all the key areas of the institution are represented.

All the staff members having a managerial position in a unit, in a degree programme or in other functions, are responsible for the quality management and development of their units and functions. Units have their own permanent development groups that aim to support the unit level management. Individual staff members may have several roles and responsibilities based on the organizational structure.

As a support function, the Quality System Services is responsible for operational maintenance and development of the quality system. The Quality Manager of the institution belongs to this unit. The tasks of the Quality Manager include coordination and actions relating to the feedback...
systems, process architecture and quality system documentation. The Quality System Services also take care of preparing the external audits and accreditations. There are designated persons for the quality work at the different units to work with centralized Quality System Services and the Quality Manager.

The organisation of Haaga-Helia includes several development groups, which are either unit-specific or cross-organisational. As told in the self-evaluation report, they were evaluated after the recent strategy update and the organizational renewal in order to make sure that they fulfil the objectives of the strategy. However, the number of different working bodies is still high.

### 3.2 Communication of the quality system

In 2016, Haaga-Helia has introduced a common intranet Quality Portal for staff and students. Concurrently of this process also the nature of the quality documentation has been enriched with visual descriptions to make it more attractive. The Quality Portal exploits the sport-inspired terminology, like “team players”, “coaches” and “goalkeeper”. Staff has access to all the quality system documentation on the intranet and those of students’ intranet, MyNet.

The building of the first version of the Portal was in progress at the time of the audit visit and it was supposed to continue until June 2017. According to the audit material, the aim has been to describe and present the quality system in an inspiring, down-to-earth and adoptable way. Moreover, the aim is to make the Quality Portal be entirely bilingual (Finnish-English) in the future. On the opening page of the Portal, the in-progress state of the art is openly highlighted, and all the users are invited to join its development by making suggestions. Audit team considers this be a good concrete example of emphasizing everyone’s responsibility on the quality work as a part of their core tasks.

Because of the ongoing building state of the Quality Portal, part of the quality-related data and information still exist in the Staff Intranet, which covers more broadly the institution’s activities and serves as a wider information channel for the staff. For instance, the recent indicator data is available in Staff Intranet and linked to the Quality Portal.

The Quality Portal includes the Playbook, which is the document gathering all the key principles guiding Haaga-Helia’s activities. It comprises, e.g., descriptions of the external and internal steering, the strategy documentation, the internal resource allocation model, the action plans and budgets as well as internal operational evaluation schedules.

In addition to this, the quality policy, relevant current plans for development of the quality system, and various survey results are openly available on the public website of the institution.

For external stakeholders, many other channels, such as newsletters, Signals publications, Advisory Boards, stakeholder events, and social media are used while communicating the quality policy and the quality system as well as its results. The audit team commends Haaga-Helia on the amount
of information available for the external stakeholders and sees it as notably high. It appreciates that Haaga-Helia shows an excellent capacity to maintain transparency and openness towards its external stakeholders and the surrounding society in general.

The Quality Portal also includes process descriptions. Descriptions are divided into two categories: 1) Public ones, which are also available on public websites in the process index 2) Non-public ones, which are available only in the Quality Portal. According to the audit material, the set of process descriptions is under the progress as is the way they are described. The Haaga-Helia has introduced a future plan to describe all the processes by using the QPR enterprise architecture tool.

As the quality policy is designed to be a tool in daily management, quality policy communication is a normal management function in Haaga-Helia. As a principle, the audit material also emphasizes that the quality policy is communicated through action. Quality and quality system are constantly discussed, and the communication of the quality system is also included in the agenda of many working bodies, such as the institutional KOVA degree programme management group, the unit level development groups, and the permanent development groups at all levels of the institution. In addition, participatory workshops have been arranged around the quality system e.g. when preparing the self-evaluation report for the audit. Moreover, the Quality System Services actively communicate the principles of the quality policy as part of their matrix work across the institution.

As regards the students, the Student’s Guide and MyNet offer information about the quality policy and the roles and different options to participate in quality management. In addition, students are informed about the survey results and development actions both via MyNet and in YTY-meetings\(^4\) at the degree programme level or in the institution-level JOOP forum.\(^5\) Process descriptions meant primarily for the students exist in MyNet and are also accessible through the process index.

The Student Union Helga and the tutors also have an important role in communicating about the quality policy and the quality system for the students. Helga is responsible for a 15 credits study module called “Being active in Haaga-Helia”, which includes lectures regarding quality in general. As a programme level attempt, the concept of Quality Assi is notable. Quality Assi consists of a group of students chosen by their fellow students for this task. They serve as a discussion channel for students and staff of the Degree Programme in Modern Languages and Business Studies for Management Assistants. The group meets two to three 2–3 times per semester to discuss, evaluate and develop matters related to the study environment of their degree programme. Each member of the group receives three credits for their active participation. The audit team recommends Haaga-Helia to extend this practice to the other degree programmes too.

Although Haaga-Helia has been actively and openly communicating its quality policy, a more systematic and comprehensive communication appears to be needed according to both the self-evaluation report and the interviews. As there are already many well-functioning procedures and promising initiatives in this area, the audit team considers that the Haaga-Helia’s opportunities

\(^4\) Programme level meetings between the programme director, academic advisor, teachers and students
\(^5\) Haaga-Helia management and student union forum for cooperation
to further develop its communication are excellent. A holistic understanding of the whole quality system, and better horizontal communication across the units were identified in the self-evaluation report as the main objectives for further development in this area.

Based on the interviews, the centralised Quality Portal in-progress containing all information and tools for quality management is beneficial to all users, and the staff members and students interviewed were satisfied with it. As there are still more than one electronic platform surrounding the quality management and its communication, it is recommendable to continue ongoing work around the Quality Portal to make it the main repository for all the quality-related communication, data and information.

Furthermore, the self-evaluation report also states that more information in English on the quality system and quality would be useful for this multicultural higher education institution with a diverse staff and student body. The audit team considers that Haaga-Helia is well on the way to completing this aim, as the Quality Portal already includes a lot of information in English.

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

The audit visit confirmed that the quality policy and the strategy of Haaga-Helia are clearly linked to each other. Furthermore, Haaga-Helia is evidently a strategy-led institution, as argued in the audit material. The internal yearly steering process in an essential component of the quality system and ensures the linkage between the strategy and the quality policy. It includes several points of reviewing and monitoring the institution’s activities against the strategic objectives set. Arranged around the modified Deming Cycle, it also visibly supports the quality policy’s aspiration for the continuous development.

During the audit visit, the audit team observed that the interviewed staff understand the purpose and objectives of the quality policy and quality system in general. In line with the quality policy, quality is not seen as a separate issue, and in the interviews it was repeatedly emphasized as a part of everyday work. Furthermore, it was evident that staff members are well aware of their own responsibilities regarding the quality system. The responsibilities are clearly assigned, but they may not always be transparent in a dense system of different development groups, teams, working groups, and other forms of exchange. The high number of actors also makes this system vulnerable and increases the risk of insufficient communication. The audit team recommends that the functionality of all the development groups and equals should be reviewed in terms of efficacy. By doing this, Haaga-Helia could also free resources for other activities, and lighten the workload of the staff members. Streamlining the working body architecture could also enhance the staff members’ motivation and possibilities to contribute to the quality work.
4 Quality system’s link with strategic management

In order to serve its strategic and operational management, Haaga-Helia has developed systematic tools and procedures to produce information on the quality of its activities. Internal steering process works strategically well and ensures the effective use of the data and information produced by the quality system. Especially on the unit and degree programme level, additional qualitative feedback is used for improvements and fine-tuning. The potential of these sources has been identified, but documentation tools have not been developed, yet. The quality system works on the different organisational levels and units. The engagement with the quality system is deepest in education. The different protagonists are committed to contributing to the quality work in the institution. The division of responsibility is mostly effective, although the high number of working bodies makes system to some extent complex.

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

4.1 Information produced by the quality system for strategic management

Haaga-Helia’s current strategy is set for five years, for the period 2016–2020, and according to the self-evaluation, quality has been placed at the core of the strategy. Since 2015 the institution has set strategic indicators and created a roadmap for the coming years. Based on the audit material, all Haaga-Helians were able to participate in the strategy work, which was based on massive online brainstorming. As to the quality policy, staff members and student representatives took part in formulating it and in setting the objectives for quality. External stakeholders were engaged in the strategy work, mainly via the Advisory Boards, Collegiate Body, alumni activities, and informal personal discussions with the top management. According to the interviews, their quality management expertise and ideas have had an important impact on, for example, enhancing the significance of sales and entrepreneurship as a focus area of the strategy.
Haaga-Helia has defined three focus areas – *Quality education with a human touch, Sales, service and entrepreneurship at the core, and Innovations in networks* – as well as points of emphasis. Haaga-Helia also has the strategic road map where key activities in implementing the strategy are outlined by year.

The Management Group has identified key performance indicators for the evaluation and continuous adjustment of the strategy (strategic indicators) as well as for the implementation of the strategy (tactical indicators). Strategic indicators cover the following areas: Implementation of vision; Level and trend of basic funding; Competencies and wellbeing of staff and students; Impact of digital solutions and International Growth. Tactical indicators extend to the following operations: Education; Sales, services and entrepreneurship; Innovations; Staff; Students; International dimension and Digital dimension. These indicators comply very well with the needs of Haaga-Helia and are based on extensive data from internal statistics. Among the statistics used there are many, which are also reported to the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC), like the number of students gaining 55 credits per academic year. Indicators are discussed every two weeks in the meetings of the Management Group.

As an internal steering process, the quality targets are set within the strategy-based annual operational and financial planning. The outcomes of the process are a strategy-based action plan and a budget for the each unit. In addition to the educational units, also the three campuses under the Unit of Experience and Wellbeing Economy have their own quality targets, plans and budgets. The Board of Haaga-Helia Ltd. approves the action plan and a budget yearly for the whole institution. The action plans and budgets are available in the Quality Portal. The quality targets set are distributed to the levels of units, functions and individual staff members. They are recorded in the performance cards.

Moreover, the Management Group has adapted a quarterly rhythm in order to analyse the data and information provided by the quality system. According to the audit material and interviews, there is clear evidence on the effective use of the data and information produced by the quality system for the strategic steering purposes. As the evaluation schedule installed reduces the risk of overlapping, an uneven production of data is avoided and a continuous quality management is ensured. As stated in the audit material, the sources of data and information used are

- Indicator data (as described above)
- Assessment of RDI project portfolio
- Financial reports
- Electronic E-form course feedback gathered on all the courses continuously and reported quarterly
- AVOP graduand feedback from the MoEC
- Annual Student survey (student wellbeing and study ability)
- VTE Arttuli feedback (from students of vocational teacher education)
- Biannual Staff Mood Check
- Brand survey every other year
- Annual image survey
• Annual performance reviews
• Staff Climate survey every other year
• Annual “Mikä mättää” tour (“What’s wrong” tour) of Student Union Helga
• Internal service survey PALKE

In addition, with regards to student feedback there are some sources of information used on unit, campus and programme level in the operational quality work, such as

• Intermediate course feedback collected by Moodle or email
• Course-specific feedback collected by individual teachers by various methods
• Student exchange feedback
• Students’ work placement reports
• YTY-meetings (between the programme director, academic advisor, teachers and students)
• JOOP meetings (Haaga-Helia management and student union forum for cooperation)

Consistent and even information is a must for any functioning quality system and an important requirement for efficiency. At present, the data provided is mainly retrospective and quantitative, which also suits the size of Haaga-Helia, which is, with more than 10,000 students, the second largest university of applied sciences in Finland. This view was highly emphasised in the interview with the Management Group. The audit team commends the key performance indicators that are well chosen and contain a reasonable amount of topics. Still, the data provided by the quality system as a whole is huge.

According to the audit material, also the Board of Haaga-Helia Ltd. regularly discusses the indicators and trends they show. The Management Group’s Education Committee, which is still a rather new body at Haaga-Helia, transmits knowledge produced by the quality system to units and degree programmes in order to ensure further development based on this data. Leadership Forum meetings also tell about the latest results of indicator analysis and serve as an effective platform for creating common knowledge about implementation of strategy.

Haaga-Helia has adopted the institutional resource allocation system for core funding. The latest revision of the allocation system was carried out in 2014 aside the national reform of the funding system of universities of applied sciences. The performance indicators used in allocation cover education (85%) and research (15%). In addition, funding is allocated to advance the strategic development. Data provided by the quality system is used for the resource allocation purposes. Thus, the internal resource allocation supports the achievement of the institution’s strategic aspirations and creates incentives for the units, campuses and programmes to achieve the goals set. The audit team commends on this approach to the resource allocation.

The IT and Corporate Planning services are responsible for providing indicator data reports for the internal steering purposes. According to the self-evaluation report, the data reports are mainly provided in a form and frequency that adequately serves strategic monitoring and decision-making. Haaga-Helia also recognises that there is still room for the improvement in the current reporting
practises: the feedback data should be better segmented to serve sufficiently the needs of the degree programmes. With regards to the national AVOP graduand feedback, Haaga-Helia has been actively contributing to its improvement into a direction which would enable data to assure a better breakdown in future. As an example, the earlier AVOP did not allow to differentiate data from business degree programmes between Helsinki and Porvoo. This has been possible for the first time with 2016 AVOP results. The audit team agrees on the need to get targeted information on the degree programmes.

As stated in the self-evaluation report, special attention has been paid to the availability and usability of data; automatisation of the data collection and reporting practises has been emphasised during the past few years. As described in chapter 3, Haaga-Helia is implementing a common Quality Portal for all quality documentation, which is expected to be finished in 2017 and which will certainly be beneficial to all users. As with all the other documentation related to the quality and quality management, the audit team encourages Haaga-Helia to ensure that reports used in the internal steering process and annual performance reviews are easily and timely available on the Quality Portal.

As far as turning student feedback into concrete measures is concerned, the audit team discovered that theoretic concepts on collecting feedback cannot always be applied in practice. Student feedback used for further development is supposed to be collected through surveys and E-form questionnaire. In reality, they do not always play an as important role as oral, direct feedback or reflections from student reports or learning diaries. This phenomenon could even be seen as a parallel, but working quality management procedure on its own. It concerns the educational units, but also the centralized functions and works equally well on the different units and degree programmes (see also chapters 6.1 and 6.2).

Most of the data and information are used, but the audit material suggests that more analysis would be useful, despite the schedule set by the Management Group for discussing key performance indicators. Feedback from the units and the whole institution could also be more explicitly used, especially the qualitative one. This aspect will be taken into consideration in chapter 6.1. In addition, there are some existing tools, which could be used for the quality management purposes, such as the StartUp School’s Competence Card.

4.2 Functioning of the quality system at different organisational levels and units

Internal yearly steering process binds together all the levels of the institution, from the top management to the level of individual staff members. It also aims to ensure that the key data and information produced by the quality system is put into use on the different levels of institution. In the light of the audit material and interviews, the internal steering works strategically and has good results.
All Haaga-Helia’s community members have apparently adapted the quality system in their daily work life, even though, of course, the focus might differentiate depending on the individual role. Quality issues including data are discussed and decided on unit level as well as in committees and working groups with members of different units. This approach takes both structural and process-oriented organisation into consideration and corresponds to practical needs as well as to modern concepts of higher education institutions.

The field-specific Advisory Boards and alumni contribute to the quality system with their views from outside the organisation. The Advisory Boards meet regularly and assure a regular exchange with the external stakeholders. During the audit visit, interviewees mentioned portal and intranet as well as the Yammer-SharePoint as very helpful sources of information.

On the one hand, quality system provides participation possibilities for all members of the institution. On the other hand, as explained too in chapter 3, working body structures are very complex and therefore do not always seem to work according to the original intent. This was also mentioned by interviewed students who appreciated the various possibilities for participation, but who also reported that there were “tons of work groups”. In the light of the interviews, the communication paths form one certain work group and/or organisational unit to another are not always clear. Obviously, the many working groups and development projects produce so much information that it is difficult to keep up with the latest news.

Haaga-Helia’s different hierarchy levels, internal bodies and units all pay high attention to the quality management. Apparently, the present quality system mainly takes quantitative information into consideration on the institution level, even though the Management Group cherish qualitative information, too. As far as the work with survey results is concerned, one has to differentiate between staff and students. Apparently, the Staff Climate Survey has become an established tool, and with the biannual Mood Check employees have even initiated another tool for gaining information on staff wellbeing and satisfaction.

The depth of engagement with the quality management depends on the area too: currently it is strongest in education. In a broad sense, most of the surveys and feedback tools provide information on the success in this area. The chosen indicators cover the education in an excellent manner.

In order to measure societal and regional impact, Haaga-Helia takes graduation rates as well as application numbers into consideration. A company survey is also being developed. The audit team observes that there is still room for introducing special tools in these fields, but also acknowledges the difficulty to assess the impact in a prosperous capital area with lots of other players in the field of higher education.

As far as the RDI section is concerned, it consists of different parts which still have a more but sometimes less clear service profile. Whereas the purpose and the tasks of the StartUp School are clear and make development based on feedback easier, the enhancement of RDI is more challenging as the role and purpose of the RDI is not clear enough for the different actors across the institutions. This aspect will be discussed more thoroughly in chapter 6.3.
To advance the efficient use of the data and information on quality at all units, it is recommended to ensure that there is across the institution enough staff who are deeply familiar with the quality system and can serve as reporters of expectations to the operational level, and vice versa as reporters of experiences with, e.g. certain survey tools to the strategic level.

4.3 Quality culture

Quality culture played an important role in the self-evaluation process in 2015. Self-evaluation report confirms that Haaga-Helia recognises in an excellent way the establishment of the joint quality culture as a major challenge for the large institution. It is also openly pointed out that Haaga-Helia’s predecessors had very different quality cultures at the time of merger in 2007 and even the previous audit process in 2010 was not able to fully replace the old policies. During the past two years, more attention has been paid to the creation of the shared quality culture. According to the audit material, the self-evaluation carried out in 2015 indicates that shared quality culture already exist to some extent. With regards to strong campus cultures, Haaga-Helia confirms that they exist too. According to the interviews, this acceptable variation appears to be related to the size of the campus.

Based on the audit visit, there were, and still are, numerous possibilities for staff, students, and stakeholders to engage in quality management. They are encouraged to participate in quality work and to seek information actively. The audit material as well as interviews show that every interviewed staff member recognizes the strategy, and strategy guides what should be done in his or her task. The quality system is perceived as an integral part of the management system. Furthermore, it is considered easy to understand, and seen to work at every level. During the interviews it was often highlighted that every Haaga-Helian, including the students, are responsible. All staff members are committed to reaching high quality throughout their work, which was proved by vivid examples from both staff and students.

All interviewees told frankly about their daily work and provided numerous examples for practical aspects of quality work. They all implored a quality culture based on feedback and a clear willingness of making improvements in their work. The Haaga-Helia Board mentioned explicitly that quality is a long-term issue, which is for them eventually more important than purely economic results. Team-based teaching has led to the distribution of concise degree programmes and to teamwork both in teaching as such as well in degree programme development. As an example of student engagement, Haaga-Helia’s recent strategy process was simultaneously conducted with the update of student union Helga’s strategy. As a result they share many goals.
Haaga-Helia has functioning procedures for evaluating and developing the quality system. Many components of the quality system have recently been renewed, based on the self-evaluation, which was carried out across the institution. The development of the quality system is embedded in the strategic management, as it is included in the yearly institutional performance reviews. Furthermore, there is still room for the systematization of the review practises. The strengths and development areas of the quality system are clearly recognised. The development of the quality system has led to concrete results. Internal and external stakeholders are involved in the development of the quality system. However, the complex working body architecture creates a challenge for the development of the quality system. The development of the quality system is at a developing stage.

5.1 Procedures for developing the quality system

The current quality system of Haaga-Helia has been developed during the past ten years, after the merger of its predecessors in 2007. So far, two institutional self-evaluations have been carried out across the whole institution (in 2007–2009 and in 2015–2016). They have served as a basis for the self-evaluation report provided for FINHEEC/FINEEC prior to the audit visits. According to the audit material, different stakeholder groups participated in the latest self-evaluation process, especially staff, students, and the business community. Furthermore, the functioning of the quality system as a whole is regularly monitored in the Management Group’s annual performance reviews.

The first external audit of Haaga-Helia’s quality system took place in 2010, and several changes were introduced based on the recommendations given in the audit report. Various components of the present quality system were also renewed according to the results of a self-evaluation in 2015 and after extensive strategy work. According to the audit material, Haaga-Helia has gained first experiences with the current practises and has already started making further adjustments. As explained in detail in chapter 4, achieving a joint quality culture for the large-size institution
is seen as a challenge. The audit visit confirmed that Haaga-Helia aims to strengthen the quality culture and has involved a wide variety of internal actors in this work. The audit team recommends that the level of accepted internal diversity would be clearly defined and documented to make it visible for all the actors.

The development of the quality system at the institutional level is coordinated by the Quality Manager. It is indicated in the self-evaluation report that the institution has invested resources in the Quality System Services during the past couple of years to advance the development of the quality system. As with every aspect of its quality system, Haaga-Helia highlights collective responsibility also in the development of the quality system itself. All the interviewees met appreciated that they had been involved in the strategy work and, subsequently, into the development of the quality system. In addition, there were signals that staff (excluding the top management) did not entirely recognise how they could contribute to the development of the quality system as a whole, but they knew how to develop their own responsibility areas. It would be recommendable to consider a procedure by which everyone could develop the quality systems as a whole, like a workshop for this purpose.

At the moment, however, it is not fully clear, up to which extent Haaga-Helia's internal reporting and evaluation procedures actually influence the methodological discussion on the quality management, on tools for gathering data, and on information about the quality of key operations. Thus, the audit team encourages Haaga-Helia to develop a mechanism to assess the methodological choices within the quality system, e.g. the division between quantitative and qualitative indicators and tools for collecting follow-up data and information. This should lead to streamlining the number of surveys and to introducing other ways of collecting data. In addition, the analytical approach should become stronger and share of good practises across the institution more vivid.

In addition, the quality system and its effectiveness are assessed within the more specific contexts like the amount of student feedback, for instance. The interviews confirmed that the quality system is also evaluated and continuously fine-tuned at the practical level, which keeps the quality system dynamic and agile.

The audit team recommends Haaga-Helia to introduce a more regular review of the quality system, which would also cover smaller sections or only certain topics at a time. This way, best practices as well as areas which need further development, could be more easily identified. Results of the activities within the various working bodies would become more visible as well. The need for the more frequent but methodologically simpler institutional quality system review was also mentioned in the self-evaluation report as an area for development. The experiences from the previous self-evaluations could be exploited in this work.

Self-evaluation report and interviews with the top management confirm that Haaga-Helia has been able to identify the quality system’s strengths and areas in need of development. Top management and staff members primarily in charge of quality system recognise that the assessment and development of the quality system is part of Haaga-Helia's continuous development. Another identified strength was that the improvement of the quality system is based on strategic and organisational needs in addition to external change requirements.
5.2 Development work after the previous audit

The audit visit and self-evaluation report confirmed that Haaga-Helia has implemented many of the recommendations given in the previous audit report. Moreover, some of the improvements are still in progress, partly due to their complex nature and partly because the active implementation of them started a bit late, a couple of years ago aside of the recent strategy process.

The number of development projects in progress is high. There is already evidence of their impact on enhancing the quality system along with the strategy. However, since many of these projects started in 2015 or 2016, more data about their impact is required in order to be able to validate their usefulness and evaluate their efficacy. This kind of evaluation would be most helpful for enhancing the efficacy of the quality system.

The improvements taken based on the previous audit are reported in the self-evaluation report as follows:

- Reducing the number of and development of the process descriptions
- Development of the support services structure into larger and more centralised units
- Improvement of the survey system as a whole, including the student feedback tools
- Seek for the international accreditations (AACBS and EQUIS) in the field of business education
- Addressing innovativeness, proactiveness and foresight
- Improving teachers’ participation in industry and society at large
- Self-evaluation and peer review practices
- Reducing workload related to the quality system
- Incorporating the funding indicators to the strategic and tactical indicators

The self-evaluation report provides sufficient information on all the above mentioned development activities. According to the self-evaluation report, one of the most extensive, complex and time-consuming areas has been the development of the entire student feedback and survey system. The state of the student feedback tools is handled in detail in chapter 6.1. Taking into consideration that many components of the quality system have still been quite recently renewed, the audit team identified the situation described as a development issue and not as lack of coherence with the strategy.

In general, the interviews with the different staff groups confirmed that the quality system is currently more approachable and more understandable than previously. Thus, it is easier to transfer it into the daily work of every staff member and student. Furthermore, compared to the time of the previous audit process, students are more aware of the improvements adjusted based on the information and on data provided by the quality system. Also the division of responsibility across the entire institution is clearer, due to the organisational changes, re-structured support
services and more approachable quality system documentation in Quality Portal. In addition to the Portal, Haaga-Helia has introduced YAMMER (chat channel in intranet), where staff can find information of all on-going projects and development work.

In the previous audit report it is pointed out that Research and Development Centre’s status with regard to some educational units was unstructured. RDI activities were carried out by different units in different ways. Currently the organization structure has been changed and RDI Services functions as its own unit, providing RDI support services for all the educational units aiming to unify the key practices around RDI.
6.1 Degree education

The quality management of Haaga-Helia’s degree education indicates that it is both a strategy-led and a pedagogy-led institution. The quality management procedures related to degree education are functional and provide good support for planning, implementing, and developing the degree programmes. They evidently advance the development of the degree education. The internal steering process uses mainly quantitative data ensuring that the objectives and targets set for the degree education are achieved. Staff, students and external stakeholders participate in quality work. Quantitative and qualitative feedback from teachers, students, alumni, business community, RDI partners and other stakeholders have a key role in the continuous development of degree education. The quality management of key support services for degree education functions well and reflects continuous improvement.

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

Functioning of the quality management procedures

Strategy, target setting and monitoring

Haaga-Helia offers both bachelor’s and master’s degree programmes. Taken the number of students into consideration, the educational provision focuses on bachelor’s programmes. The objectives and monitoring of Haaga-Helia’s degree education stem from the institution’s strategy, mission, vision and values, and from the objectives and indicators set by the Ministry of Education and Culture. Haaga-Helia’s mission is “To open doors to future careers”, and its vision is to be “The most attractive and professionally-oriented Finnish institution of higher education”. Both strategic statements, and the strategy as a whole, emphasize the needs of the businesses as a starting point of all activities. In general, Haaga-Helia’s approach to degree education is seen to reflect a strategy-led approach.

The strategic aspiration set particularly for education is “Quality education with the human touch”.
The following objectives are linked to the degree education:

- Personalized study paths and pedagogy
- Ensuring timely graduation
- Digital dimension in learning and digital competencies
- Enthusiasm, collaboration and personal commitment
- Partner competencies and credibility
- Sales, service and entrepreneurship in course content
- Nurturing innovation and experimentation

According to the audit material and the interviews, the internal steering process functions well and supports the achievement of the objectives set for the degree education (on internal steering process, see chapter 4). The achievement of objectives is systematically and regularly reviewed in the unit, the team, and function level meetings and in annual performance appraisals. According to the interviews, the use of strategy-linked indicators in monitoring the quality and functioning of degree education is effective. Due to modern technologies, up-to-date monitoring of the programme and of student level results is possible, and the results can also be used for internal comparisons and for external benchmarking. Haaga-Helia also has a clear view on the future development needs in this area, which are discussed in detail in chapter 4. For instance, there is a need for more targeted information on the different degree programmes provided in the same educational field.

As stated in the audit material, Haaga-Helia is both a strategy-led and pedagogy-led institution when looking at the degree education’s quality management. The audit team found plenty of generic and sample-specific evidence for these arguments. The degree programmes reviewed by the audit team reflect most of the strategic focus areas and points of emphasis set by the institution. Furthermore, the atmosphere between students and their teachers is positive. There is plenty of interaction and collaboration between students and their teachers, and the staff interviewed appeared enthusiastic. These observations are strong indicators of Haaga-Helia’s strategy-led approach to the degree education.

According to the audit material and the interviews, the ways to increase competences of an individual student, pedagogical choices, projects, work placement, and interaction with the employers are the most important features when linking students’ learning to real-world workplaces. As an example of the strategic development projects applied in the area of education, Haaga-Helia has established an institution-wide process for the development of degree programmes in 2016. Each educational unit has chosen one degree programme for piloting the current strategic reform of the curricula and the renewed indicators. Remarkable changes to content and structures are implemented in line with a separate project plan.

Division of responsibility

The Management Group’s Education Committee is led by the Vice President of Education, and it consists of directors of the educational units and the RDI Services. The Committee is responsible for reviewing and preparing education development issues. The Vice President of Education is
also responsible for the pedagogical strategy as well as for the bachelor level education as a whole. The horizontal KOVA degree programme management group gathers together all the degree programme directors and principal lecturers in charge of master’s programmes. KOVA is also led by the Vice President of Education.

As regards the directors of the different educational units, they have a double role: on the one hand, as members of the Management Group, they match the unit’s tasks with results from strategic on-top discussions; on the other hand, they are also responsible for the advancement of their units. Aspects concerning the degree programme are considered among the programme directors in the KOVA group, who discuss them with those teachers who teach in this programme. Students are represented in the numerous working bodies concerning the degree education. External stakeholders contribute to the development of the degree programmes in the Advisory Boards.

In addition to that, the Haaga, Porvoo and Vierumäki campuses have their own campus coordinators. They serve as programme directors, internal guides for campus members and for people and/or support services, RDI etc. from other campuses. They also take care of administrative tasks, e.g. real estate topics, and hold contact with regional stakeholders. The potential, which derives from the combination of academic and administrative tasks, should be used for linking the Management Group’s strategic ideas on quality management with the practical ideas from the teachers’ perspective.

*Design, delivery and development of the degree programmes*

According to the audit material, Haaga-Helia’s quality management procedures for designing, delivering, and developing degree education are extensive and cover the whole institution. The process descriptions as well as work instructions cover all the key functions in the area of degree education. Since the previous audit conducted by FINEEC’s predecessor FINHEEC, the institution has reduced the number of process descriptions, turned some of them into work instructions and aims to renew the way of describing all the processes by using QPR enterprise architecture tool.

As a principle, the general outline of the curricula is based on assessment of future trends and competence needs of the field in question. Taken into consideration the self-evaluation report and several interviews carried out with the teaching staff and students, data and feedback from various sources are used in curriculum design across the institution. This includes student and staff feedback as well as their participation to the design processes. Furthermore, the expertise of vocational teacher education staff is exploited. Employers and RDI partners – namely business and industry community – are involved, although there are varying practices in the interaction with them depending on the unit and a degree programme.

According to the self-evaluation report, new learning methods and curricula are currently based more on dialogue between students and teaching staff. Interviewed students had, for example, contributed to curriculum development as members of the steering groups, and by attending to the round tables arranged in their programmes and units. Many interviewed students felt that there is enough space for discussions between teachers and students in general.
The curricula of Haaga-Helia’s degree programmes are competence-based. According to the audit material, the competence-based approach offers new ways for coping with today’s challenges. The competence-based approach implies that the competence aims, i.e. learning outcomes, are a living process, and constantly updated. The audit team considers that this creates new challenges for both students and for the quality management. As also noted in the self-evaluation report, learning outcomes should be presented to students in a clear, concise and understandable way. In line with this, the audit team encourages Haaga-Helia to continue its development work related to describing competence aims, and respectively, to development of student assessment methods. It is also necessary to distinguish more clearly between bachelor level and master level competences in learning projects and competence development.

With regards of pedagogy, Haaga-Helia has chosen that students’ competences are developed holistically in learning projects, which are linked to real-world workplaces. Student assessment methods are developed accordingly. The institution is e.g. currently using assessment matrices, which integrate the learning outcomes and competences. According to the self-evaluation report, peer assessment, self-assessment and team assessment are used as sources of student assessment. In 2016, Haaga-Helia also initiated an extensive project for integrating a new learning model, Study & Work, into the degree education. This concept is described in chapter 6.2.1.

Examples of team-based teaching, pedagogical innovations and experimentation, learning concepts and learning models, and good practices currently in-use are described in chapter 6.2. As a whole, the audit team considers pedagogy as one of the evident strengths of Haaga-Helia. In addition, Haaga-Helia is currently updating its pedagogical vision and strategy, which were in-progress at the time of the audit visit.

Pedagogical training and innovative didactic initiatives are internally offered and used, by exploiting the expertise of School of Vocational Teacher Education. The staff members interviewed often mentioned HH-PEDAALI teacher training programme as a key tool for developing pedagogy and degree education. HH-PEDAALI is one of the actions presented in the strategic roadmap for implementing the current strategy in education. The audit team encountered with many concrete examples of its application across the institution. For full-time teachers, at least 50 hours per academic years is reserved for the development of competencies. As mentioned in chapter 4, Haaga-Helia monitors staff satisfaction via two surveys, with biennial Mood Check and every other year with Staff Climate Survey. The results are used in the internal performance evaluation and steering.

Audit material and visit confirmed that the development of Haaga-Helia’s teaching methods are strategy-based, determined, and systematic. The innovative teaching methods are constantly developed based on the student feedback as well as feedback and ideas from the business community and other external stakeholders. In addition to development of teaching and learning methods, the expertise offered by the vocational teacher education experts is most important for further developing student assessment methods. As a whole, Haaga-Helia’s pedagogical development approach, and the enthusiasm and commitment of teaching staff are exemplary, and offer good examples and points of reference to be also applied by other higher education institutions.
Haaga-Helia offers a wide range of its degree programmes in English. Two of them were reviewed by the audit team as samples of the degree education. Various recent discussions in Finland suggest that insertion into the job market is still a challenge to the foreign degree students. One important reason is a lack of language skills, as Finnish is usually not needed in daily (student) life. Haaga-Helia should take this issue more into consideration and encourage students to make Finland their permanent country of living and working. There are already some study components which aim to help foreign students’ integration. However, the audit team recommends Haaga-Helia to consider a special programme, which might have both curricular and extra-curricular components. This could provide foreign students the necessary skills for the time after their studies.

**Student feedback tools and their functionality**

According to the self-evaluation report, Haaga-Helia has been continuously improving its student feedback mechanisms in order to increase the response rates and to make the feedback questions meet the needs of the institutional strategy and the renewed curricula. Student course feedback is systematically used, but the low response rates of the electronic tools are a challenge recognized by the institution. The complete list of the student feedback tools in use is presented in chapter 4.

The current situation is a result of many steps and changes, and continuous efforts to embed the tools throughout the institution. In 2011, the transfer from paper forms was done by establishing the electronic course feedback tool with Winha Opaali software. The transfer was challenging due to technical reasons, and it resulted in a drop of response rates. A new software, E-form, was introduced in 2014, and the sampling technique was changed so that feedback is to be collected from all courses. The questionnaire was also developed and shortened, and course feedback was included into courses as a learning assignment in order to improve the response rates. The E-form comprises of numeric (scale 1–5) and open questions. One of the questions concerns a learning self-evaluation conducted by a respondent. The current institution level reporting focuses on the numeric answers. The latest version of E-form questionnaire was introduced at the beginning of the fall term in 2016. Apart from the course feedback, the more holistic student survey has been improved, too, e.g. by changing a student atmosphere survey into a student survey in 2012. Also the student survey comprises of numeric and open questions, which are both reported on the institutional level.

The self-evaluation report tells very honestly that during this transition period many teachers started collecting feedback by using their own methods. The response rates of the electronic feedback tools have improved to some extent, but challenges still exist. The targets set for course feedback in 2016 were a 50% response rate in spring term, and 60% for the autumn. With regards to the current student survey, the latest response rate was 14.2%.

Taking the entire context into consideration, the following reasons were mentioned in the audit material and in the interviews to challenge the student feedback system as a whole: creation of the competence-based curricula, team-based teaching and multidisciplinary study components. Thus, Haaga-Helia shows capacity to recognize its wider working context in this matter.
First, the audit team recommends Haaga-Helia to rethink the amount of surveys and course feedback questionnaires per semester. At the moment, every course is evaluated every semester, which, as students reported, sometimes frustrates them. In addition to that, this also creates continuous disturbance for the teacher, who might review his/her course content more often than actually needed. Second, the moment of questionnaire distribution should be reconsidered. The email reminding students on course feedback probably comes too early. And it is even more likely that it is simply forgotten, if students have already filled in a few questionnaires.

In addition to these institutional tools, degree programmes and teachers use their own ways to collect student feedback for monitoring the quality of their courses. The audit material and interviews contain plenty of vivid examples of continuous improvement based on students’ feedback at course level. Teachers interviewed also mentioned using students’ learning diaries and reflection sections from their reports for the development of their work, although they are not considered as official tools. In the light of the interviews, the feedback gathered via tailored course-specific methods is most effective and better in quality for fine-tuning the courses and solving practical challenges during them. Both students and staff gave various examples from daily life, where direct comments had led to concrete improvement. Moreover, this feedback has at least partially had impact on the development of the entire degree programmes, too.

In the self-evaluation report Haaga-Helia sometimes refers this form of feedback as “informal”. However, as explained in chapter 4, the audit team considers it to be an essential part of the Haaga-Helia’s degree education quality management, although not always sufficiently documented. According to the audit material, Haaga-Helia is currently searching for new ways to systematically document dialogues and other tailored feedback within the quality system. The audit team encourages Haaga-Helia to actively follow this approach, with complies with the recent discussion in higher education research on data and information analysis, in order to reach the optimized level of analyzing all the information produced the quality system.

Some students and staff members interviewed perceived that the amount of feedback collected is far too extensive. Students also pointed out as a recommendation that by decreasing the number of surveys and questionnaires, the response rates would be higher, and accordingly, the results more reliable. The audit team recommends that Haaga-Helia should introduce a mixed method combining quantitative and qualitative student feedback, e.g. documented oral feedback or information from reports could be used together with survey results. Group discussions or workshops would also work well. It could be defined beforehand, which approach could provide or add information and how the findings could interact. By using this method, the institution could ensure and extend the impact of the quality development loop to the whole institution.

Quality management of the master’s programmes

Haaga-Helia offers master’s programmes in all of its fields of study. The RDI Services unit coordinates all these programmes. This structure was introduced in 2016 with an aim to strengthen the link between master’s programmes and RDI. In addition, there were aims to make coordination and development of the master’s degree programmes more effective.
Therefore, there is a clear future need to review the rearranged division of responsibility. Haaga-Helia is recommended to consider quality management procedures, which would monitor the functionality of this effort.

The Director of Innovation is in charge of the Development group for master’s degree programmes. Each programme has a designated principal lecturer. Furthermore, teachers from the educational units teach in the programmes and act as thesis supervisors. According to the audit material, the agenda of the Development Group for the master’s programmes comprises e.g. student course feedback results, monitoring of the programmes’ development and agreeing on the common timetables and responsibilities. All the master’s programmes follow institution level processes, which are described in the Quality Portal. This applies to admission, curriculum design, course delivery and thesis writing.

According to the self-evaluation report and interviews, students and their workplaces have a significant role in developing master’s degree education. The theses are prepared in cooperation with the student’s current work places as development assignments. Thus, students bring a great deal of up-to-date working life knowledge and information to Haaga-Helia during their studies. The supervision of the students’ theses is decided by case and staff from the RDI Services unit participates to it.

In 2015, master’s degree programmes were self-evaluated by the School of Vocational Teacher Education and RDI unit. Teachers in charge were included, as well as students and alumni. The rearrangement described above is one of the outcomes of this process. The audit team encourages Haaga-Helia to continue working on master’s degree programmes as a whole and recommends to create a joint vision embedded both in RDI unit and educational units. Moreover, the self-evaluation results have been used in designing the common study contents for all the programmes.

It was pointed out in the interviews with the teaching staff that due to the relatively small number of master’s students in each programme, it is difficult to draw conclusions based on the student feedback gathered. The audit team recommends that feedback from the master level students should be primarily collected in workshops and by dialogues between the students and their teachers, since the amount of students is relatively small. The joint courses could be a most useful starting point. Due to their professional experience, the master level students are usually able and willing to openly discuss and develop their degree programmes.

At the moment, master’s programmes have no fixed teaching staff of their own, and the teachers come from other degree programmes. However, since the reorganization took place quite recently, it is too early to evaluate how well the new structure functions. As presented in the self-evaluation report, programme development tends to fall on principal lecturers in charge of the programmes coordination. This is obviously a challenge and the audit team recommends Haaga-Helia to seek for arrangements to integrate the other teachers to development activities in the future. The self-evaluation report indicates that the Development group for the master’s degree programmes aims to work into this direction.
Participation in quality work

The top management, staff, students, and external stakeholders are actively involved in the degree education's quality work as individuals and as members of various committees, groups, and teams. In addition to the Education Committee, the KOVA degree programme management group, and the unit-level development teams, there are other groups, such as the thesis coordinators and a multiform teaching steering committee, which also contribute to developing degree education.

Students have various options to have an impact on degree education. In addition to the collaborative YTY meetings, in which the issues related to the development of degree programmes are discussed, there are round tables and forums for the exchange of informal feedback. According to the interviews, many students are committed to quality work. Additionally, there was much discussion on the lost opportunities during the audit visit. Unfortunately, students are not using all these opportunities to the full, although all the students interviewed were aware of some development activities based on student feedback. Some students interviewed reported a certain fatigue, since they are asked to give feedback on all courses every term. Teachers shared the same opinion.

The Advisory Boards help in enhancing the degree programmes, in generating development ideas and giving feedback. They contribute in formal meetings or in frequent informal interaction with the top management and also other Haaga-Helians. There is clear evidence that their feedback, ideas, and suggestions have had an impact on, for example, creating the new Degree Programme in Aviation Business, the StartUp School, the Work & Study concept, the content of different courses, and on the internships. The audit team considers that active interaction with the committed stakeholders is beneficial to the institution, the students and the potential employers and the stakeholders themselves.

The audit material indicates, however, that the workload generated by Haaga-Helia's quality management procedures is quite remarkable. By improving the efficiency of the quality management procedures regarding the degree education, this workload could be decreased and the motivation and commitment of the students could be increased.

Quality management of key support services

The support services were rearranged aside of the wider organizational re-structuring. The support services as a whole have been developed based on the institutional PALKE programme in 2012-2016. Haaga-Helia's support services serve both the staff and the students, and they offer services to all functions, units, and activities of the institution. According to the self-evaluation report, the development of support services is increasingly aligned with the strategy. The four units providing services are:

- Financial services
- Human Resources services
- IT services and Corporate Planning and
- Higher Education Services.
The Higher Education Services include the Admission Service, Legal Services, Library and Information Services and International services, Marketing & Communications, Study Affairs Office, and Online Teaching Support. Career, Recruitment and alumni Services work as a part of unit of Commercial Services. As described in chapter 3, the Quality Management Services work under the IT Services and Corporate Planning.

There are several services which directly support the implementation of the degree education. With regards to the planning of the educational provision, Education Support Services coordinate the creation of the education offer on yearly basis and in addition, is e.g. responsible for the timetables for Helsinki campuses and WinhaPro student information management system.

Haaga-Helia has systematic and well-established procedures for the quality management of the support services. First, according to the self-evaluation report, all the support services have joint service promises, which guide their work. The service promises highlight, e.g. flexible electronic customer services and efficiency. In addition, some of the services have their own, more specified service promises, too. Second, the process descriptions and work instructions form a basis for shared and documented practices in the support services. Haaga-Helia has several process descriptions concerning the support services, covering well the key functions.
The main tool for monitoring and development of the support services is the PALKE survey. The PALKE feedback survey of the support service personnel aims to support the holistic development of support services. It was launched in 2012. According to the audit material and the interviews, feedback from students is also received, for example, from the student survey and indirectly via teachers. The student surveys in use include entrance exam participants’ opinion, the functioning of the E-form, as well the functioning of financial aid services.

There is evidence of systematic and continuous improvement of the support services, based on the data and information produced by the quality system. Feedback is collected from various sources, and compared nationally. The contents of the PALKE survey have ever since been adapted to make sure that the data support the monitoring of the strategy-based annual targets set for the support services. At the moment, the continuous development of support services is increasingly aligned with the strategy, and the measures used are to be found in the strategic roadmap. This enhances the functioning of the quality management of support services. However, as noted in the audit material, the PALKE survey is comprehensive, but heavy. The segmentation of the content would be more useful, and functional for development work. According to the self-evaluation report, the use of PALKE survey data and documentation of the development activities could also be improved.

In addition, services provided directly to the staff and students are using new methods to engage the customers into the development work. Observation, mood jars, photography, and feedback trees are good examples of innovative feedback collecting. During the audit visit, the Library and Information services as well as Career and Recruitment services were mentioned as exemplary units making good use of these methods. The audit team commends on these innovative practices and encourages Haaga-Helia to extend their use across the institution.

The audit team perceives that both PALKE programme and survey have enhanced the quality management of Haaga-Helia’s support services. While developing further this holistic and strategy supporting survey, the institution could focus on making better use of the data collected and documenting the development actions taken more carefully. In the potential future attempts to lighten the PALKE survey, it might be useful to introduce some target-specific elements, as stated in the self-evaluation report. These elements could replace parts of the current survey and the new mixed approach might offer new options to further enhance the qualitative objectives and targets of the institutional strategy.
6.2 Samples of degree education

6.2.1 Bachelor’s Programme in Business Information Technology

There are functioning and established quality management procedures for planning, delivering and developing the Programme. The contents reflect the main focus areas, and continuous improvements are made. Programme planning and development is carried out in compliance with the results of extensive empirical, both quantitative and qualitative research with external stakeholders. This enables the programme team to close the PDCA-cycle and advance the Programme. For instance, the analysis of performance indicators has led to the introduction of the Work & Study concept, where the work place is an integrated learning location. Feedback culture and commitment to quality are strong within the Programme and meet the needs of both teachers and students in an excellent way, although students could contribute more to the development of the Programme.

The quality management of the Bachelor’s Programme in Business Information Technology is at an advanced stage.

The Bachelor’s Programme in Business Information Technology is provided by Haaga-Helia’s Digital Business Unit. The Programme comprises of 210 credits and aimed duration of full-time studies is 3.5 years. The degree awarded after completion of the programme is Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA). The programme has got 315 full-time students. The annual intake is 92 students, half for the spring semester, the other half for the autumn semester.

The Programme emerged from a Finnish equivalent in 2003. The most recent curricula of both programmes are aligned and enrich each other on concept level. There are also joint courses and joint projects with other internationally oriented programmes of Haaga-Helia such as the Bachelor’s Degree Programme in International Business (see chapter 6.2.2). Currently, there are two curricula in use: old BITE2013 curriculum, which will cease in spring 2018, and the new DIGIE curriculum, which was launched in 2015. One of the changes applied is an increase of specialisation studies, which offers more choice for students.

The language of instruction is English, which attracts foreign students, who make up about 68% of the student body. Incoming exchange and double degree students are also integrated into the Programme.

The aim of the Programme is to enable students acquire a solid knowledge base for working as ICT professionals, which includes IT-specialist’s as well as managerial tasks. In order to create their own profile in either ‘business and service development’ or ‘software and technology’, students can choose courses from four fields of competence: ICT and business, Digital services, Software development, and ICT infrastructures and security. The Programme also includes a 30-credit work placement.
Quality management related to the planning of educational provision

Both the audit material and the interviews confirm that the Programme’s quality management follows Haaga-Helia’s quality policy as well as common processes and work instructions defined on the institution level for the degree education. Haaga-Helia’s strategy, annual action plan and budget are distributed as unit level goals and thereafter programme level aims. As is the practice across the institutions, these aims are further translated into personal goals for each staff member.

The Programme’s goals reflect the strategy of Haaga-Helia combining nearly all strategic focus areas as well as points of emphasis. The interdisciplinary character of the Programme including language skills and intercultural competence provides students with soft skills, which are not only necessary on the job market, but which also reflect clear educational targets of the institution.

According to the audit material, programme planning is carried out using systematically results from both surveys and interviews with experts from businesses, public institutions and field-specific associations as well as other higher education institutions. One of the methods used in gathering information during the latest renewal process were interviews with the various stakeholders (60 altogether). The Programme representatives also participated in the workshop organised by the ICT Education Committee within the Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC). As pointed out in the interview with the Programme staff, new ideas are also regularly discussed with the Advisory Board. The audit material and interviews confirmed that this mixed-method approach took all necessary aspects into consideration, which are needed for designing a degree programme.

The Programme’s curriculum is competence-based. According to the self-evaluation report, it is also flexible and allows collaboration with the other degree programmes within Haaga-Helia. The programme level aim is to have a curriculum which is easy to adjust constantly and keep up-to-date. As explained in the self-evaluation report, the background of this choice is rapidly changing ICT field. For the same reason, also Open UAS courses are offered for those ICT professionals who want to extend and update their skills. The audit team commends on this contribution to life-long-learning.

According to the audit material, students receive solid knowledge in programming, information systems and digital services, which enables the students not only to work in their specific field, but to see the larger picture and enhance their competences by themselves. In addition to that English language skills and intercultural competence are musts on the work market nowadays and certainly improve graduates’ employment possibilities considerably.

The Programme has procedures in place to ensure its working life relevance. A direct link to working life is the Work & Study concept, which emphasises the role of the workplace as an extra-mural learning location within the degree programme. The institution, the student, and the partner company identify possible competence goals, which are assessed later by Haaga-Helia. The thesis can also be prepared in cooperation with this employer. As this is a new concept, criteria for company selection are still being developed. However, long-term experience due to collaboration with these institutions in the past ensures a certain liability, and the wide industrial network also provides an excellent setting for carrying out attractive projects, which assure that students attain the competence level, which is appropriate for the Programme.
The Work & Study concept also serves as a concrete example for the improvement of the Programme due to quality work. The analysis of student statistics had suggested that many students would start a (well-paid) job in the IT-industry without ever graduating. This led to the development of the Work & Study concept, where Haaga-Helia and the work place are essential parts.

The audit team was impressed by this efficient approach to link higher education with the professional world. The audit team considers that Haaga-Helia should evaluate the Work & Study concept using the various tools available or even create new ones, and, based on the results, make further adjustments. Once the concept is more elaborated, it would certainly be very interesting for other units and/or programmes, and could even be used as a unique selling point in the competition with other higher education institutions of the region. This would also further enhance the recruitment of foreign students, who, in their home countries, usually do not have access to such forms of learning as an integral part of the curriculum.

The Programme is an excellent example of how the unit handles quality issues in practice. The unit has applied key performance indicators, which comply with Haaga-Helia's strategy and with the quality aims of the unit. Regularly, the unit reviews statistics, which provide information on student results in their Programme. Round tables ensure regular communication with students. The unit also exploits students feedback, which is gathered using both electronic institutional tools as well as by teachers' own course-specific methods. Also staff survey results are used. Members also monitor externally funded RDI projects, and benchmarking with other institutions offering IT education or even foreign partner universities is carried out thoroughly before launching a new degree programme or introducing major changes. The Advisory Board is asked for comments, too.

Considering the large percentage of foreign degree seeking students in the Programme it could be useful to introduce more curricular or extra-curricular courses, which contribute to their insertion into the Finnish job market. The work placement would also be an excellent possibility, especially the Work & Study concept. This was already discussed more thoroughly in chapter 6.1.

**Quality management related to the implementation of educational provision**

The Programme makes use of a range of teaching methods, including traditional approaches such as lectures, but also concepts such as problem-based learning (PBL). According to the self-evaluation report, students can also validate previously acquired knowledge (RPL). According to the interview with the Programme students, processes concerning RPL are transparent and working well. Assessment complies with teaching and also contains learning diaries and portfolios. Teachers consider these methods as an important source for the enhancement of degree education, but also acknowledged their further potential for quality management and collection of student feedback.

The HH-PEDAALI pedagogical training programme has had a significant impact on improving the education and teaching in the Programme. Teachers mentioned the activities there as very helpful for their work and for their professional development. In addition to that, networking with companies and international partners creates new awareness of future pedagogical needs and encourages the unit to offer successful concepts, such as Work & Study, to be applied in other parts of Haaga-Helia.
According to the self-evaluation report, the study guidance is arranged appropriately. The personal study advisor is named for each student at the beginning of the studies. Personal study plans (PSP) are used and students draft them in cooperation with their personal advisor.

Usually, the already mentioned results from various feedback tools are used for pedagogical development. The same settings and methods are applied, which are used for the development of the curriculum, such as round tables as well as the discussion of statistics and survey results. The teaching staff interviews confirmed that especially feedback from students’ course reports as well as from discussions and dialogues between teachers and students contributes considerably to the development of teaching and learning. However, students told that they sometimes “felt forced” to fill in the electronic student surveys and questionnaires although they saw their significance for Haaga-Helia.

Interviewed students were very satisfied with their situation and with the way their feedback was taken into consideration. For example, the obligatory work placement can be split in two or can be recognized as prior learning experience. According to the interviews, teaching and assessment methods have become more flexible, and there are new guidelines for preparing the thesis, enabling students to link their final paper with a concrete project at work.

Taking all the material and interviews into account, the audit team considers the Programme be well-structured with committed teachers and students from various cultural backgrounds. Individual study profiles respond to special needs and to previous competence acquisition of students. Students reported that Haaga-Helia had fulfilled their expectations thoroughly.

**Participation in quality work**

Staff are represented in various development teams, such as the thesis coordinator working group or the unit development group, and participate actively in HH-PEDAALI trainings. They also take part in both Climate Survey and Mood Check carried out on the Haaga-Helia level. In addition to that, human resource management tools such as the annual appraisal are directly linked to the strategy. Results from course feedback can be discussed there, and individual professional goals, which are derived from Haaga-Helia’s overall strategic goals, are documented.

As it was already mentioned, students have various possibilities to contribute to quality work on programme level. Discussion results from the Unit Development Team are communicated to the Student Union Helga. There are also regular cooperative team meetings within the degree programme, such as the programme team meetings or the round tables with the students. Some interviewed teachers regret that, on the one hand, students do not participate as much as they should. But on the other hand, those students, who do participate, take this opportunity seriously and improve the Programme with their ideas. Participation in student surveys and electronic course feedback is a critical issue in this Programme as well, as it is across the whole institution (see chapters 4 and 6.1.).
External stakeholders are represented in the Advisory Board and as employers of students who are in the Work & Study track, but also in partners in projects with Haaga-Helia. Staff members of the Programme are also actively engaged in discussions with partner institutions abroad which send exchange and/or double degree students regularly.

6.2.2 Bachelor’s Programme in International Business

The Programme has systematic and well-established procedures for planning, delivering and developing the curriculum. The Programme has set an ambitious target for its curriculum: the course content is aimed to be formulated so that it can be easily modified according to the changing working life requirements. The recent renewal of the curriculum was conducted in a professional manner and was supported by the information produced by the quality system. The Programme has recently stressed the transparency of the curriculum development and review towards staff and students. The Programme applies a wide variety of pedagogical approaches and learning environments in its implementation. The number of teachers involved in the many programmes is a recognised challenge for the team spirit and the Programme has started to approach this issue. Both staff and students contribute to the quality work. The business community is involved at all stages of the Programme operations, including course design and delivery as well as feedback and development procedures. The quality work clearly has an enhancement effect on the Programme.

The quality management of the Bachelor’s Programme in International Business is at an advanced stage.

The Bachelor’s Programme in International Business is part of the Business Programmes unit. There are two programmes with a similar structure and curriculum, full-time with 550 degree students and part-time with 150 degree students. The Programme comprises 210 credits and aimed duration full-time of studies is 3.5 years. The language of instruction is English. The degree awarded after the completion of the Programme is Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA).

The Programme also offers Open UAS courses and study semesters for incoming exchange and double degree students. The core staff consists of 28 senior lecturers (IB teachers) and a Degree Programme Director. Additionally, 20 other senior and principal lecturers teach in the Programme. About 50% of the students and 16% of the staff are international. The Programme is located on the Pasila Campus in Helsinki.

The Programme is using two curricula models, GLOBBA 09, which will run on until 2019 and GLOBBA16, which was introduced in autumn 2016. The self-evaluation report points out that the development work for GLOBBA16 made good use of evidence generated from the quality management procedures in place previously.
Quality management related to the planning of educational provision

Both the audit material and the interviews confirm that the Programme’s quality management follows Haaga-Helia’s quality policy as well as common processes and work instructions defined on the institution level for the degree education. Haaga-Helia’s strategy, annual action plan and budget are defined as unit level goals and thereafter programme level aims. The Programme result card is dealt with by the Programme staff. The Programme Director discusses performance appraisals with everyone to define personal goals in order to meet the institutional focus areas.

The learning outcomes set for the Programme are competence-based. The curriculum consists of meta-competencies and sub-competencies. According to the self-evaluation report, special attention has been paid to presenting the learning outcomes in a clear and concise manner. This was confirmed in the interview as there was also a concern that the learning outcomes should be accessible and easy to understand. The Programme has also set an ambitious target for its curriculum: people in charge aim to formulate the course content so that it can be easily modified according to the constant change of the business world. Audit team considers that the Programme’s learning outcomes are clearly stated in the course descriptions.

The staff review and revise the Programme curriculum annually and assure that it complies with the learning outcomes. This process is evidence-based, using information gathered from staff and student feedback and from discussions with external stakeholders. In the interview staff emphasized that they wanted to make the development process of the new curriculum more transparent to all students and staff.

The interviewed staff pointed out that the data and information provided from the quality system was beneficial to their development work for GLOBBA 16 curriculum. It clearly helped them to develop the curriculum, to prioritize and pinpoint the main areas. The staff was adopting a more systematic approach to the curriculum development, which in turn allowed them to reflect on the process more effectively. The annual review and revision of the curriculum has led to some major changes. The example was provided of splitting the 9–12 ECTS courses into smaller units in 2014. This was followed in 2015 with a realignment of the thesis process to conform more closely to the process of the Finnish language business programmes. The audit team recommends that an attempt should be made to identify data showing the strengths of the new GLOBBA programme as compared to the earlier formulation.

The approach to teaching and learning has also been subject to modification, again based on the data provided by the quality system. As a result, students now receive peer group and peer coaching as well as one-to-one support.

According to the self-evaluation report, students were involved in the curriculum work and supported the development of new procedures, acting as designers as well as ‘guinea pigs’ to test what worked best. According to the staff, their aim had been to embed the quality system in the programme, not least because students are demanding a quality product, and this was the way to show that their opinions were valued and being taken on board. The audit team commends on this inclusive and customer-oriented approach to the programme design.
The interview confirmed that employees are only too aware that many components of the quality system are new or recently renewed. This is true especially regarding the current student feedback concept. It was also stated by the Programme staff that the focus on quality is present at every business stakeholder and unit meeting. According to the interviews, the Programme staff also recognises different measurement tools and procedures used in Haaga-Helia and consider that the choice is down to a professional decision. It is recommended that Haaga-Helia undertakes a review concerning the potential for more effective use of online data gathering procedures, including both qualitative and quantitative evidence. According to the interviewed staff, they had the autonomy to some extent as to how they change and improve the quality management on the programme level.

Quality management related to the implementation of educational provision

According to the self-evaluation report, the Programme has developed course implementation plans using a common template and of the modes of delivery, pedagogical methods, and learning for each course. These plans are made available to students at the beginning of each course on the web platform Moodle, and staff are encouraged to use the documents to check on their own compliance with the requirements student guidance to be concise, transparent and user friendly.

Concrete examples were provided during the visit of the way in which a process of continuous improvement operates in the course implementation and programme delivery. The first courses of the renewed curricula were designed using feedback, including student responses from the learning diary. Staff viewed the experience as professional development, as a learning experience for them and to guide future development.

There are procedures in place to ensure the Programme’s working life relevance. First, the Advisory Board functions as a channel between the company stakeholders and Haaga-Helia’s business degree programmes. Second, both teaching staff and students are encouraged to initiate new stakeholder relations for the programme. Third, it was also noted that a number of the student projects are company based, with business stakeholders involved throughout the process. In addition, all the course implementation plans include an explanation of connections to working life during the course. These may include commissioned projects, business case studies, presentations from the company representatives and visits to companies. One of the latest student initiatives brought up in the spring 2016 roundtable has been the enhancement of the employability. According to the self-evaluation report, this issue is currently handled in the deeper cooperation with the Haaga-Helia’s Career Point recruitment services. However, the self-evaluation report also mentions that there is need for the programme level statistics in this matter (see also chapter 4 and 6.1. on the need for the more targeted AVOP survey data).

As a summary, the business community is involved at all stages of the Programme operations, from course design through to implementation and delivery. One concrete example given was the municipal consortium Helsinki Region Environmental Services Authority HSY, which wanted to cooperate with the Programme to create marketing videos. As a part of the process, surveys were undertaken to establish the project requirements and the finished videos reflected
the views given. Moreover, according to the self-evaluation the Programme has set a target to further systematise stakeholder cooperation and stakeholder involvement in the evaluation and planning of the programme.

According to the interviews, the Programme staff has also worked extensively with the RDI to support their ongoing development. They have also accessed the specialist knowledge of the RDI personnel, for example to make an application for Erasmus+ project VITAE Vietnam International Trade and Education Programme. The RDI Coffee meetings were seen as a very effective way of operating, not least with staff who take a flexible approach to development planning.

The StartUp School provides a good example of the collaborative planning to improve the quality of the student experience, not just within their unit but across the institution and with staff, students and external stakeholders. Students are encouraged to reflect and the learning diaries were very supportive of this process. Teachers presented themselves as very approachable and tried to ensure that students felt able to voice their opinions and their experiences.

The student-centred approach the Programme has adapted clearly advances the study process. Interviewed students felt able to influence the quality management process and they were encouraged to become active participants. This is at least partly down to a changing role for staff, who perceived that they have made a shift to a more democratic way of working in which everyone has a right to express their opinion, with a focus on generating constructive feedback. This change in pedagogy is focussed around Problem Based Learning (PBL) which according to the interviews with both staff and students gives more flexibility. PBL starts from the assumption that students should be challenged to take on greater personal responsibility for their own learning when presented with unique challenges which have a range of possible solutions. Some staff members work as StartUp School coaches and there is an entrepreneurship module available for the programme students.

According to the self-evaluation, the Programme uses varying learning environments, e.g. campuses, virtual learning platforms, international exchange, work placement, projects with companies and on-the-job learning. During the recent curriculum renewal, also the previous numerous student assessment matrixes were replaced by one shared matrix. The new assessment matrix is linked to the each course description and the course’s Moodle workspace. Thus, the Programme has evidently invested on the enhancement of the learning infrastructure and a clear assessment practise.

Employees are expected to commit to professional development activities and there are a range of diverse activities, including conferences and seminars which are well attended. The Programme supports the staff’s attendance to the doctoral training in a partner university, although take up for this has been slow so far (2 from 28 staff). Staff also participate in the HH-PEDAALI training programme for the teachers. In addition staff are encouraged to engage with local industry and business community, both to support their student’s links with employers and on RDI activities.
In the Programme’s core team there are 28 teachers, most of whom teach in other programmes too. There are also 20 other teachers who teach in the Programme. This raises challenges for team spirit, as the community is not very close. So apart from the Business programmes unit level activities, the Programme has at least two annual events that encourage co-operation, support team spirit and at the same time enhance teacher wellbeing. According to the feedback given by the staff, more emphasis should be laid on these social encounters. Another point to mention is that the staff premises on the Pasila Campus – with its open office space – has facilitated even more interaction between the programme team and other Business programmes unit teachers.

The Programme staff has also been active in providing feedback to the top management on the functioning of the quality system on the programme level. They have identified challenges regarding the institutional data gathering mechanisms as well as student engagement in quality management. The interviewed staff emphasized the avoidance of bureaucratisation in data gathering. As explained in chapters 4 and 6.1, especially students would benefit of streamlined feedback tools instead of heavy and time-consuming practises.

There is a very clear statement of strengths and weaknesses in the self-evaluation report, with a need for better cooperation with both internal and external stakeholders and overall an improvement in communication. Thus, the Programme also shows capacity to carry out critical self-evaluation. On the basis of the internal and external feedback and the quality work of the staff, several steps have been taken to improve the Programme further. The pedagogical approach is being modernised and modified to best suit the implementing and assessing of the new courses in order to produce the intended learning outcomes.

The social and regional impact is seen to be strong. Alumni are working in local companies and some companies have been started by the students. Data is collected and there are clearly some stories behind the figures but it was acknowledged that the Programme does not always celebrate its success as much as it could.

**Participation in quality work**

Interviewed staff felt that they had impact on decisions about the shape and operation of the quality system. They also felt they could, and did, access a broad range of support to develop and improve the quality management. Staff and students were supportive of the open nature of the programme review procedure, with many opportunities to reflect on the overall effectiveness of the quality management. Companies have been brought on board to work with the projects, to enhance the quality and to mirror real life experiences as external stakeholders.

The quality management in the field of company relations reflects the fact that many of the business and industry links rely on personal contacts. This focus on a targeted approach is supported by a data gathering and monitoring procedures which allows staff to gain a broader overview of industry needs and interest. As was mentioned in the interviews, some of the industry representatives appreciate the rigour of the quality system as it mirrors the systems to be found in their own companies.
6.2.3 Master’s Programme in Hospitality Management

The Programme has functioning procedures for planning, delivering and developing its curriculum. The data and information produced by the quality system are systematically used for the programme level enhancement. The curriculum is regularly improved using the previous year’s feedback, and the impact of the business community is high. The programme level challenge is to find a suitable procedure for gathering sufficient amount of feedback from the small-size student body. The Programme uses several procedures for ensuring its working life relevance, such as theses as employer assignments, courses with a RDI interface and business community’s contribution as lecturers and study visit destinations. The Programme applies a wide variety of pedagogical approaches in its course implementation. Both teachers and students participate in the quality work, although the master’s students’ participation in governance and development should be improved across the institution. The Programme has a lot of well-functioning cooperation and interaction with external stakeholders. However, there is a need to systematise the documentation of the stakeholder feedback and create a procedure where students could receive feedback from the stakeholder partners on their success in the joint projects. The quality work has an enhancement effect on the Programme.

The quality management of Master’s Programme in Hospitality Management is at a developing stage.

The Master’s Programme in Hospitality Management has been a part of Haaga-Helia’s degree education since 2007. At organisational level, the Programme belongs to the RDI Services unit, while on the operational level the Programme functions within the Experience and Wellness Economy Unit and on the Haaga Campus.

The Programme has continually grown. The current intake is 43. Admission criteria for the Programme are a bachelor’s degree and three subsequent years of work experience in the relevant field. This complies with the framework given for the admission procedure in the Finnish legislation. The Programme comprises 90 credits and the average study time is approximately 2.5 years. Studies are conducted part-time, as most of the students work full-time during their studies. The degree awarded after the completion of the Programme is Master’s in Hospitality Management.

In 2011 the Master programmes coordination group decided to design a joint structure for all master’s programmes of Haaga-Helia, and thus to look for more synergy between them. This led to a structure, where compulsory studies form 30 credits, elective studies 25 credits and optional studies 5 credits. A new programme curriculum started in 2012 and it was further developed in 2014, with an aim to further enhance the synergy between the programmes. As a result, the compulsory courses became common to all Haaga-Helia’s master’s programmes.

Quality management related to the planning of educational provision

Both the audit material and the interviews confirm that the Programme’s quality management follows Haaga-Helia’s quality policy as well as common processes and work instructions defined on the institution level for the degree education.
The teachers, the programme head, and the student secretary meet on a regular basis to discuss the development of the programme, the development of courses, student progress, and to share ideas and concerns. The teachers are responsible for developing courses based on feedback received from the students. According to the interview with the teaching staff, teachers follow the current trends in their own field of expertise, keep themselves updated on the changes in the hospitality field and bring their insights to the courses. For the Programme, the KOV A degree programme management group, the Development group for the master’s degree programmes and the Programme’s own development team are the key platforms for the development.

The course descriptions are in use, including learning outcomes and assessment methods. Learning outcomes are competence-based. They consist of general learning outcomes and field-specific learning outcomes. According to the interview with the teaching staff, the learning outcomes are communicated to the students at the application stage, during the orientation part of the studies as well as through the course-specific learning outcomes. The learning outcomes engaged to the theses are presented to the students as well. The audit team commends on this integrated way of communicating learning outcomes.

Students participate in programme design and development by providing feedback on courses through the electronic E-form feedback questionnaire. In addition, as common in Haaga-Helia, feedback is also gathered by the individual teachers by using their own tailored methods. According to the self-evaluation report and interviews, there is an open feedback culture, in which it is easy to give feedback, especially, face-to-face. This direct feedback is seemingly beneficial in development work and fine-tuning, but it could be better documented. Moreover, also the business and industry partners provide feedback on the courses and their delivery to teachers with whom they are working.

According to the audit material and interviews, the curriculum is regularly improved using the previous year’s feedback, and the impact of the business community is high. As all students are a part of working life, they are rather seen as part of the industry than as “average students”. The master’s programmes as a whole are systematically developed in the work of Master’s programmes development group on the Haaga-Helia level. This has resulted e.g. into the recent system of common compulsory studies for all the master’s programmes. Furthermore, the audit team encourages the Programme to document the business stakeholder feedback better in order to make it an integral part of the quality management on programme level. In addition, the audit team advises the programme to ensure that the selection of labour market partners is clearly wider than those of students’ employers.

According to the self-evaluation report, the Programme’s RDI is strongly linked to the projects conducted on Haaga Campus. The RDI projects can be integrated into the courses and they also offer thesis ideas to the students. The programme also emphasises its RDIs direct link to Haaga-Helia’s strategy and focus areas: service and sales, internationalisation, and entrepreneurship.

As the Programme is carried out in Finnish, foreign applicants are not a current target group. However, the Programme offers its students a possibility for an exchange period abroad. As the exchange is often far more challenging for the mature students, the audit team encourages the Programme to
actively seek solutions to make this a real possibility. With regards to the quality management, the Programme and RDI Services unit are recommended to consider a quality management procedure for monitoring the effectiveness of this effort. A good approach might be short-term mobility for summer schools or excursions. Due to the growing importance of international tourism in Finland, employers will certainly appreciate competences acquired in an international environment. The joint courses provided for all the master’s students already exist in English.

**Quality management related to the implementation of educational provision**

The implementation of master’s level studies in Haaga-Helia is an outcome of collaboration between many parties. For the individual programme, the main actors involved are the RDI Services unit and its master’s programmes team, the the Development group for the master’s degree programmes consisting of all programme heads, the Study Affairs Services, the teachers and thesis supervisors of the Programme, the Library Services and the International Services.

Different pedagogical approaches are used in delivering the courses of the Programme. According to the self-evaluation report, the pedagogical choices include innovation pedagogy, inquiry-based learning, case studies and project-based learning. The contact lectures usually take place during from three to five intensive days per month. Pedagogical assets are evaluated by using both student and stakeholder feedback. Students mentioned in the interviews, that they receive guidance and support throughout their studies. A human approach and “everyone is an advisor” mentality – which means that all staff members have adopted a guidance-based approach in their work – are clear assets of this Programme. The audit team commends this concrete and student-centred approach in the Programme’s local quality culture.

The virtual or partially virtual study courses are available, to make the attendance to the studies as flexible as possible. The self-evaluation report points out that there is need to develop more virtual courses and course implementations, to better serve the needs of the student body. The other development areas identified in the self-evaluation report are as follows: cohesion of the joint practises in master’s programmes, the consistency of curriculum delivery and the course offerings. Therefore, this shows that the Programme is able to identify its development areas and conduct critical self-evaluation.

With regards to the common master’s courses, the students interviewed appreciated working together with the students from other programmes. On the other hand, they were eager to reduce the amount of common courses provided jointly. This is understandable in the light of the fact that the amount of credits in the master’s degree programmes is limited as is the study time. The audit team encourages Haaga-Helia to further improve the ways in which students’ work in the mixed teams. This could be made more attractive. The need to further improve the common master’s courses is also noted in the self-evaluation report as an area for development.

There are procedures in place to ensure the Programme’s working life relevance. First, the studies are strongly connected to the world of work in general. As explained, many of the courses include a concrete working life and RDI interface and final theses are usually conducted as stakeholder
assignments. As an example, all the theses in 2013 and in 2014 were commissioned by the hospitality industry companies. Second, all the students study part-time and bring up-to-date experience and knowledge from their workplaces to Haaga-Helia. Third, business community representatives are involved in the course delivery as guest lecturers and hosts of the business life visits. Stakeholders are also fostering the learning environments. As an example, some companies have donated newest professional equipment, like buffet tables, kitchen knives and a coffeehouse simulator, to Haaga Campus.

The students of the Programme are encouraged to find fresh ideas and new perspectives, and also network outside the hospitality industry. This is done through SILAB (Service Innovation Laboratory) concept. Students must visit conferences, meetings, events, etc. at least eight times during their studies and report about their experiences on the SILAB webpage. The Programme is also a living example of lifelong learning, because the students have approximately ten years of work-life before entering the degree studies.

As regards students’ wellbeing, most of the students work full-time while studying. The Programme has been designed to provide part-time studies, which enable full-time work. The results from the annual student survey indicate that stress is the biggest weakness of the studies. According to the audit material, the personalised study plan (PSP) allows the student to decide the progression of his/her studies independently helping them to cope with work, studies and personal life. The PSP can also be re-adjusted according to the changing needs of the student.

The Programme has functioning practices for the staff development. Staff performance appraisals are in use following the Haaga-Helia’s common practice. Teachers´ annual workload includes 100 hours allocated to joint competence development activities and 50 hours for personal development. At the campus level, staff has joint development events organised around the themes identified in the campus action plan. Teachers participate in HH-PEDAALI pedagogical training. Haaga-Helia regularly offers teachers opportunities to apply for working periods. Since the importance of virtual courses will increase in the future, one of the identified areas to develop is enhancement of the digital competences.

As with all the programmes, quality system provides regular reports and key figures on the implementation of the Programme. The key performance indicators and tools of the Programme are the number of applicants, the number of graduating students, the course feedback, student survey and the graduand feedback (AVOP). Feedback from teachers is discussed regularly in programme development team consisting of the teachers and thesis supervisors of the Programme, as well as the student secretary. The Master´s programme´s development team meetings – consisting of the programme heads – function as a forum for joint development. The student feedback is discussed there at regular intervals.

The Haaga-Helia´s student survey provides information about many aspects of the studies, and also information, which helps to improve the individual programme as a whole. As the Programme is quite small, the low number of respondents is seen somewhat problematic. More respondents are needed in order to verify the results. Thus, Haaga-Helia and the Programme are advised to find ways that would advance the use of the student survey results in the small degree programmes,
too. The increase of the coverage should be a priority. As explained in chapter 6.1, one possible solution for the small programmes could be development of the alternative feedback methods, such as workshops.

**Participation in quality work**

According to the audit material and interviews, teaching staff has possibilities to participate to the quality work. In line with Haaga-Helia’s quality policy, much is done as a part of everyday teaching and guidance activities. In addition, staff participates in quality work by attending the meetings of the Programme’s own development team. Moreover, the programme management participates in Haaga-Helia level coordination and development within the KOVA degree programme management group and the Development group for the master’s degree programmes.

Students participate primarily by giving feedback on courses and studies in general. As the master’s degree students are currently not very well represented in the governing bodies and development groups, the audit team recommends the Programme and Haaga-Helia to examine their possibilities to influence on Haaga-Helia’s activities and further improve them. The part-time studies obviously create a challenge for participation, as the full-time working, mature students have a very limited amount of time to spend on studies.

The Programme has a lot of cooperation and interaction with external stakeholders, but there is still room for the improvement of their participation in the quality management on the programme level. With regards to the governance, the Advisory Boards are an established structure covering all the educational units and RDI. As explained, a great deal of business community’s feedback for the Programme is direct and often undocumented. Interviewed students pointed out that they are also missing feedback on their own progress from the business and industry stakeholders. The audit team recommends that the Programme should address this issue as a priority and develop a systematic and documented feedback procedure for this area, taking into consideration needs of students and external stakeholders.

As a summary, the interviewed staff considers that quality management provides common platforms to the degree programme development as well as a framework for the course design and delivery. It also evidently provides many feedback channels on the programme level to support the planning and development. Moreover, quality management is seen to create the structure, streamline processes and give common ground for everyone to develop processes.
6.3 Research, development and innovation activities

Haaga-Helia has set high strategic aspirations for research, development and innovation activities. The strategic vision on the RDI is clear on the top management level, but requires further actions on the level of units, campuses and programmes. The current amount of RDI funding is relatively low, which has an effect on the quality management too, making it to some extent fragmented and narrow. The institutional matrix services around the RDI were recently rearranged into the RDI Services unit, including the StartUp School and coordination of the master’s programmes. The institution emphasises the systematisation of the project portfolio management by introducing the RDI Arena platform in near future. The quality management partially has enhancement effects on the RDI operations and achievement of the institutions strategic goals. Staff of the RDI Services unit participates in the quality work, and there is a growing amount of practises to include the teaching staff, too. Students participate to the quality work by providing feedback in the RDI-related study projects. External stakeholders are well involved in the quality work, in the Advisory Boards and as project partners.

The quality management of research, development and innovation activities is at an emerging stage.

Strategic aspirations and organisation of RDI

Research, development and innovation activities (RDI) are performed within all educational units of Haaga-Helia. The strategic aspiration set for Haaga-Helia’s RDI is “Sales, services and entrepreneurship at the core”. In addition, the value foundation set in the strategy extends to the all core activities of the institution, as it is “We serve together the business community, working together responsibly and sustainably”.

The RDI Services unit is a matrix unit supporting all RDI activities and units. The RDI Services unit hosts the strategic development of Haaga-Helia’s RDI activities, the coordination of Haaga-Helia’s RDI project portfolio, project support, the StartUp School and master’s degree programmes. The RDI Services unit is organised into three teams

1. the StartUp School
2. Master’s degree programmes and

The StartUp School is discussed in detail in chapter 7. Master’s programmes and their coordination are handled in chapters 6.1 and 6.2.3. The current structure was introduced in 2016. Therefore, it is not possible to evaluate, yet, its full functionality. As Haaga-Helia aims to achieve added value to all of the operations included within this internal structure, the audit team recommends monitoring carefully its functionality as a part of the quality management. As the aim is to make master’s programmes and StartUp School essential actors in RDI, there is need for the shared and holistic strategic vision for the three teams included in the RDI Services unit. According to the audit team’s observation, the StartUp School currently supports the RDI in an effective manner, which is a promising example of shared goals and activities in the respective field.
The purpose of the RDI Development and Support Services team is clear as it provides support services for the educational units. The RDI Services unit allows its teams to work independently in developing their own work. This helps the teams target their development areas and also gather qualitative feedback in the way that suits them. However, this structure shows that there are no defined development goals yet for RDI as a whole on the institutional level apart from the tactical indicators set.

Current state of RDI activities

The self-evaluation report indicates that the amount of RDI funding is currently low compared to the size of the institution. As the aim is to increase funding and therefore number of RDI projects and actors involved, a systemization of the quality management tools around RDI and its societal impact is needed. The most common way to carry out RDI are joint projects with the stakeholders, which is typical for the Finnish universities of applied sciences sector. The stakeholders are important co-financiers of the RDI. Most of the projects are to some extent tailored in cooperation with the parties involved. For instance, the funding instruments may have their own requirements concerning the documentation, communication and financial reporting.

According to the self-evaluation report and interviews, there is a clear need to strengthen the role of RDI and its quality management as a core function of Haaga-Helia. As the strategic aspirations are high already, it should lead to the more extensive operations, too. The audit team recommends Haaga-Helia to approach the following three aspects as a priority.

First, RDI should have a much stronger position in the implementation of the strategy. Currently, the RDI Services unit follows the development of the RDI activity and project portfolio of the whole institution. According to the audit material and the interviews, the status of project portfolio is presented and discussed at least twice a year in Haaga-Helia’s Management Group and once a year in the Board meetings. Recent news is shared with the Board in every meeting and any deviations are brought to the Management Group without delay. According to the interviews with the staff related to RDI, the RDI Services unit is moving towards a systematic RDI portfolio data management by establishing the electronic RDI Arena platform. This also aims to enable financial monitoring of projects. The audit team recommends that the RDI should be even more clearly and deeply involved in the internal steering practices, such as yearly performance evaluation and target setting led by the Management Group.

Second, the top management is advised to stress the communication within the RDI Services unit and especially definitions of research and innovation in Haaga-Helia’s context. The audit team considers that, below the top management level, there is currently not enough shared and embedded understanding on what research and innovation are supposed to be like.

Third, the increased RDI activity obviously requires the enhancement of staff competences, which should be considered when planning human resources development. With regards to research components in the RDI projects, staff’s doctoral training opportunities play an important role. According to the interviews, there are existing unit and programme level arrangements to advance the qualification of teachers. Haaga-Helia is recommended to find ways to further
encourage staff’s attendance to the doctoral training across the institution. Moreover, there should be a clear space for integrating the staff members’ own research activities into the institutional ones.

**Monitoring and evaluation of the RDI**

As explained, the use of tactical indicators and quantitative feedback helped to push forward the rearrangement of the RDI structures on the institutional level. For review and follow-up of the RDI activities, tactical level indicators are used such as external funding received, number of publications, number of partner agreements and number of working years spent on RDI.

The work done by the RDI Development and Support team gives considerable professional support for the acquisition, documentation and controlling of RDI projects. The team members are also continuously developing their work by having unit-based meetings, office discussions and also using Haaga-Helia’s electronic platforms. According to the audit material, the results of PALKE service survey has been used when planning the new structure for the RDI support and coordination functions at Haaga-Helia level.

There are two kinds of working bodies engaged in RDI and its review at Haaga-Helia. First, the RDI Advisory Board consists of six invited experts: four represent companies of different sizes, one a selected national research organisation and one a selected university. The audit team advises Haaga-Helia to ensure in future, that the composition of the RDI Advisory Board clearly balances the needs of both research and innovation. The Advisory Board meets 3 to 4 times per year. The RDI Services unit staff can contribute new development ideas to the Advisory Board meetings and discuss them. As stated in the interviews, the unit staff also has a possibility to receive feedback about the development of their work in the meetings of RDI Advisory Board. The audit team encourages Haaga-Helia to ensure that also the staff of the educational units have equal and systematic opportunities to contribute to the RDI Advisory Board’s work. The field-specific Advisory Boards discuss the RDI issues in their meetings as well.

Haaga-Helia has some functioning practises to advance communication on RDI between the different units. RDI Coffee Sessions are a meeting point for involvement of Haaga-Helia’s staff and is regularly organized by the RDI Services unit. In the educational units, the RDI Service coaches help to lower personal/individual barriers of seeking advice. There are two coaches nominated for each educational unit. Their job description and individual development plans have been updated in 2016. As a matter of principle, the active engagement of the educational units is an essential precondition for the successful RDI operations. Therefore, Haaga-Helia is recommended to continue the creation and improvement of the practises that aim to strengthen proficient cooperation in the RDI across the whole institutions, including the active and sufficient use the RDI support services as a whole.

Internationalisation has been identified as a core priority for the educational units and the support services at Haaga-Helia. The RDI Services unit should now give serious consideration to both the rigour and the adequacy with which the institution’s quality system monitors and reports on the progress of these developments in RDI.
Quality management of the RDI projects

There are a couple of institution level processes set for the RDI. As a work instruction, Haaga-Helia has a Project Manual, which include common guidelines for the project implementation. The Manual consists of the following areas: the roles and responsibilities, instructions for starting the project, agreement management, project costs and financing, project documentation, dissemination of the results as well as instructions for closing the project. The ethical principles are also included. The Project Manual is updated by the RDI coaches. Thus, Haaga-Helia has well-documented procedures for planning and monitoring RDI projects. According to the audit material, each project manager is primarily responsible for the project documentation for the different purposes (such as financial reporting and stakeholder communication). As an example of the project management’s fine-tuning, the self-evaluation report mentions a plan to integrate human resources reporting to the RDI Arena software. The new architecture is planned so that Peppi education management system and the RDI Arena together will replace Otso resource planning tool, which is not seen fit for purpose anymore.

Criteria for choosing the stakeholders and project partners are primarily set by case, based on Haaga-Helia’s priorities in societal interaction and regional development.

Currently the quality work carried out during the RDI projects focuses on collecting feedback through the mechanisms built into the projects. The feedback results are communicated between the parties involved in the project. With the introduction of the RDI Arena, there is space for a systematic generalized collection of feedback. The audit team commends on this attempt and encourages Haaga-Helia to complete it, by including the appropriate customer feedback into the process. The chosen feedback procedure should not be too laborious, as the audit team’s aim is not to increase the number of extensive surveys included in the quality system. However, this feedback would provide the necessary information for the internal steering purposes, if it was mixed with the indicator data and analysed sufficiently.

The audit team also discussed business and industry feedback on projects with the students. Interviewed students missed both praise and criticism from cooperation companies concerning their projects. The fact that a company continues collaboration with Haaga-Helia students is not enough for them. The audit team encourages Haaga-Helia to develop a simple, but effective tool for documenting qualitative feedback from companies. Students should definitely be informed on how they performed according to the customers and partners.

There are functioning procedures for disseminating the project results. The most common way is to use Haaga-Helia’s public web site, but larger projects have typically their own web sites too. Furthermore, the events like Haaga-Helia’s Future Forum are used for the disseminating purposes. According to the self-evaluation report, projects consult the Marketing and Communication Services, and cooperation with them is integrated to the project implementation.

RDI Development and Support Services also provide support for the publishing process. Haaga-Helia has set a target to increase the number of publications and all the projects are supposed to produce publications on the project results. The amount of publications is followed jointly by the
RDI Services and Library Services. Haaga-Helia has the Publication Committee, which discusses the publication activity on the institutional level and proposes corrective actions, if there are signals of decreasing activity. The audit team considers that the publishing activity is one of the key ways to enrich and strengthen the research dimension in the RDI projects.

**Participation in quality work**

Currently, a major part of engagement work concerning the staff and students is done by the RDI coaches. In the light of the interviews there is still a lack of knowledge concerning the work of the RDI Services among the students on the one hand. On the other hand, many students mentioned real-life project based learning and research when discussing their study paths. Thus, this indicates that they are at least partially aware of the RDI operations as such, but not that much of the organisational structures around them. Moreover, the first one is definitely more important for the vast majority of students.

According to the audit material, staff of the all the three teams of the RDI Services unit are involved in the quality work. Students are asked to provide feedback during their engagement on the RDI related courses or RDI related theses. According to the interviews with the staff, student feedback is used for the development purposes in the RDI Services’ teams. In the interview, the RDI Unit staff also emphasized the use of different electronic platforms in order to share the feedback outcomes and also the possible developments carried out.

The staff of the educational units is also engaged in development of the RDI and its quality management, by participating in the RDI Coffee Sessions, contacting RDI coaches and also by filling out the PALKE support service survey. As stated earlier in this chapter, the extension of the RDI operations should also lead to the improvement of the quality work around it, including the systematized participation of the teaching staff.

According to the audit self-evaluation report and interviews, the communication between the externals and the institution is reciprocal and good and it was used for developing the RDI operations, including the support services.

**Quality management of key support services**

The renewed structure of RDI Services unit is somewhat challenging in terms of quality management, as it mixes pure support services, educational functions and coordination responsibilities. As the structure is very recent, its quality work is understandably in-progress, especially regarding the interfaces between its different functions. Furthermore, the teams have several established function-specific quality management practises already. As a backbone of its work, the RDI Services unit has its own service promise, which is stated in the general RDI function process description.
According to the interviews, the RDI Services unit and its teams receive direct face-to-face feedback both from students and staff members. In general, the situation is more or less similar as with the feedback used on the course level in the degree programmes (see chapter 6.1). It is direct, partially undocumented and visibly effective in practical fine-tuning. Thus, it is clear that there is room for improvement on the management of this kind of feedback and its documentation.

In addition to the RDI Development and Support Services team there are many other service functions, too, working partially with the RDI matters. For example, IT services support the implementation and quality management of the RDI in their respective field. Their responsibilities are described in the process description. IT services maintain a system of SIGs (Special Interest Groups), which gather together staff members from the different functions to share information, ensure the smooth information flow across the institution and support decision-making. Marketing and Communication Services help to disseminate the results of the RDI and promote its societal impact. Marketing and Communication Services also employ several quality management practises, such as surveys, media monitoring as well as follow up of web page traffic statistics.

As explained in chapter 6.1, all the support services units attend to the internal performance evaluation and negotiate their own quality targets with the top management. Moreover, the RDI Services unit and well as other support units involved are regularly evaluated as a part of the PALKE service survey.
Haaga-Helia has an extensive network of external stakeholders, which opinions have had a visible effect in many operations, including the formulation of the current strategy. There are several tools in place for producing information on institutions societal and regional impact. Haaga-Helia recognizes well its challenging position in the metropolitan area, where there are a significant number of higher education institutions. The external stakeholders participate to the quality work. With regards to the internal stakeholders’ participation, there is unused potential among the StartUp School staff and students in general. The quality management of the support services functions well and covers the main processes in the respective field. The quality management advances the development of societal impact and achievements of its institutional goals.

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

Functioning of the quality management procedures

Strategy, monitoring and areas of implementation

Societal impact is included in many components of Haaga-Helia’s current strategy. The strategic aspiration set for this area is “Innovations in networks”. Haaga-Helia’s value foundation also expresses strong societal and regional impact: “We serve and revitalize the business community, working together responsibly and sustainably”.

The self-evaluation report states that Haaga-Helia’s primary societal task is to educate experts for the needs of the world of work. Thus, the key impact of the institution comes through its graduates. Haaga-Helia’s role as an adult educator is also highlighted in the self-evaluation report as a part of the societal impact. In practice, this refers to a range of part-time degree programmes and a wide offer of Open University of Applied Sciences studies. The School of Vocational Teacher Education has a direct impact on the secondary level vocational education and training in the capital area. Through the vocational teachers trained in Haaga-Helia, the institution has a unique possibility to influence the crossroads of business and education in the region. It is the only institution offering vocational teacher training in the region and the vocational schools see it as a trustful partner. Teachers trained in Haaga-Helia serve as important mediums for transmitting educational values to vocational students, who, in the future might also study at a university of applied sciences and/or contribute to working life from their own point of view.

A significant number of the institution’s strategic indicators serve the monitoring of the societal impact and regional development. According to the Haaga-Helia’s own definition, graduation and employment rates are the most important indicators of societal impact. Thus, chosen institutional indicators on societal impact align with the strategy. In addition, official statistics show that Haaga-Helia has good employment rates in general, which indicates that it is not only a well-known but also respected educator among the employers. It is worth noting how Haaga-Helia perceives in the self-evaluation report the regional context of the societal impact:
due to the high number of higher education and research institutes working in the metropolitan area, it is difficult to find a clear way to measure Haaga-Helia’s impact alone. The audit team recommends Haaga-Helia to benchmark its measures in this field with partners in similar regions. Regional stakeholders are well involved in the various RDI projects in the educational units and the degree programmes.

**Division of responsibility**

According to the audit material and the interviews, the division of responsibility is widely shared in the area of societal impact and regional development, and accordingly, in its quality management too. As with every core activity, the Management Group carries the overall responsibility of monitoring and taking initiatives on this area too. The Vice President of Commercial Services is responsible for the export of education and its quality management. He/she also acts as a Director of the Commercial Services. The Director of RDI Services is responsible for the RDI support functions, which have a clear link to the societal impact, too.

**Information produced by the quality system on the societal impact**

The audit material presents a number of tools are used in order to produce data and information on societal impact and regional development.

In addition to the strategic and tactical indicators followed, specific surveys are carried out in this area of societal impact. Haaga-Helia stresses image and brand building, which align well with its business-oriented educational profile and with its challenging location in the metropolitan area. The Image survey is carried out annually and the Brand survey biennially. The latest alumni survey was implemented in 2016. The survey results are available in the Quality Portal. However, due to the in progress status of the Portal, information and material on societal impact and its quality management in the Portal are still limited.

Haaga-Helia has produced a holistic survey on its societal impact in 2009. Also the latest institutional development programme related to societal impact is based on the results of 2009 survey. The audit team encourages Haaga-Helia to continue this holistic approach to the quality management of societal impact and regional development. As far as degree education is concerned: also in this case it is recommended to develop a mixed methodology combining both quantitative and qualitative data and information in order to understand the societal impact entirely, as it was already mentioned in chapter 6.1. Societal impact could also provide a topic for research, to enhance the deep understanding of the current practices and their effectiveness.

Societal impact is also monitored through the recognitions and awards provided by other institutions. The self-evaluation report provides plenty of examples of them, e.g. in 2016 Haaga-Helia’s hospitality management students won the third place in the Cuisine du Monde competition and The Sales Education Foundation has listed Haaga-Helia on its Top Universities for Professional Sales Education list.
The audit material includes a lot of initiatives according to which the societal impact is approached and monitored. As the strategic vision concerning the societal impact is clear, the audit team encourages Haaga-Helia to define the key information sources more clearly and to stress the effective analysis of information. The Quality Portal should be developed in a way that provides more than survey results on regional or societal impact, e.g. selection of best practices for internal learning purposes and information on the shared working principles.

Quality management procedures in societal impact and regional development

The self-evaluation report presents a wide range of function-specific quality management procedures related to societal impact and regional development. Some of the functions, as degree education related to the graduate impact, are well covered by the institutional process descriptions and work instructions.

Stakeholders’ views are included in the annual internal steering process: e.g. the results of the Image survey and Brand survey are examined regularly parallel to indicator data.

The audit material and interviews mentioned procedures and criteria for selecting the strategic partners. First, as Haaga-Helia is a privately run institution, and its shareholders obviously are a primary stakeholder group. Second, the strategy emphasizes the business community in general as a stakeholder group. Third, according to the audit material, many units, degree programmes and functions have their own strategies for building and maintaining relationships in their respective area. In addition, the interview with the support services confirmed that the criteria for selecting the international partners were elaborated in 2012. Haaga-Helia also cooperates strategically with the other higher education institutions in the metropolitan area.

The Commercial Services operating as a matrix function have launched a uniform partnership model, which is executed in a flexible manner at each campus. All the projects are tailored to meet the customers’ needs, as typical for the commercial services. According to the self-evaluation report, the customer processes include many consultative sessions in order to ensure that the product meets the customers’ expectations. The Commercial services have decided to collect feedback by project, always as a tailor-made procedure. Furthermore, the unified customer feedback system is not implemented because it is not seen fit for purpose. According to the self-evaluation report, the use of CRM (customer relation management software) is still in progress, but could result in improved sales if taken into use across the institution. Thus, the audit team considers that quality management of commercial services is at a promising stage and works well towards the established procedures and processes. The audit team considers that the RDI Services could learn from this conceptualized approach.

The Open UAS activities are primarily integrated to the degree programmes, and therefore the quality management procedures applied are mostly the same. The Open UAS has its own steering group and a network of contact persons. As an example of the recent development activities, the electronic system for signing in for the courses has been introduced to make this task easier. Benchmarking with other higher education institutions’ similar functions has been used to develop the Open UAS activity in 2016.
Participation in quality work

According to the audit material and interviews, external stakeholders have versatile possibilities to participate in Haaga-Helia’s activities and also partly in Haaga-Helia’s quality management. Advisory Boards on degree programme level engage external experts in each field of study. In addition, also the RDI Advisory Board engages external experts. Notably, a great deal of externals’ participation takes place in the informal discussions with the staff and top management of Haaga-Helia. Haaga-Helia is recommended to improve the documentation of this kind of feedback, keeping in mind that the amount of surveys should not be extended anymore.

The audit team recommends a more effective use of internal stakeholders in the quality management of societal impact and regional development. The interviews pointed out that there is unused potential among, for instance, the StartUp School staff and students, which could be exploited in a different, more effective manner.

Quality management of key support services

According to the audit material, Haaga-Helia has functioning support services, which enhance the achievement of societal impact and regional development. Taken into consideration the complex nature of the societal impact and its versatile implementation areas, also its support services are found in many locations in the Haaga-Helia’s internal structure. As Haaga-Helia emphasizes its impact through graduates, the remarkable part of the support services is those of education’s. On the development of the support services as a whole, see chapter 6.1.

Commercial Services, acting as a matrix unit, works with the all the educational units and provide tailor-made educational services for the varying domestic and foreign customers. Their quality management procedures are chosen to clearly meet the needs of the tailor-made customer process. As the RDI Services, also they mix support services with the educational functions (see chapter 6.3).

Moreover, the Partner Management Services as well as Career, Recruitment and Alumni Services provide support for all the units and functions in their respective areas. Career and Recruitment Services collects employer feedback once a year and exploits the AVOP survey and alumni survey results in its work. Communication and Marketing Services take care of centralized communication processes as well as marketing, which has a key role in advancing the societal impact and regional development (on their quality work, see chapter 6.3.).

All the aforementioned services are included in PALKE support services survey.
Optional audit target: Quality management of StartUp School

The StartUp School was launched in 2011 in order to support strategy implementation and to create a modern version of a learning environment supporting entrepreneurship in university of applied sciences education. A key part of the 2016–2020 strategy and profile of Haaga-Helia is entrepreneurship, and the StartUp School represents this with an approach that reaches across the organisation. The StartUp School has procedures for planning, implementing and evaluating its activities. However, due the relatively young age of the StartUp School it is still too early to evaluate the entire functioning and especially full impact of its quality management. It is acknowledged and recognized by Haaga-Helia that broadening the concept calls for well-managed processes with integrated quality management and that the project is currently still in the development phase. The staff and external stakeholders are involved in the quality management, and also partially students. There is still room for a better promotion of the StartUp School and its quality management among the students.

The StartUp School is a community open to all Haaga-Helia students, who are interested in entrepreneurship or want to develop their own business ideas. The basic premise is to support students so that they can work on their business ideas and progress in their studies at the same time. The StartUp School provides training modules as well as coaching and networking services in the field of entrepreneurship. StartUp School also organises events and competitions for internal and external customers. The StartUp School is available to all students of Haaga-Helia providing an additional experience for those wanting to explore the opportunities for starting their own business. Set up in 2011 as a pilot, a decision has been taken in 2016 to make this a permanent feature.

The StartUp School staff consists of a core team of five members, along with the student intern. In addition, one of the main ways to embed the StartUp School into the educational units is a system of coaches. There are around ten coaches at the moment, at least one on each campus. The StartUp School Manager regularly meets coaches, representatives of the KOVA degree programme management group and involved teachers from the educational units.
Under the strategic cooperation of Haaga-Helia, Laurea University of Applied Sciences and Metropolia University of Applied Sciences, the StartUp School has been assigned a leader’s role in entrepreneurship education. The yearly number of credits gained within the StartUp School exceeded 2000 in 2015. According to the self-evaluation report, there has been systematic growth of the credits since the establishment of the StartUp School in 2011.

**Functioning of the quality management procedures**

According to the self-evaluation report and the interviews, there are a number of quality management procedures in place at the StartUp School. As the StartUp School is a matrix function, some of the quality system’s components – like results of performance indicators – are a joint effort with the educational units and other support units. A need for effective quality management to drive continued improvement has been identified as an important dimension of the extended rollout. As noted in the self-evaluation report, specific areas for the development have been identified, including the pedagogical concept, a supporting database, fine tuning of the collaborative model with degree programmes and a systematic use of staff work outputs.

The StartUp School has set criteria for selecting the partners as follows: quality orientation, continuous improvement, openness and transparency, which, according to self-evaluation report are used in every selection process.

**Quality culture as well as strategic planning and monitoring**

The Audit team commends the quality culture of the StartUp School. As a matter of principle, the StartUp School is intentionally operated as an internal start-up. According to the self-evaluation report, feedback and new ideas are sought as an integral part of the activities. The StartUp School activities are developed in cooperation with students and other stakeholders of the institutional community. Interviewees appreciated the atmosphere, which encourages problem-based learning and an enhancement-led handling of mistakes. Staff were committed to the notion that in in the StartUp School it is acceptable to make mistakes and that setbacks are openly discussed in order to identify development opportunities and learning for all. In the light of the interviews with the StartUp School staff, the core team shared similar values and attitudes about the value of the StartUp School concept and were committed to developing it and making it a success.

The performance indicators for this activity include credit accumulation, student enrolment and the number of companies registered in any one year. There is also a sound link with the local business community with regular meetings, which allow for the gathering of feedback and the discussion of issues of concern. This in turn leads to changes and ongoing development, for example with the business incubator network, which are driven by a desire for continuous improvement. The overarching quality policy of Haaga-Helia was seen to be steering the operations, with its clear focus on aiming for excellence. Targets are set by internally within the School and progress is reported back to the Haaga-Helia’s Management Group. The audit team recommends that the performance indicators should be regularly reviewed as they may require further development as the initiative progresses and evolves.
The development plan for the StartUp School is formulated yearly by the core team, with reference to the institution’s broader action plan and budget. It is then reviewed on a monthly basis and evaluated at the end of each academic year, taking representations from a range of stakeholders and facilitated by a range of feedback mechanisms, including a Strategy Day to which external stakeholders are invited. As an area that has only recently been expanded, it is acknowledged that there is work still to do to embed the quality management into the StartUp School schedules.

**Quality management of the StartUp School studies**

The StartUp School has adopted Haaga-Helia’s modified continuous improvement model of Plan-Do-Check and Learn & Develop. This culture of pedagogic experimentation influences the approach to quality management, with new approaches being piloted fearlessly and each either adopted or rejected based on the experiences. Therefore, the StartUp school was established as a project and as a place to test ‘all pedagogical novelties’. The achievements have been documented as evidence of both progress made and as indicators, for both the core team and Haaga-Helia’s Management Group, as to future development requirements. The data is also shared with external stakeholders who are reported as expressing satisfaction with the direction of the initiative and that StartUp School is something worth continuing.
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The student-centred approach has allowed for effective and productive links to be developed between the vocational teaching education non-degree programme and the StartUp School. Teacher education students can freely work within the project, and the staff of the School of Vocational Teacher Education adds strength to the offering through their understanding of pedagogy and student-centred learning. The RDI Development and Services team have also requested support for other staff with entrepreneurial teaching strategies.
The interviews showed that the StartUp School experience is all about acquiring the vital knowledge and competences for entrepreneurs. The StartUp School concept has been designed and built by people who have their own personal experience of being an entrepreneur or supporting entrepreneurship. In addition to that, internal didactic expertise from the School of Vocational Teacher Education has been very beneficial to the project.

Based on the audit material and interviews, all members of staff have a responsibility to ensure that all students are informed of StartUp School: “All of us are expected to talk about to students about StartUp School.” Every new student is given a folder in which the StartUp School is presented and promoted. Interviewed staff pointed out that they were sure that their students knew they being given access to a high quality product and would recommend it to their peers. This was verified during the interviews with students, who had become involved with the StartUp School activities and consistently described their genuine satisfaction and high regard for the StartUp School scheme. This seems to justify the response of the StartUp School staff that satisfied students are the best advertisement.

The arrangement whereby students have both a coach/mentor as well as access to the teaching team seems to work well in terms of generating useful feedback. According to the audit material, this in turn has led to changes, for example whereby some students wished for more interaction with a wider range of other students, and at a direct result some additional courses were timetabled to facilitate this.

Entrepreneurship is linked into the other degree pathways as a result of substantial discussion with teaching staff. The core determinant is that the student should be at the centre of the training and that it should allow for personal development in line with the specified competencies.

Cooperation with the degree programmes is clearly demanding, but StartUp School staff appeared more than aware of the need to build strong links and relationships. Interested students are required to liaise with the nominated contact teacher for their degree programme. In every campus, there is a StartUp coach and demonstration materials are also made available. The StartUp School makes use of teachers from different courses and useful cooperation and contacts do exist. An example was provided of jointly designing and making a marketing plan, ensuring best use of a range of skills and expertise. Although many StartUp School projects are mainly for-profit, there are also some social enterprise initiatives, which appears to broaden the appeal to a wider spectrum of students and staff across the degree programmes on offer.

According to the interviews, the student cohort recruits well from the Bachelor’s programme in International Business and there is a lot of interest from international students in the StartUp School. One foreign interviewee even mentioned that StartUp School was the main reason for choosing Haaga-Helia.

Working with the master’s courses is an area for development and in the interviews there was expressed a belief that the core team had a lot to contribute. As an example, Haaga-Helia is one of the four university partners in the SMARTUP project (2017–2018) focusing on the development
of an International Master’s Programme in Entrepreneurship, coordinated by Università degli Studi di Milano-Biocca, Italy. The project involves some of the staff who decided that they could make a useful contribution and that it would fit with their unit’s strategy.

The StartUp School students with their own entrepreneurial experience have participated in its development. Benchmarking from other similar and successful organisations happens all the time, for instance via participation in the UBI (University Business Incubator) Global network. ‘Learning by doing’ is at the core of studying at the StartUp School, with a focus on teaching and learning, which is student-centred.

Students can enrol any time of the year and the ‘Challenging yourself’ phase of StartUp School is open to anyone at Haaga-Helia. According to the interviews, students take responsibility for their own learning and can also choose how far to pursue their research, with some following through to actually launching a business enterprise. A broad range of support appropriate to each phase of development is made available from both internal and external stakeholders. At the same time, interviewees of the StartUp School emphasized that this class format does not necessarily fit every student. Counselling and coaching cannot settle a missing entrepreneurial personality and spirit for the project.

During 2016 the learning outcomes of the core courses of StartUp School have been reviewed and upgraded in co-operation with Haaga-Helia’s School of Vocational Teacher Education. Extensive use is made of Competence Cards to record progress across a range of skills and to support students in planning their personal learning programme. Staff report that they are continuing to monitor and modify this system to improve effectiveness. These cards follow the format of ‘I want to do this and I have completed…’ and offer students the opportunity to measure their progress as independent learners and informing staff of future development needs. The Competence Cards were designed as a collaborative venture, involving detailed conversations with stakeholder representatives and with support from the RDI Services. The Competence Cards are a sound example of best practice at Haaga-Helia and potential exists to exploit their use more effectively as an integral part of the quality management. Therefore, the audit team encourages Haaga-Helia to improve the use of the Competence Card as a qualitative tool for the quality management producing the information on the functioning of the StartUp School.

The strength of their approach was rightly recognised as the student-centred approach and the effective use of the Competence Card. This tool was seen, not as an end in itself but as an integral part of their work – ‘it supports our work, and we understand where we are’.

Staff across the institution are offered opportunities for professional development in entrepreneurial teaching and learning. It was pointed out by top management and staff that the motivation for staff to take part in StartUp School was to both broaden their own experience and to be able to offer more to their students. Degree programmes were encouraging entrepreneurial projects and there is a plan to introduce a degree programme in entrepreneurship too. In addition, there is a three-day course for coaching skills for staff who want to support the work of StartUp School.
The StartUp school is at present a development project which was initially piloted on a limited scale and has only relatively recently been opened up to a much wider staff and student audience. As with any 'start up' there now needs to be in place a business plan which allows for the further development and embedding of the initiative as an integral part of the Haaga-Helia fabric. The audit team recommends that the role of StartUp School should be systematically developed towards a function that provides support for all entrepreneurial development, innovation and creativity across the institution.

**Participation in quality work**

The relationship with the RDI Services was felt to have been positive, supportive and effective.

The StartUp School is premised on constant and ongoing feedback with the students – interviews and discussions based around their project work. Students are encouraged to reflect on their learning experience, with evidence being presented of both formative and summative assessment mechanisms in place.

Stakeholders are typically involved in all of the development work. Evidence was provided about a multiplicity of mechanisms for stakeholders to engage with and inform the development of StartUp School, but there is less clarity about the extent of their involvement in the quality management. The submission is very open to the need for a more formal approach at times; the audit team suggests that a thorough review of the StartUp Schools communication plan would be considered.

Communication of the project quality management strategy conforms to the broader Haaga-Helia strategy with a major emphasis on engaging with stakeholders. An annual event brings together stakeholders and interested others to share success and ideas for future development. According to the interviews, more efforts are needed to inform other staff and external stakeholders of the value of the StartUp philosophy and operational culture.

The defining of a StartUp School collaboration strategy is being worked upon and further development is ongoing. A description of the StartUp School operational model for Haaga-Helia staff is currently lacking and the information is currently being transmitted through informal discussions only. Furthermore, although connections with the StartUp School alumni companies exist, the audit team considers that they require a more structured approach.

The core team works with the Haaga-Helia Innovation Director, accessing the professional expertise to ensure compliance with the broader institutional goals as well as with their commitment to adapt the StartUp School to changing circumstances. These include working more closely with the Masters programmes.
Haaga-Helia's quality system is aligned with the strategy of the institution, and it covers all key operations and functions. The quality management procedures constitute a functioning system, which converts Haaga-Helia's strategy effectively into practice, and enhances continuous improvement according to the innovatively modified Deming cycle. Haaga-Helia is both a strategy-led and a pedagogy-led institution, and its internal steering process is very effective, using mainly quantitative data. The determination of the top management to advance the quality management is evident, and the inclusion of external stakeholders exemplary. The quality culture is strong. Staff members are committed to continuous quality improvement, and they participate actively in quality work. The students are also involved, but they are not using all the options available to them. The quality work has a clear enhancement effect on the core duties of the institution.

The quality system as a whole is at a developing stage.

8.1 Comprehensiveness and impact of the quality system

The rationale and the objectives of Haaga-Helia's quality policy are defined explicitly, and the roles and responsibilities of the actors are stated clearly. The quality system is aligned with the strategy of the institution, and it covers all the core duties of the institution. The quality system is an integral part of the management system, and it consists of procedures, processes, feedback tools, (responsible) working groups as well as relevant key performance indicators, which are improved regularly. The quality system is clearly linked to the strategic management, as the data and information produced by it is regularly used in the internal steering operations.

The development of the quality system is also embedded in strategic management, since it is included in the yearly performance reviews. Haaga-Helia recognizes the strengths and development areas of the quality system, and has already started improving certain aspects, such as the feedback mechanisms as a whole, and the student feedback system.
Haaga-Helia is both a strategy-led and a pedagogy-led institution, and there is plenty of evidence of the functionality and impact of the quality system on degree education level. The degree programmes reviewed as part of the audit reflect most of Haaga-Helia’s strategic focus areas and points of emphasis. The audit team encountered with enthusiastic teachers and students working together in pedagogically advanced learning environments. The communication between teachers and students is vivid and effective. The internal teacher expertise of the institution is actively used for pedagogical training and development, and pedagogical innovations are often applied. Student feedback is systematically used for designing and developing the curricula and in implementing the degree programmes. There is also plenty of evidence of course-level fine-tuning and improvement made based on direct feedback. During the audit visit, it was, however, noted that some students suffer from a certain evaluation fatigue. They consider that by decreasing the number of surveys and questionnaires, the response rates would be higher. The audit team recommends that the number of the electronic surveys should be reduced and the position of qualitative feedback within the quality system should be reviewed, and its documentation should be improved.

RDI work is supported by the RDI Services unit, consisting of three teams. Currently the RDI Services unit is systematizing the project portfolio data management, as well as activating RDI work, and sharing ideas, for example, by arranging RDI Coffee sessions. The active and ongoing engagement of the teaching staff is one of the future challenges. However, the purpose and functioning of the quite recently installed RDI Services unit is not clear enough, and it does not act as one coherent unit yet. There is cooperation between the three teams, but it may still take some time before collaboration will be more established, the processes fine-tuned, and the added value and synergy of the new structure evident. By adding communication, the options and responsibilities of the actors would be clearer.

As regards the societal impact and the regional development work, the audit team acknowledged that it is not easy to measure societal impact of a higher education institution located in the Helsinki metropolitan area, where the range of educational institutions is wide. Haaga-Helia collects different data on its visibility. The results from the image survey speak for the positive impact and reputation of the institution among the higher education institutions operating in the Helsinki area. In addition, the Haaga-Helia graduates are wanted on the job market, and in certain fields, like tourism and hospitality, the institution has quite an exclusive position as provider of workforce for the job market. Moreover, the societal impact and regional development work of the institution are reflected in its various RDI and commercial activities.

There is plenty of evidence concerning continuous improvement in accordance with the Plan-Do-Check-Learn & Develop -cycle. At the time of the audit, the quality system of Haaga-Helia in its current form is still quite recent, and there are many development projects going on. Since some of these projects had been started recently, it was not possible to evaluate their full impact, yet. Moreover, there are some existing practices (e.g. face-to-face student feedback) which could be exploited more in the quality work, in order to make them an integral part of the quality system.
8.2 Quality culture

The quality culture of Haaga-Helia is strong, and staff members evidently strive for quality. All interviewees considered quality as Haaga-Helia’s key for success, recognised their responsibilities in the quality system, and discussed openly about their work and possible challenges encountered. The management, staff, and many students share a positive attitude, even enthusiasm towards quality. The quality culture varies to some extent at campuses and in different educational units. The management promotes openness and transparency, and encourages all Haaga-Helians to take part in different activities in order to create shared understandings and a more unified culture. Staff members are involved in the development of a quality culture within their organisational units. In addition, they take part in various committees and numerous operational working groups parallel to the organisational structure. Quality matters are also discussed in staff’s yearly development discussions. Students are involved in quality work, but there is still potential to increase their engagement. The audit team recognises this to be a more universal challenge in the higher education communities.

8.3 The quality system as a whole

The quality management procedures constitute a functioning system, which converts Haaga-Helia’s strategy effectively into practice, and enhances continuous improvement according to the innovatively modified Deming cycle. The student feedback tools in use constitute a versatile system: there are electronic quantitative feedback tools used across the whole institution, and in addition, they are supplemented by the tailored, course-specific ways of gathering feedback. The electronic tools would be more effective, if the response rates in surveys could be increased. The audit team recommends a differentiated mixed-method approach for the Check part of the quality system in order to enhance its functionality. Combining both approaches, using survey results and, e.g. information from reports etc., would be beneficial, as already mentioned in chapter 6.1. As a principle, the focus of the quality work should be in analysing data, instead of just collecting it. However, since there is already plenty of evidence on the analysis and use of the data and information produced by the quality system at all levels of the institution, Haaga-Helia has an excellent basis to further develop this area.

The quality management procedures of Haaga-Helia form a dynamic system, which is constantly being developed and improved. This implies that new development projects are initiated and new forums established according to the emerging needs and objectives. The audit team considers, however, that a more continuous monitoring of the system and evaluation of its efficacy is required. Currently, there are several development projects in progress, and the working body architecture remains complex. It is suggested that “less is more” might be a good principle for guiding this development. The audit team considers that this would be useful for the staff members, students, and the whole institution, in particular, while bearing in mind its ambitious aspirations for international accreditations in the field of business studies. The main challenges relate to the amount of information and data collected, as well as to how the data are analysed and
communicated. The impact of feedback from certain areas, for example, from degree education for the institutional-level development could be made more explicit. The prioritising would lead to the decrease of the staff workload and improve the students’ motivation to give feedback. Furthermore, horizontal communication and communication between the various committees need more attention. By improving communication, Haaga-Helia could share its innovations, ideas and good practices even more effectively. New ideas to extend horizontal interaction and better use of reciprocal feedback and ideas would comply very well with the existing high commitment of Haaga-Helia staff to the quality of their work.
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Conclusions

9.1 Strengths and good practices

Strengths

1. Haaga-Helia’s strategic management functions well and is clearly linked to the quality management, especially in the internal steering operations. The annual internal steering process exploits a wide range of the data and information produced by the quality system. The degree programmes reviewed as a part of the audit clearly reflect institution’s strategic focus areas.

2. Community engagement in quality work has evidently been one of the key priorities from the very beginning of Haaga-Helia and beyond. The current good level of engagement offers a solid foundation for further embedding the shared quality culture into Haaga-Helia’s units and campuses. Communication on the quality system and its results is extensive and versatile. Haaga-Helia has systematically developed its internal communication by creating the intranet Quality Portal for all the quality-related information. The amount of information available on the web pages for the external stakeholders is also high.

3. Haaga-Helia has a very strong pedagogical approach. Pedagogical innovations are systematically applied across the institution. The institution as a whole, as well as its units, actively seek new teaching and learning solutions that advance integral connections to working life. The in-house expertise of vocational teacher education is exploited in an excellent manner in quality management and in teachers’ further education and training, such as in the HH-PEDAALI training programme.

4. The learning environments are both versatile and inspiring, and support the achievement of the goals set for the education, as well as its continuous development. The units, campuses and degree programmes make use of various settings, such as campuses, virtual learning platforms, work placements, projects with companies, on-the-job learning and international exchange. It is possible to adjust individual study and/or working paths to special circumstances, which visibly supports staff and student wellbeing.

5. Haaga-Helia’s quality culture includes two notable assets: service-orientation and a dynamic atmosphere. Staff and students are widely committed to these. There is a strong feeling of membership across the institution and being Haaga-Helians.
6. Haaga-Helia uses its external stakeholders’ expertise widely and provides them with various possibilities to participate in the development activities. This applies to the programme development and the RDI as well as to the governance and decision-making on the different organisational levels.

**Good practices**

1. HH-PEDAALI is a training programme that Haaga-Helia offers for its teaching staff. The programme is a part of the actions defined in the current strategic road map. The programme aims to enhance teaching staff’s pedagogical skills and brings together teachers from the different educational units.

2. The StartUp School’s Competence Card is a tool that provides a platform for the target setting and self-evaluation for the students. The Competence Card includes tasks both for the StartUp School coaches and for the students. The Competence Card is organised in a way that follows the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. It makes it possible to monitor the student’s individual progress. The audit team considers that the Competence Card could also be used for quality work purposes, too.

3. Quality Assi is an established communication channel between the students and teachers on the programme level. Quality Assi consists of a group of students chosen by their fellow students for this task. They serve as a discussion channel for students and staff of the Degree Programme in Modern Languages and Business Studies for Management Assistants (ASSI). The group meets 2–3 times per semester to discuss, evaluate and develop matters related to the study environment of their degree programme. Each member of the group receives three credits for their active participation.

4. Some support services, namely Library services as well as Career and Recruitment services, use fresh and customer-friendly methods to collect feedback from the staff and students. These include observation, mood jars, photography, and feedback trees.

**9.2 Recommendations**

1. The quality system and especially its components that produce data and information should be critically reviewed and sparsened in order to make the system more efficient and effective. Furthermore, the institution’s working-body architecture should be reconsidered and therefore, be simplified appropriately. Finally, Haaga-Helia is advised to stress prioritizing, coordination and realistic timing in its development activities, to avoid the situation where several improvements were started simultaneously.

2. The role of the recently established RDI Services unit still requires clarification, as well as the RDI operations in general. The top management needs to define, what research and innovation are supposed to be like in Haaga-Helia. Furthermore, the RDI should be more deeply linked to the internal steering, such as the annual performance evaluation. In addition, the research dimension of the RDI could be strengthened in various ways: for example, via staff training opportunities, encouraging the staff to publish project results and creating a clear space for the integration of the staff’s own research as well as institutional projects.
3. The number of surveys and other feedback tools is currently too high; in particular in degree education. Haaga-Helia is advised to develop a mixed-methodological approach where both qualitative and quantitative data and information are effectively gathered and analyzed. In addition, there is a great deal of direct, partially undocumented student and stakeholder feedback, the use of which should be extended, including a sufficient documentation.

4. Cooperation and communication between educational units should be increased. In this way, best practices could be widely shared and used across the institution. The aim to increase reciprocity should be a leading feature in this work, as well as ensuring that all the parties involved get the information that is needed in their everyday work. This carries a great importance especially in the RDI sector, as there is clear need to increase the volume of the RDI funding and activities.

5. The development of the shared quality culture still requires action. In this work, the campuses could be key actors. Moreover, it would be beneficial to define the level of accepted diversity inside Haaga-Helia, including key quality management procedures in core functions, and therefore, document them in an appropriate way.

6. Haaga-Helia is advised to use benchmarking as a tool for developing its core duties. It would complement the stage Learn & Develop in the modified Deming’s cycle applied to the institution. One of the beneficial opportunities could be benchmarking with foreign partner institutions located in a region with similar characteristics (e.g. capital area, similar economic features).

9.3 The audit team’s overall assessment

The quality system of Haaga-Helia 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 Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences passes the audit.

9.4 Higher Education Evaluation Committee’s decision

In its meeting on 16th June 2017, the Higher Education Evaluation Committee decided, based on the proposal and report of the audit team, that the quality system of Haaga-Helia 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. Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences has been awarded a quality label that is valid for six years beginning on 16th June 2017.
## APPENDIX 1: Table of the audit targets and criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETS</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality policy</td>
<td>The quality policy shows an absence of or major shortcomings in the</td>
<td>The quality policy's rationale, objectives and division of responsibilities are at an early stage of development and are only partially defined.</td>
<td>The quality policy's rationale, objectives and division of responsibilities are clearly defined and the result of an inclusive process.</td>
<td>The quality policy's rationale, objectives and division of responsibilities are defined in explicit terms and the result of a thorough and wide process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• rationale and definition of the quality system's objectives and responsibilities</td>
<td>• The quality policy is not fully accessible and does not sufficiently take into account the information needs of internal and external stakeholders.</td>
<td>• The quality policy is accessible to all internal and external stakeholders, taking their information needs into account.</td>
<td>• The quality policy is accessible and actively communicated to all internal and external stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• accessibility of the quality policy to internal and external stakeholders</td>
<td>• The quality policy is insufficiently linked to the institution's overall strategy.</td>
<td>• The quality policy is clearly linked to the institution's overall strategy.</td>
<td>• The quality policy is an integral part of the institution's overall strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGETS</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absent</strong></td>
<td>• The quality system and the information it produces serve only partially the needs of strategic and operations management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Procedures for the use of and communication of quality information are weak or uneven.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The quality system functions unevenly across the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing</strong></td>
<td>• The quality system and the information it produces serve strategic and operations management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Established procedures ensure that the information produced is put to use and communicated systematically within the institution and to external stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The system works evenly across different organisational levels and units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The division of responsibility is effective, and roles and responsibilities in the institution's quality work are executed with commitment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced</strong></td>
<td>• The institution has well-established and excellent procedures that systematically produce information for strategic and operations management needs, and the information is put to systematic and wide use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The institution has well-established and excellent procedures for communicating information to different personnel groups, students and external stakeholders. Communication of the information is active and up-to-date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The quality system works effectively across all organisational levels, in a way that adds value to and enhances the quality of the institution's operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Managers and members of the community are committed to enhancement and the embedding of a quality culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Quality system's link with strategic management

The quality system and quality work show an absence of or major shortcomings in the:

• ability to meet the information needs of strategic and operations management
• procedures for the use and communication of quality information
• functionality at different organisational levels
• division of responsibility
• commitment in the execution of roles and responsibilities in the institution's quality work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETS</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Development of the quality system</td>
<td>The HEI shows an absence of or major shortcomings in the:</td>
<td>• The institution 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>
<td>• The HEI has in place well-functioning procedures to evaluate and develop the quality system.</td>
<td>• The HEI has well-established and systematic procedures for regularly evaluating and developing the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
<td>• The institution is able to identify the system's strengths and areas in need of development, and development work is systematic.</td>
<td>• The institution is able to efficiently identify the system's strengths and areas in need of development. There is clear evidence of the system's successful development work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• overall view of the functioning of the quality system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>• The development of the quality system after the first audit has not been systematic or effective.</td>
<td>• The development of the quality system after the first audit has been systematic. The system works better than before.</td>
<td>• After the first audit, the HEI has systematically improved the functionality and fitness for purpose of the quality system. Special attention has been given to the workload produced by the system. The system has been developed in a successful and effective manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• development work following the first audit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Quality management of the core duties, including essential services supporting these

#### 4a) Degree education

- 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.

#### 4b) Research, development and innovation activities, as well as artistic activities

- The quality management procedures are in place but insufficiently developed. The procedures do not fully support the achievement of institutional strategic goals set for the core duties.
- The information provided by the quality system is as yet insufficient for the development of the core duties. Information use is sporadic and/or information collection is an end in itself.
- Personnel groups, students and external stakeholders are only partially involved in quality work.
- The quality management of key support services is not functional.

#### 4c) Societal impact and regional development work (incl. social responsibility, continuing education, open university and open university of applied sciences education, as well as paid-services education)

- Functional quality management procedures advance the development of the institution's core duties and the achievement of goals set for the core duties.
- The quality system produces relevant information for the development of the core duties, and the information is used for this purpose.
- Personnel groups and students are involved in quality work. External stakeholders also participate.
- The quality management of key support services functions relatively well.

#### 4d) Optional audit target

- The HEI has systematic and well-established quality management procedures that provide excellent support for the development of the institution's core duties and the implementation of its overall strategy.
- The institution has systematic and excellent procedures used to produce information for the development of the core duties. There is clear evidence that information is used systematically and successfully.
- Personnel groups and students are committed and actively involved in quality work. Special attention has been given to the workload generated by the quality management procedures. External stakeholders are also systematically involved in quality work.
- The HEI has systematic and well-established procedures for the quality management of key support services. There is clear evidence that these procedures function well.
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><strong>5. Samples of degree education: degree programmes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Planning of the programme** | • Curricula and their preparation  
• Intended learning outcomes and their definition  
• Links between research, development and innovation activities, as well as artistic activities, and education  
• Lifelong learning  
• Relevance of degrees to working life. |
| **Implementation of the programme** | • Teaching methods and learning environments  
• Methods used to assess learning  
• Students’ learning and well-being  
• Teachers’ competence and occupational well-being. |
| **Participation** | • Participation of different personnel groups, students and external stakeholders in quality work related to the degree programme. |
| **Effectiveness of quality work** | • Suitability of key evaluation methods and follow-up indicators and their impact on the achievement of goals. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The quality system shows an absence of or major shortcomings in the:  
• quality management procedures related to the planning of the programme  
• quality management procedures related to the implementation of the programme  
• participation of the institution’s personnel groups, students or external stakeholders in the development of the programme or  
• effectiveness of the quality work related to the programme. | 
• The quality management procedures related to the planning of educational provision are not fully functional and do not provide sufficient support to the planning of the programme.  
• The quality management procedures related to the implementation of educational provision are not fully functional and do not provide sufficient support to the implementation of the programme.  
• Personnel groups, students and external stakeholders only partially participate in quality work.  
• There is little evidence of the effectiveness of the quality work related to the programme. | 
• The quality management procedures related to the planning of educational provision are fully functional and support the planning of the programme.  
• The quality management procedures related to the implementation of educational provision are fully functional and support the implementation of the programme.  
• Personnel groups and students participate in quality work. External stakeholders also participate.  
• There is evidence that quality work has an enhancement effect on the programme. | 
• 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.  
• Personnel groups and students participate actively and with commitment in quality work. External stakeholders are also systematically involved.  
• 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><strong>Absent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The HEI has only individual and unrelated quality management procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is no evidence of the procedures' impact on the development of the operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Stages and time table of the audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit agreement between FINEEC and Haaga-Helia</td>
<td>19.1.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomination of the audit team</td>
<td>12.5.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the audit material</td>
<td>14.11.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and discussion seminar at Haaga-Helia</td>
<td>17.1.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit visit</td>
<td>7. -9.2.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINEEC Higher Education Evaluation Committee’s decision on the audit result</td>
<td>16.6.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish of the report</td>
<td>19.6.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing seminar</td>
<td>19.6.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up of the quality system’s development</td>
<td>In 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 3: Programme of the audit visit

### Tuesday 7th February 2017 Pasila Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00–9.50</td>
<td>Interview with the Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00–10.40</td>
<td>Interview with the Board of Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50–11.30</td>
<td>Interview with the Directors of Educational Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.40–11.20</td>
<td>Interview with the Campus Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30–13.20</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30–14.20</td>
<td>Interview with the teaching staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30–15.20</td>
<td>Interview with the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30–16.20</td>
<td>Thematic interview: Quality management of RDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30–17.20</td>
<td>Interview with the external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wednesday 8th February 2017 Haaga Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00–9.20</td>
<td>Concise presentation of the key features of Haaga Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30–10.20</td>
<td>Thematic interview: Quality management of the education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30–11.20</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Programme in Business Information Technology: interview with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30–12.20</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Programme in Business Information Technology: interview with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30–13.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.40–14.30</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Programme in International Business: interview with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.40–15.30</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Programme in International Business: interview with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.40–16.30</td>
<td>Masters Programme in Hospitality Management: interview with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.40–17.30</td>
<td>Masters Programme in Hospitality Management: interview with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thursday 9th February 2017 Pasila Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00–9.50</td>
<td>Thematic interview: Quality management of vocational teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00–10.50</td>
<td>“Climate Walk” and “Pop Up Interviews” on Pasila Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00–11.50</td>
<td>Thematic interview: Quality Management of StartUp School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00–12.30</td>
<td>Interview with the support services key staff, part A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.40–13.10</td>
<td>Interview with the support services key staff, part B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.20–14.10</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20–15.30</td>
<td>Meeting of the audit team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00–16.00</td>
<td>Interview with and preliminary feedback to the Management Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4

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 oriented 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). Furthermore, higher education institutions are independent in their internal governance.

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 adopted a national qualifications framework (NQF) in 2017. Provisions on the National Framework for Qualifications and Other Competence Modules are laid down in Act (93/2017) and Government Decree on the National Framework for Qualifications and Other Competence Modules. The framework covers the entire education system. In this framework, the qualifications, syllabi and other extensive competence modules of the Finnish national education system are classified into eight levels on the basis of the requirements. Statutory regulations on the level descriptors and the positioning of qualifications, syllabi and extensive competence modules on the various levels of the framework on the basis of required learning outcomes, are enacted by the Government Decree. With respect to the higher education, degrees awarded by Finnish higher education institutions are positioned in the framework as follows:

- Bachelor’s degrees (universities of applied sciences) and Bachelor’s degrees (universities) at level 6
- Master’s degrees (universities of applied sciences) and Master’s degrees (universities) at level 7
- Universities’ and National Defence University scientific and artistic postgraduate degrees (licentiate and doctor degrees), the General Staff Officer’s Degree, the Specialist Degree in Veterinary Medicine, and Specialist training in medicine and Specialist training in dentistry at level 8

The Framework for Qualifications and Other Competence Modules is based on the European Qualifications Framework (EQF). The abbreviation FiNQF is also used to refer to the National Qualifications Framework.
In addition, 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 licences. 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.
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 at 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 Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences and the results of the audit.