EIQAS

ENHANCING INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS

ERASMUS + PROJECT

2014-2016

COUNTRY REPORT:

SLOVENIA

FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEY ON
PART I OF THE EUROPEAN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AND INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS

Author:
Klemen Subic, Nacionalna agencija RS za kakovost v visokem solstvu / Slovenian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, Slovenia

FREE PUBLICATION

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance

The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (European Standards and Guidelines, ESG), developed by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), provide a common framework for quality assurance of learning and teaching at European, national and institutional levels. They were adopted by the Ministers responsible for higher education as part of the Bologna Process in 2005. A recently revised version of the ESG (https://revisionesg.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/esg-draft-endoresed-by-bfug.pdf) was endorsed by the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG) in September 2014 and is expected to be approved by the Ministers in May 2015. Like the 2005 version, the revised ESG include three interrelated parts:

    Part 1 – Internal quality assurance;
    Part 2 – External quality assurance;
    Part 3 – Quality assurance agencies.

1.2. EIQAS Project

The survey on Part 1 of the ESG and internal quality assurance systems was a key initial activity in the Erasmus+ Strategic Partnership project 'Enhancing internal quality assurance systems' (EIQAS), approved for funding in autumn 2014. EIQAS is a joint initiative of national quality assurance agencies and Rectors' Conferences and / or higher education institutions (HEIs) from four countries, Poland (Coordinator), Bulgaria, Portugal and Slovenia. It has two objectives. First, it aims to support HEIs in further development of their internal quality assurance (IQA) systems by enhancing their awareness and understanding of Part 1 of the ESG. Second, it aims to support the national agencies in further development of their methodologies for the external assessment of IQA systems at HEIs, thus addressing one of the standards in Part 2 of the ESG. The two main outputs of the project will be a Guide to IQA based on Part 1 of the ESG and a reference framework for comparative analysis of the participating agencies' methodologies for the external assessment of IQA. More details about EIQAS at: http://www.eiqas.com.

1.3. EIQAS Survey

Pursuing the first objective of EIQAS, the survey focused on IQA in the context of Part 1 of the ESG and was conducted at the institutional level. It aimed to collect data on overall progress that HEIs had made in the implementation of their IQA systems, the extent to which (elements of) Part 1 ESG are integrated into their IQA systems, and the problems they had faced and / or might face when integrating the ESG into their IQA systems. Survey findings will feed into an EIQAS Training Seminar on IQA and the ESG for HEIs to be held in spring 2015. Together with suggestions and conclusions from the seminar, they will also be used to develop the above-mentioned Guide to IQA which will be available to all interested HEIs.

The survey was based on the BFUG-endorsed draft of the revised ESG, which overlaps to a large extent with the 2005 version. As the draft was yet to be approved in May 2015, HEIs were not expected to have the new ESG elements in place, though some might have integrated such or similar elements into their IQA systems regardless of the ESG. Since EIQAS is forward-looking, the main reason for choosing the draft ESG for the survey was that this enabled the EIQAS partners to identify (elements of) Part 1 of the ESG which should be given special attention both at the Training Seminar on IQA and the ESG and in the Guide to IQA which will be based on the revised ESG.

The questionnaire was designed to provide mainly quantitative data as a basis for a more in-depth and qualitative analysis during the EIQAS Training Seminar on IQA and the ESG. It comprised 45 questions. General questions about IQA systems covered, in particular, the period when an HEI started implementing its system and the main motivation behind the decision to do so; the scope of the system; progress in its implementation across the institution and problems encountered; beneficial changes resulting from its operation; general links with the ESG, and activities undertaken to raise internal awareness of the ESG. These were followed by detailed questions about procedures, processes

and / or other arrangements covered under each of Part 1 ESG. HEIs were also requested to identify the ESG which had been or could be most difficult to implement, and those where they would need more detailed clarification and guidelines. For details, please see the full questionnaire in Annex.

The survey was conducted online between 3 February and 3 March 2015 among HEIs in all four countries participating in EIQAS. Depending on the total number of HEIs, the number of those invited to complete the questionnaire varied between the four countries.

In Slovenia 9 HEI-s, representing 16,3% of the total number of HEIs (55), were invited to complete the questionnaire.

Three of participating HEI-s were university-type (33,3%), two non-university (22,2%), one public (11,1%) and five non-public (55,6%). Six of participating HEI-s (75%) have been involved in internal quality assurance for more than five years, one HEI (12,5%) has been involved for more than 19 years and one HEI (12,5%) for more than 15 years.

The size of the HEI-s participating in the questionnaire and also the period in which they were involved in internal quality assurance are shown in *Chart 1* below:

Chart 1

Size of the higher education institution	Less than 300 students	33,3%	3
	300 - 1 000 students	11,1%	1
	1 000 - 5 000 students	22,2%	2
	5 000 - 15 000 students	11,1%	1
	15 000 - 25 000 students	0,0%	0
	25 000 - 35 000 students	11,1%	1
	35 000 - 45 000 students	11,1%	1
	Over 45 000 students	0,0%	0
	TOTAL:	**100%**	**9 HEI-s**

Period in which the HEI-s were involved in internal quality assurance	More than 20 years	0%	0
	More than 15 years	12,5%	1
	More than 10 years	12,5%	1
	More than 5 years	75%	6
	5 years	0%	0
	Less than 5 years	0%	0
	TOTAL:	**100%**	**8 HEI-s**
	Note: 1 HEI did not answer the second question		

The position (function) of the individuals who filled the questionnaire and how they filled in the questionnaire is shown in *Chart 2* below:

Chart 2

Position (function) of the individuals who filled in the questionnaire	Rector / President	28,6%	2
	Vice-Rector / Vice-President	0,0%	0
	Institutional Quality Assurance Coordinator	28,6%	2
	Head of the Quality Assurance Unit / Office	14,3%	1
	Administrator	14,3%	1
	Other (please specify)	14,3%	1
	TOTAL:	**100%**	**7 HEI-s**
	Note: 2 HEI-s did not answer the question		
	*1 HEI answered with Other: **dean***		

The questionnaire was filled in individually or in consultation with colleagues	Individually	62,5%	5
	In consultation with colleagues	37,5%	3
	TOTAL:	100%	8 HEI-s
Note: 2 HEI-s did not answer first question and 1 HEI-s did not answer the second question			

1.4. Basic facts about Internal Quality assurance in Slovenia

After the adoption of the Higher Education Act in 1993, higher education institutions in Slovenia have developed certain forms of self-evaluation and quality assurance systems. Despite the delays and problems, the National Committee for Quality in Higher Education (NCQHE) was established. Supported by the PHARE international project, 'The European Dimension of Institutional Quality Management', by the abovementioned Committee and by the management of the then Slovenian universities and independent higher education institutions, a network of committees responsible for regular self-evaluation of the overall activity of these institutions was established. In 2000 and 2001, the committees prepared self-evaluation reports according to the modified Phare project guidelines for each higher education institution separately (for both universities and their members, sometimes for individual departments, and for independent higher education institutions).

Furthermore, the experts of the Conference of European Rectors, CRE, (currently EUA), also performed external institutional evaluation at both Slovenian universities; in 1996, at the University of Ljubljana, and two years later, in 1998, at the University of Maribor. At certain faculties, relevant European professional organizations performed external programme evaluations (e.g. in veterinary medicine, dental medicine and the majority of university and professional technical study programmes). Within these external evaluations, the higher education institutions performed self-evaluation following the instructions and standard of the above mentioned organizations.

When the new Higher Education Act came into force at the end of 2006 (OG RS, nr. 119/2006) and the Council for Higher Education of the Republic of Slovenia was reformed, the development and improvement of the internal systems of evaluation (self-evaluation), defined activities, responsible persons and areas of self-evaluation and external evaluation were for the first time set out in the Act. The Act imposed to the Council for Higher Education to collect and analyze annual self-evaluation reports of higher education institutions and vocational schools. The Act provided that the person responsible at HEI is also responsible for the preparation of internal regulations (criteria) for QA in all areas of the institution (at the level of the university, faculty, courses, scientific, artistic and academic work and responsible for monitoring, assessment and quality assurance (in public and independent/private higher education institutions).

Council for Higher Education has been ordered to cooperate with universities and vocational schools and to promote the implementation of self-evaluations. Therefore, since 2007 annual self-evaluation reports are collected and analyzed. Analysis of HEI's self-evaluation reports is part of the meta-analysis which has been publicly published by the Agency since 2007.

Although ESG were not explicitly mentioned in the Act of 2006, the entire system of internal and external quality system has followed the European guidelines and international principles in the field of quality assurance since their adoption in 2005.

Along with the amendments to the Higher Education Act in 2009 (HEA-G) and with the establishment of the new agency, the compliance of operation of the SQAA with European standards and guidelines was also defined in the Act. It was determined that all the procedures of external quality assessment must follow ESG, while encouraging the development of internal QA systems in accordance with ESG (ESG integration of the principles of assessment in higher education institutions, study programs and

in external evaluations of vocational colleges). The HEA also provided that in any proceedings of extension of accreditation (study programs, higher education institutions and vocational colleges) self-evaluation reports are used as a basis for assessment.

Since establishment of the SQAA (as successor to the Council of the Republic of Slovenia for Higher Education) the ESG are integrated in both external and internal QA systems.

2. OVERVIEW OF INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE (IQA) SYSTEMS

Six (75%) of the responding Slovenian HEIs have designed a formal IQA system of their own (i.e., a formally adopted and organized collection of components, including multiple and interrelated procedures and tools), one (12,5%) has a single procedure (e.g. a programme review procedure or tool – e.g. a student evaluation survey) and one (12,5%) has *Other* type of IQA system, defined as "*an overarching quality system, defining the components, overarching processes and tools. The situation at faculty level is very diverse, ranging from option A (a formal internal quality assurance system) to option B (a number of unrelated procedures which do not yet form a system).*"

The majority of responding HEI-s (60%) established the system entirely by their own, before relevant requirements or evaluation criteria were introduced at national level (in HEA), with one HEI (20%) establishment of the system was prompted by a requirement in national legislation and with one HEI (20%) the decision to establish the system was prompted by external evaluation criteria of the national quality assurance agency.

The activities covered by QA systems are explained in *Chart 3* bellow:

Chart 3

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Teaching and learning	85,7%	6
Research	85,7%	6
Governance	71,4%	5
HEI-s that answered the question		7
HEI-s that skipped the question		2

All of the responding HEI (100%) have their own IQA Manual (obligatory for all accredited HEI's).

In accordance with agreed criteria of the SQAA, all higher education institutions and higher vocational colleges must have developed appropriate mechanisms for monitoring and improving internal quality systems (adopted rules of defined responsibilities and tasks for monitoring and improving quality, the system of self-evaluation must involve all relevant stakeholders, vertical accountability (rector, dean, the Senate, the quality commission, student council, students), must strive for continuous improvement. Self-evaluation reports must be written annually and are used as an overview and basis for all activities and decisions relating changes and improvements in the IQA systems. In the procedure of re-accreditation special attention is given to the institution's internal quality system and/or self-evaluation procedures, whether and in what way the HEI's fulfilled its plans for achieving goals or for improvement of its work, whether the applied measures were efficient, whether the measures at the level of institution and study programme are based on findings from self-evaluation, conducted surveys on satisfaction (student surveys, staff surveys, graduate surveys, etc.) or other forms of monitoring and proposals for quality improvement.

The first criteria for accreditation of higher education institutions and study programs were adopted in 2004 and all higher education institutions which were established after that date were obliged to provide the proceedings of quality assurance at the time of first accreditation procedures.

HEA often changed and supplemented in the last ten years and which also resulted in organizational and structural changes of the national body responsible for quality assurance in higher education (from the Council for Higher Education, Secretariat of the Council for Higher Education, Senate (for accreditation, for evaluation, habilitation) and the Slovenian Quality Assurance Agency). Therefore, the answers of institutions participating in the survey probably take into account only time since the establishment of the SQAA. From the responses, it is clear that the quality system is well developed at the institutional level, but can significantly vary from one unit/department/faculty to another.

The level of implementation of the IQA system in the various units of the HEIs is shown in *Chart 4* below:

Chart 4

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
All units (faculties, departments, etc.) are at the same stage of implementation	28,6%	2
Progress in the implementation varies to some extent among units	57,1%	4
Progress in the implementation varies considerably among units	14,3%	1
Any additional comments	0,0%	0
HEI-s that answered the question		**7**
HEI-s that skipped the question		**2**

Three main groups of problems are reported.

First, individual HEI-s report very diverse situation at the level of faculties because of the size of the university, lack of integration, very diverse organizational cultures, week responsiveness of teachers, in some cases also small numbers of students, lack of experience and confusion regarding the content of Quality Manual and Self-evaluation report.

Second, institutions state the lack of the support of the leadership in implementing the quality system, week responsiveness of students, subjectivity and too much time spent on administration work.

Third, institutions declare lack of incentives/resources to develop institution-wide tools and procedures, week responsiveness of employers and of graduates and poor survey response rate.

Examples of beneficial changes that have occurred after the implementation of IQA systems are presented. Positive influences can be summarized in following points:
- On teaching/learning processes;
- On achieving excellence in research;
- On improvement of internal communication system (between faculties, units, departments);
- On involvement of different stakeholders into internal QA system (experts, students, employers, graduates etc.);
- On improvement of study programmes;
- On development of new QA mechanism and revision of existing one (aiming at enhancement of quality culture, governance and management at different organizational levels, individual development, opportunities for practice and knowledge sharing);
- On quality of administrative services;

- On learning resources.

Based on the information, it is not possible to establish any relation between date of establishment of IQA system and progress in quality assurance made. Data reported at institutional level point to a state in which significant agreement with requirements has been achieved. Also, no relation between type and size of institution and beneficial changes can be seen.

The IQA systems of the respondent HEIs vary with regard to their reference to the ESG, as shown in *Chart 4* below:

Chart 5

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Refer explicitly to the ESG	0,0%	0
Refer implicitly to the ESG as they are based on national legislation / national external evaluation criteria in which the ESG are integrated	71,4%	5
Do not refer explicitly or implicitly to the ESG	14,3%	1
Other (please explain)	14,3%	1
HEI-s that answered the question		**7**
HEI-s that skipped the question		**2**
Note: 1 HEI answered with Other: Does not refer explicitly although basic criteria are very much similar		

The majority of the HEI-s (71,4%) use the current version of ESG (Part 1) as a broad guidelines for selected elements of the IQA system, 28,57% have ESG integrated into their own standards and guidelines and 14,29% as an indicative checklist to ensure broad compliance with the ESG.
It is worth mentioning that national Criteria for accreditation are explicitly in alliance to the ESG, so all HEI should refer implicitly to the ESG as they are based on national (accreditation and external evaluation) criteria in which the ESG are integrated.
The majority of the HEI-s (57,14 %) use explicit reference to the ESG made in internal quality assurance documents to familiarize its internal stakeholders (teaching staff, students, quality assurance coordinators / advisers and others) with internal quality assurance, 14, 29% undertake training events and seminars on internal quality assurance where the ESG were explicitly discussed, 14,29 % undertake training events and seminars on internal quality assurance where the ESG were not explicitly discussed, minority of institutions organized Training events and / or seminars where topics were specifically devoted to the ESG and in one case no such activities were undertaken.

INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS AND PART 1 OF THE ESG

2.1.   ESG 1.1: Policy for quality assurance
Five (83,3%) of respondent HEI-s have a published QA policy that is published and specifies structures and processes through which it is implemented, one (16,7%) has no policy or policy has not been developed yet.
Chart 6 bellow explains how external stakeholders were / are involved in development and / or implementation of HEI-s QA policy. As seen from the *Chart 6* 33,3% of HEI-s have involved external stakeholders both in the development and implementation of the policy, 33,3% HEI-s have involved external stakeholders in the development of the policy but not in its implementation and 33,3% of HEI-s have only involved external stakeholders in the implementation of QA policy.

Chart 6

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Involved in both the development and implementation of the policy	33,3%	2
involved in the development of the policy but not involved in its implementation	33,3%	2
Not Involved in the development of the policy but involved in its implementation	33,3%	2
I don't know / It is hard to say	0,0%	0
Other (please explain)	0,0%	0
HEI-s that answered the question		**6**
HEI-s that skipped the question		**3**

In the procedures of accreditation and external evaluations, and especially in the renewal procedure of accreditation of higher education institutions and study programs SQAA always verifies the involvement and participation of all stakeholders (internal and external) in the self-evaluation procedures, their involvement in changes in the educational process, participation in scientific, research, artistic and professional work, the integration of HEI with the environment and their functioning.

Responding HEI-s review their IQ policy as shown in *Chart 7* below:

Chart 7

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
On an on-going basis	16,7%	1
Every year	83,3%	5
Every two years	0,0%	0
Every three years	0,0%	0
Other (please specify)	0,0%	0
HEI-s that answered the question		**6**
HEI-s that skipped the question		**3**

2.2. ESG 1.2: Design and approval of programmes

Five of (71,4%) HEI-s answering the question have in place a formal procedure for the design of programmes in all fields of study, one of HEI-s (14,2%) has it in most fields of study and one HEI-s (14,2%) in some fields of study. Note that two HEI-s skipped the question.

In terms of observing ESGs, progress in this process can be described as follows:
- Are designed in line with the institutional strategy, mission and vision (66,6% in all fields of study, 33,3% in most fields of study);
- Are designed in line with the objectives set for them (42,8% in all fields of study, 57,2% in most fields of study);
- Are designed by involving students (16,6% in all fields of study, 50% in most fields of study, 33,3% in some fields of study);
- Are designed by involving external stakeholders (33,3% in all fields of study, 33,3% in most fields of study and 33,3% in some fields of study);

- Are designed so as to enable smooth student progression (50% in all fields of study, 50% in most fields of study);
- Define intended learning outcomes to be achieved by students (66,6% in all fields of study, 33,3% in most fields of study);
- Define the expected student workload in terms of ECTS credits (83,3% in all fields of study, 16,6% in most fields of study);
- Include student practical placements where appropriate (83,3% in all fields of study, 16,6% in most fields of study);
- Lead to clearly specified qualifications which refer to the correct level of the National Qualifications Framework (33,3% in all fields of study, 50% in most fields of study, 16,6% in some fields of study).

The extent to which HEI-s programmes apply to the statements set up in the questionnaire is also explained in the *Chart 7* bellow.

Chart 8

Answer Options	In no field of study	In some fields of study	In most fields of study	In all fields of study	Response Count
Are designed in line with the institutional strategy, mission and vision	0	0	2	4	6
Are designed in line with the objectives set for them	0	0	4	3	7
Are designed by involving students	0	2	3	1	6
Are designed by involving external stakeholders (employers and other partners)	0	2	2	2	6
Are designed so as to enable smooth student progression	0	0	3	3	6
Define intended learning outcomes to be achieved by students	0	0	2	4	6
Define the expected student workload in terms of ECTS credits	0	0	1	5	6
Include student practical placements where appropriate	0	0	1	5	6
Lead to clearly specified qualifications which refer to the correct level of the National Qualifications Framework	0	1	3	2	6
HEI-s that answered the question					**7**
HEI-s that skipped the question					**2**

In addition, HEI-s provide/have:
- Provide programmes in different modes of delivery (e.g. full- and part-time, campus-based and distance-learning) in most fields of study (71,4%);
- Offer flexible learning paths to students (e.g. individual study programmes/paths): 14,3% in all fields of study, 71,3% in most fields of study;
- Use a variety of teaching and learning methods, including those which encourage active and interactive engagement of students in their learning: 33,3% in all fields of study, 50% in most fields of study;

- Evaluates and adjust the modes of delivery of programmes on a regular basis: 66,6% in all fields of study;
- Evaluate and adjust teaching and learning methods on a regular basis: 50% in all fields of study, 33,3% in most fields of study.

The spread of the responses indicates that there exists a good understanding and substantial observance of this standard (see *Chart 8)***:**

Chart 9

Answer Options	In no field of study	In some fields of study	In most fields of study	In all fields of study	Response Count
Provides programmes in different modes of delivery (e.g. full- and part-time, campus-based and distance-learning)	0	2	5	0	7
Offers flexible learning paths to students (e.g. individual study programmes / paths)	0	3	3	1	7
Uses a variety of teaching and learning methods, including those which encourage active and interactive engagement of students in their learning	0	1	3	2	6
Evaluates and adjusts the modes of delivery of programmes on a regular basis	0	0	2	4	6
Evaluates and adjusts teaching and learning methods on a regular basis	0	1	2	3	6
HEI-s that answered the question					**7**
HEI-s that skipped question					**2**

2.3.   ESG 1.3: Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment
In terms of student-centredness, progress can be described as follows:
- Student assessment procedures, methods and criteria are published (100%);
- Procedures, methods and criteria enable assessing the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved by students (83,3%);
- A procedure to ensure consistency and fairness in student assessment is in place (50%);
- Student performance is assessed by more than one examiner where possible (16,7%);
- A procedure for student appeals is in place (83,3%).

With regard to the assessment of student achievement, required features such as consistency and fairness are realized to a great extent (3 HEI-s) and to a great extent (3 HEI-s).
The spread of the responses indicates that there exists good understanding and substantial observance of this standard.

2.4.   ESG 1.4: Student admission, progression, recognition and certification
In terms of designing and publishing regulations, progress of institutions can be described as follows:
- Regulations on student admission (in all fields of study 83,3%);
- Regulations on student progression (in all fields of study 83,3%);
- Regulations on certification / the award of diplomas and certificates (in all fields of study 100%);
- Regulations on the recognition of study periods completed at other institutions in the country and abroad (in all fields of study 66,6%);

- Regulations on the recognition of qualifications (degrees) awarded by other institutions in the country and abroad (in all fields of study 50%);
- Regulations on the recognition of non-formal and informal learning (in all fields of study 50%, in most fields of study 50%).

100% of HEI-s apply regulations consistently.

In *Chart 9* regulations for each of respondent HEI-s are listed:

Chart 10

Answer Options	In no field of study	In some fields of study	In most fields of study	In all fields of study	Response Count
Regulations on student admission	0	0	1	5	6
Regulations on student progression	0	0	1	5	6
Regulations on certification / the award of diplomas and certificates	0	0	0	6	6
Regulations on the recognition of study periods completed at other institutions in the country and abroad	0	0	2	4	6
Regulations on the recognition of qualifications (degrees) awarded by other institutions in the country and abroad	0	0	3	3	6
Regulations on the recognition of non-formal and informal learning	0	0	3	3	6
HEI-s that answered the question					**6**
HEI-s that skipped question					**3**

2.5.   ESG 1.5: Teaching staff
With regard to teaching staff, institutions guarantee the competence of the teachers.
Progress can be defined by the following 8 descriptors:
- Has in place a transparent and fair recruitment process for teaching staff (50% in all fields of study);
- Provides professional development opportunities to teaching staff (33,3% in all fields of study);
- Offers incentives to encourage professional development of teaching staff (33,3% in all fields of study);
- Offers incentives to encourage innovation in teaching (50% in all fields of study, 16,6% in no field of study);
- Offers incentives to encourage the use of new technologies in teaching (33,3% in all fields of study, 16,6% in no field of study);
- Has in place mechanisms for rewarding teaching achievements (33,3%in all fields of study);
- Regularly assesses the performance of teaching staff (66,6% in all fields of study);
- Regularly monitors teaching staff satisfaction (50% in all fields of study).

This correlation can be figured in the following chart:

Chart 11

Answer Options	In no field of study	In some fields of study	In most fields of study	In all fields of study	Response Count
a) Has in place a transparent and fair recruitment process for teaching staff	0	1	2	3	6
b) Provides professional development opportunities to teaching staff	0	2	2	2	6
c) Offers incentives to encourage professional development of teaching staff	0	2	2	2	6
d) Offers incentives to encourage innovation in teaching	1	2	0	3	6
e) Offers incentives to encourage the use of new technologies in teaching	1	2	1	2	6
f) Has in place mechanisms for rewarding teaching achievements	0	3	1	2	6
g) Regularly assesses the performance of teaching staff	0	1	1	4	6
h) Regularly monitors teaching staff satisfaction	0	1	2	3	6
HEI-s that answered the question					**6**
HEI-s that skipped question					**3**

Related to the above descriptors, the following examples can be given:

Provides professional development opportunities to teaching staff:
1. by organizing trainings for them;
2. by involving them into "in house" and external programmes;
3. by participation in seminars and training courses.

Offers incentives to encourage professional development of teaching staff
1. as a requirement for staff (in some fields) to participate in L&T trainings in order to progress academically;
2. by planning their career;
3. with financial awards.

Offers incentives to encourage innovation in teaching
1. by enabeling participation in pedagogical conferences and other events, L&T centres at some faculties;
2. by development of holistic innovation model at institution;
3. with financial awards.

Offers incentives to encourage the use of new technologies in teaching
1. by facilitating accessibility to moodle and the training for its use, flipped classroom training available (university-wide, but limited places);
2. by development of holistic innovation model at institution;
3. with new devices.

Has in place mechanisms for rewarding teaching achievements
1. "best teacher/mentor" awards;
2. by developing holistic innovation model at institution (finacial , educational ... rewards);
3. with financial awards.

Regularly monitors teaching staff satisfaction
1. implemented at some faculties, since 2015 there is a requirement to set up monitoring of employee satisfaction, there are guidelines for implementation and a tool-box made available;
2. A questionnaire for self-evaluation of the academic staff is developed;
3. The satisfaction of the teaching staff is accounted through interviews.

The spread of the responses indicates that there exists very good understanding and broad observance of this standard.

2.6. ESG 1.6: Learning resources and student support

Learning resources and student support are issues that are adequately met. Progress can be described as follows:
a) Provides academic support to its students (50% in all fields of study);
b) Provides financial support to its students (16,6 % in all fields of study, 33,3% in no field of study);
c) Provides advice and support to outgoing and incoming students (66,6% in all fields of study)
d) Has in place mechanisms for informing students about the support and services available (83,3% in all fields of study);
e) Has in place a mechanism for assessing whether learning resources are adequate and accessible (66,6% in all fields of study);
f) Has in place a mechanism for assessing whether student support is adequate and accessible (66,6% in all fields of study);
g) Has in place procedures to ensure that administrative staff are properly qualified to deliver support services to students (83,3% in all fields of study);
h) Offers professional development opportunities to administrative staff providing support services to students (33,3% in all fields of study, 16,6% in no field of study).

All these data can be shown as well in the chart below:

Chart 12

Answer Options	In no field of study	In some fields of study	In most fields of study	In all fields of study	Rating Average	Response Count
a) Provides academic support to its students	0	0	3	3	3,50	6
b) Provides financial support to its students	2	1	2	1	2,33	6
c) Provides advice and support to outgoing and incoming students	0	1	1	4	3,50	6
d) Has in place mechanisms for informing students about the support and services available	0	0	1	5	3,83	6
e) Has in place a mechanism for assessing whether learning resources are adequate and accessible	0	1	1	4	3,50	6

f) Has in place a mechanism for assessing whether student support is adequate and accessible	0	1	1	4	3,50	6
g) Has in place procedures to ensure that administrative staff are properly qualified to deliver support services to students	0	0	1	5	3,83	6
h) Offers professional development opportunities to administrative staff providing support services to students	1	0	3	2	3,00	6
HEI-s that answered the question						6
HEI-s that skipped question						3

Satisfaction of students with resources and support is measured as follows:
1. as part of university-wide student survey and part of yearly planning, reporting and self-evaluation procedure questionnaire;
2. with focus groups;
3. with anonymous survey.
No additional comments were given.

2.7.   ESG 1.7: Information management
HEI-s collect data on a regular basis. This can be described as follows in *Chart 12*:
Chart 13

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A defined set of key performance indicators for the institution	83,3%	5
Profile of the student population (e.g. age, gender, domicile; level, mode and subject of study)	66,7%	4
Student progression, success and drop-out rates	83,3%	5
Students' satisfaction with their programmes	100,0%	6
Learning resources and student support available	100,0%	6
Indicators of graduates' employability	83,3%	5
Indicators of internationalization of the institution	66,7%	4
HEI-s that answered the question		**6**
HEI-s that skipped question		**3**

83,3% of the HEI-s have a formal mechanism for analyzing and using data collected for IQA.

Examples range as follows:
1. the indicators are used in annual planning procedure, then in reporting and self-evaluation procedure. Self-evaluation results in proposals for the improvements of different fields (e.g. the library system) and then (upon discernment/reflection) feed into next planning procedure as actions;
2. the indicators are part of institutional annual plan and action plans with measures for improvement on regular basis;
3. organization of a seminar for graduation for faster completion of study, offering of extra learning hours for students with lower progression, improvement of the material conditions (Wi-Fi, software...) and informing of all stakeholders by e-news.
No additional comments were given.

2.8.   ESG 1.8: Public information

Public information is ensured in the following way:
- Full information about programmes offered, including admission criteria, full curricula, syllabuses with all names and contact details, reading lists, intended learning outcomes, qualifications awarded and student assessment procedures (66,7%);
- Only selected information about programmes offered (33,3%).

As far as national context is concerned, provision of information is regulated by the law. Institutions are obliged to provide any kind of information to an interested party (Article 3 of the Rules of invitation to subscription and implementation of enrollment in higher education, which applies to public and private HEI's with concession).

2.9.   ESG 1.9: On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes

Institutions have in place procedures for ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes (50 %) in all fields of study and 16,67% in most fields of study. But there is stated in the survey, that one HEI (16,67%) has no procedures in place for on-going monitoring and periodic review for programmes in no field of study, as it can be seen in the following chart:

Chart 14

Answer Options	In no field of study	In some fields of study	In most fields of study	In all fields of study	Rating Average	Response Count
Does your institution have in place (a) procedure(s) for on-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes?	1	1	1	3	3,00	6
HEI-s that answered the question						6
HEI-s that skipped question						3

It is worth mentioning that procedures for ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes are regulated by the SQAA's Criteria for Accreditation and External Evaluation of HEI's and Study Programmes. In addition, re-accreditation monitoring is carried out by SQAA on a regular basis.

For example, information is used as follows:

1. for the improvements of the study process, changes of ECTS, re-design of the programmes, introduction of new L&T methods, redefinition of LOs
2. for curricula improvement, syllabus improvement, staff improvement, teaching and learning methods improvement

2.10   ESG 1.10: Cyclical external quality assurance

Accreditations and external evaluations are part of the external quality assurance system in higher education and higher vocational education in Slovenia. The external QA activities of the SQAA have a clear focus on the institutions own internal policies and procedures for IQA. This are the fundamentals on which quality assessment of a higher education institutions, an individual study programmes or a higher vocational colleges are based. The annual self-evaluations, produced by the institutions, give valuable information to the SQAA in the accreditation process about the recent developments within the institutions.

Accreditations are made through: Initial accreditation of higher education institutions and/or study programmes, re-accreditation of higher education institutions and/or study programmes, External evaluation of higher vocational colleges and extraordinary evaluation.

Initial accreditation and re-accreditation can be granted for a maximum of seven years. The accreditation period can be shortened to three years or less. Extraordinary evaluation can also shorten the initial period of seven years. A condition for the re-accreditation is the external evaluation of the higher education institution or study programme, to be carried out before the expiry of accreditation validity. The accreditation procedure includes self-evaluation, an assessment and a report prepared by the expert group, and a decision of the Agency Council on granting the accreditation.

External QA can be enhanced as follows (based on the opinion of responding HEIs):

1. The evaluation should be taken out of the accreditation procedure, in order to enable it to develop past the box-ticking. Accreditation as a procedure is stifled by legislation allowing no room for enhancement dimension;
2. the procedures of the agency are burdening the HEI's as well as the agency itself and unfortunately there is a multiplication (not only duplication) of work-burden. The procedures should logically distinguish between the specific areas that need to be evaluated in each case. Unfortunately now the agency evaluates the study support for e.g. 20 study programmes of the same faculty 20-times;
3. the procedures should be aligned with their purpose;
4. the agency should take time for the participatory development of the tools, criteria and procedures. It would need to be transparent (not just involving some acquaintances form an institution and then acting like the institution participated…);
5. the agency should make sure all their administrative staff are conducting the procedures similarly - the council of the agency is in a serious need of comprehensive in-depth training (in legal matters, participatory culture, QA systems and culture and the external QA ethics, international overview…). They should improve on transparency, ensuring similar decisions in similar situations, participatory culture, developing enhancement-led policy and practical solutions that would at least start to ease the difficult situation in Slovenian HE;
6. the e-application for the accreditation procedure should be user-friendly. The collection process should be rid of multiple collection of similar data. The data-base resulting from the process should enable limited overview of the HE area (for now the data collected this way is totally un-usable;
7. once the critical situation at the agency is normalised, the agency could start acting as a driver towards the development of HE by involving HE area in the development of specific themes;
8. agency could start using the over-view of the HEIs for the counselling and support to the HEIs. The data could be used also for national policy-making;
9. take into account e-learning and its specifics;
10. with communication between institutions;
11. less administration, institutional evaluation instead of evaluation for each study programme, provide guidance on the criteria of research, appropriate structure of lecturers, monitoring of employability.

2.11. Most difficult ESG in Part 1

Only 3 HEI-s expressed their opinion regarding which ESG Standard would require further clarification and / or more detailed guidelines to be entirely clear and easily understandable to teaching staff and students. The majority of HEI-s which responded did not find difficulties in understanding and implementing the standards in Part 1 of ESG (66,7%).

Needs reported for clarification are connected with 3 standards as follows:

- ESG 1.1 Policy for quality assurance (12,5%)
- ESG 1.2 Design and approval of programmes (12,5%)
- ESG 1.8 Public information (12,5%)

The correlations are also explained in *Chart 14*.

Chart 15

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1.1 Policy for quality assurance	33,3%	1
1.2 Design and approval of programmes	33,3%	1
1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment	0,0%	0
1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification	0,0%	0
1.5 Teaching staff	0,0%	0
1.6 Learning resources and student support	0,0%	0
1.7 Information management	0,0%	0
1.8 Public information	33,3%	1
1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes	0,0%	0
1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance	0,0%	0
None	66,7%	2
HEI-s that answered the question		**3**
HEI-s that skipped question		**6**

40 % of the HEIs did not find difficulties in integrating the new standards for IQA in their institutional IQA systems. As the most difficult to apply in their IQA system the following standards are pointed out:
- ESG 1.1 Policy for Quality Assurance (20%)
- ESG 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment (12,5%)
- ESG 1.6 Learning resources and student support (40%)

In *Chart 15* the responses are figured:

Chart 16

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1.1 Policy for quality assurance	20,0%	1
1.2 Design and approval of programmes	0,0%	0
1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment	20,0%	1
1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification	0,0%	0
1.5 Teaching staff	0,0%	0
1.6 Learning resources and student support	40,0%	2
1.7 Information management	0,0%	0
1.8 Public information	0,0%	0
1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes	0,0%	0
None	40,0%	2
HEI-s that answered the question		**5**
HEI-s that skipped question		**4**

3. CONCLUSIONS
- *IQA General:*

SQAA has been externally evaluated in 2013 and 2014 for the purpose of inclusion in the EQAR and full membership in ENQA. Both external evaluations have stated a fully compliance with majority of ESG's and substantial compliance with small number of standards.

Constant improvement of external quality assurance system of the agency is a priority for its future operations. Indeed, Agency's self-evaluation reports for 2013 and 2014 show that the main opportunities for improvement are aimed at further development of the IQA (lowering bureaucratic

barriers in terms of writing and submitting applications for accreditation and external evaluation – in this concern development and implementation of Agency's own information system eNakvis; preparation of guidelines for writing self-evaluation reports, commitment to continuous improvement of Agency's functioning with providing additional interpretation of the criteria for accreditation, assessment and decision-making; continuous improvement of training program for SQAA experts, preparation of guidelines for the equal participation of people with disabilities in the educational process and preparation of starting points for assessment of different forms of e-learning and open education. Most of the challenges were also raised in the survey.

- ***ESG:*** *Progress made*
We note that Slovenia has a well-developed external quality assurance system that encourages and takes into account in particular the development of internal quality systems of higher education institutions. This systems are constantly (regularly) monitored and improved. The fact is that most of the problems which higher education institutions are facing by establishing effective internal quality system are also recognized in the Agency's self-evaluation report. Ways to improve the situation have already been identified. Key issues raised by the higher education institutions in establishing IQA are divided into five sections:
- First, individual HEI-s reported the lack of resources (for different study process, trainings, IT support), difficulties of full implementation of student-centered learning;
- Second, institutions state the lack of focus in favor of research, not teaching, full implementation of constant assessment;
- Third, institutions declare issues regarding justified fear of using subjective feedbacks, which can be used for T&L improvements, as quasi-subjective tool, on-going monitoring involving all parts, lack of stimulation;
- Fourth, additional problems are identified in capacity issue – teachers overburdened already, and with mechanisms for on-going staff development;
- Fifth, danger of over-regulating instead of enabling, encouraging, approving of programmes.

SQAA is aware that in order to ensure further development of IQA, higher education institutions have to be relieved from overburdened administrative procedures, so we are striving for an early transition to institutional re-accreditation and for establishment of Agency's own information system, which will eliminate the multiplication of administrative burdens, improve the user's experience and enable faster and more efficient exchange of good practices in the field of IQA.

- ***ESG****: Accents*
HEI's have IQA systems in place which function uniformly for all faculties. Between faculties and especially on departments and units levels practices may vary. Partial lack of consistency is due to inexperience, high number of study programmes, overburdened teachers and administrative requirements.

Students are systematically involved in EQA and IQA (e.g. in experts groups and in bodies of the HEI and of the Agency) and student-centered learning in theory is well understood. The actual implementation of this range of issues is to be addressed more fully.
Also external stakeholders are involved in IQA, but the actual level of involvement varies between institutions. This is an ongoing process and SQAA has made significant progress in this respect. Also international experts are involved in accreditation and external evaluation procedures.

- **ESG**: *Standards which are not entirely clear*

In some cases responders have expressed a need for clarification of standards:
- 1.1 Policy for quality assurance;
- 1.2 Design and approval of the programmes;
- 1.8 Public information.

No further information has been given from interviewees regarding above mentioned standards.

HEI's do not find difficulties in integrating the new standards for IQA in their own IQA systems. In line with the above mentioned concerns, HEI's report the following standards as difficult to apply in their IQA systems:
- ESG 1.1 Policy for quality assurance (20%)
- ESG 1.3 Student centered learning, teaching and assessment (20%)
- ESG 1.6 Learning resources and student support (40%)

- **Agency's methodology**: *Any conclusions concerning possible improvements in the agency's methodology for the assessment of IQA;*

In their responses higher education institutions highlighted several improvements in the Agency's methodology, which relate in particular to:

- Unifying the standards of conduct of proceedings, assessment and decision-making;
- Training of the SQAA Council members, for more consistent decision-making;
- Reducing the number of procedures, especially in the case of a re-accreditation of study programmes (transition to institutional re-accreditation);
- The data collecting procedures should exclude multiplication of similar data, the e-application for the accreditation procedure should be more user-friendly;
  - taking e-learning and its specifics into account.

- **Other**: *N/A*

- **Other, EIQAS Seminar & Guide**: *Aspects of IQA systems and ESG which should be given special attention at the Training Seminar and in the Guide to IQA;*
  Interpretation of 10 standards of Part 1
  Interpretation of guidelines to standards of Part 1
  Discussion of the notion of "IQA system"
  Discussion of the notion of "quality culture"
  Discussion of the notion of "compliance with an ESG standard"
  Discussion of relationship between ESG and current national evaluation and accreditation criteria

Annex 1

INTRODUCTION

The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (European Standards and Guidelines, ESG), developed by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), provide a common framework for quality assurance of learning and teaching at European, national and institutional levels. They were adopted by the Ministers responsible for higher education as part of the Bologna Process in 2005. A revised version of the ESG (https://revisionesg.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/esg-draft-endoresed-by-bfug.pdf) was endorsed by the Bologna Follow-Up Group in September 2014 and is expected to be approved by the Ministers in May 2015. Like the current version, the revised ESG include three interrelated parts: Part 1 – Internal quality assurance; Part 2 – External quality assurance; Part 3 – Quality assurance agencies.

This survey is a key initial activity in the Erasmus+ Strategic Partnership project 'Enhancing internal quality assurance systems' (EIQAS), approved for funding in autumn 2014. It involves Poland as the coordinating country, Bulgaria, Portugal and Slovenia. EIQAS is a joint initiative of national quality assurance agencies and Rectors' Conferences and / or higher education institutions (HEIs). It aims to support HEIs in further development of their internal quality assurance systems based on Part 1 of the ESG and national agencies in further development of their methodologies for external evaluation of internal quality assurance systems at HEIs, thus addressing one of the standards in Part 2 of the ESG. For more details about EIQAS, see the project website at: http://www.eiqas.com.

The survey focuses exclusively on internal quality assurance at HEIs in the context of Part 1 of the ESG. It is being conducted in parallel among HEIs in the four countries participating in EIQAS. As EIQAS is forward looking, the survey is based on the draft of the revised ESG which, however, overlap to a large extent with the current version of the ESG. The survey aims to collect data on the extent to which Part 1 ESG are integrated in internal quality assurance systems at HEIs, and the problems HEIs have faced or may face when integrating the ESG into their internal quality assurance systems. Survey findings will feed into an EIQAS Training Seminar for HEIs to be held in spring 2015. Together with suggestions and conclusions from the seminar, they will also be used to develop a Guide to Internal Quality Assurance based on Part 1 of the ESG available to all interested HEIs.

Aside from introductory questions about the institution and the respondent completing the questionnaire, the questionnaire includes 38 (30 close-ended / multiple choice and 8 open-ended) questions. It is divided into two parts: general questions (Section I) and more specific questions (Section II) about internal quality assurance systems and the ESG. All questions in Section I and a number of questions in Section II refer to the level of the institution as a whole; where differences between fields of study may be relevant in other questions, this is reflected in multiple choice answers. The questions in Section II are structured according to Standards of Part 1 of the ESG; thus, each set of questions begins with the relevant Standard as it is phrased in the draft of the revised ESG. The questions refer only to basic issues covered by Part 1 Standards and are intended to collect mainly quantitative data; each Standard will be discussed in greater depth at the Training Seminar in spring 2015.

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE INSTITUTION AND THE RESPONDENT

1. Where is your institution located?
   a) Bulgaria   b) Poland   c)Portugal   d)Slovenia

2. When was your institution established? ……….. (year)

3. What is the type of your higher education institution? Please tick the boxes that apply to your institution.
   a) University-type   b) Non-university   c) Public   d) Non-public

4. What is the size of your higher education institution? Please tick the appropriate box.
   a) Less than 300 students   b) 300-1 000 students   c) 1 000-5 000 students
   d) 5 000-15 000 students   e) 15 000-25 000 students   f) 25 000-35 000 students
   g) 35 000-45 000 students h) Over 45 000 students

5. What is your function / position at your institution? ……………………………………………………

6. How long have you been involved in quality assurance at your institution? Since ……..… (year)

7. Are you filling in the questionnaire individually or in consultation with colleagues at your institution? Please tick the appropriate box.

   a) Individually   b) In consultation with colleagues

8. What stage has your institution reached in the implementation of its internal quality assurance system? Please tick the appropriate box. Our institution has in place:
   a) A formal internal quality assurance **system** (i.e. a formally adopted and organised collection of components, including multiple and interrelated procedures and tools)
   b) A number of unrelated procedures which do not yet form a system
   c) A single procedure (e.g. a programme review procedure) or tool (e.g. a student evaluation survey)
   d) Other. Please explain: …

   If you ticked "b", "c" or "d", please go to Question 6.

9. When did your institution start establishing a **formal internal quality assurance system** (as defined in the previous question, and **not only** individual and / or unrelated procedures or tools)? Please tick the appropriate box.
   a) Before 2000
   b) Between 2000 and 2005
   c) Between 2006 and 2011
   d) Between 2012 and 2014

10 What prompted your institution to establish a **formal internal quality assurance system**? Please tick the appropriate box.

a) The system had been established entirely on our own initiative before relevant requirements or evaluation criteria were introduced at national level.
b) The decision to establish the system was prompted by a requirement in national legislation.
c) The decision to establish the system was prompted by external evaluation criteria of the national quality assurance agency,
d) The decision to establish the system was prompted by a requirement in national legislation <u>and</u> external evaluation criteria of the national quality assurance agency.
e) Other. Please specify: ……………….

11 What areas of activity does the internal quality assurance system (or, in case a formal system is not yet in place, do the internal quality assurance arrangements) at your institution cover? Please tick all boxes that apply to your institution.

a) Teaching and learning
b) Research
c) Governance

12 Does your institution have a Quality Manual / Handbook providing details about its internal quality assurance system? Please tick the appropriate box.

a) Yes   b) No

13 How would you describe the progress in the implementation of the internal quality assurance system (or, in case a formal system is not yet in place, in the implementation of individual procedures) across your institution? Please tick the appropriate box.

a) All units (faculties, departments, etc.) are at the same stage of implementation.
b) Progress in the implementation varies to some extent among units.
c) Progress in the implementation varies considerably among units.

14 Please describe briefly three main problems that your institution encountered when developing and / or establishing its internal quality assurance system (or individual procedures in case a formal system is not yet in place).

1. ……….
2. ……….
3. ……….

15 Please give three examples of beneficial qualitative and / or quantitative changes or innovative practice that have been introduced on the basis of evidence collected through your internal quality assurance system (or individual procedures if a formal system is not yet in place).

1. ……….
2. ……….
3. ……….

16 Do internal quality assurance documents of your institution refer to the ESG? Please tick the appropriate box.

a) Refer explicitly to the ESG
b) Refer implicitly to the ESG as they are based on national legislation / national external evaluation criteria in which the ESG are integrated
c) Do not refer explicitly or implicitly to the ESG
d) Other. Please explain: …….

17 How does your institution use the current version of Part 1 of the ESG in its internal quality assurance? Please tick the appropriate box.

   a) As a strict checklist to ensure full compliance with the ESG
   b) As an indicative checklist to ensure broad compliance with the ESG
   c) As broad guidelines for selected elements of the internal quality assurance system
   d) ESG integrated into the institution's own standards and guidelines
   e) ESG not used at all

18 What activities has your institution undertaken to familiarise its internal stakeholders (teaching staff, students, quality assurance coordinators / advisers and others) with internal quality assurance and / or Part 1 of the ESG? You may choose one or more answer(s).

   a) Training events and / or seminars on internal quality assurance where the ESG were explicitly discussed
   b) Training events and / or seminars on internal quality assurance where the ESG were not explicitly discussed
   c) Training events and / or seminars specifically devoted to the ESG
   d) Link to the ESG provided on the institution's (quality assurance) website
   e) Explicit reference to the ESG made in internal quality assurance documents
   f) Other. Please specify: …..
   g) No activities undertaken

PART II: SPECIFIC QUESTIONNES ON ESG PART 1

> ***ESG Standard 1.1: Policy for quality assurance:*** *Institutions should have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.*

19 Does your institution have a policy for quality assurance that is published and specifies structures and processes through which it is implemented? Please tick the appropriate box.
   a) A published policy that specifies structures and processes
   b) A published policy that does not specify structures and processes
   c) A policy that specifies structures and processes but is not published
   d) No policy / Policy not yet developed
   e) Other, please explain: ……………………………………..

If you ticked "d", please go to Question 23.

20 Were / are external stakeholders (employers and / or other external partners) involved in the development and / or implementation of your institution's quality assurance policy? Please tick the appropriate box.
   a) Involved in both the development and implementation of the policy
   b) involved in the development of the policy but not involved in its implementation
   c) Not Involved in the development of the policy but involved in its implementation
   d) I don't know / It is hard to say
   e) Other. Please explain: ….

21 Does your institution review its quality assurance policy? Please tick the appropriate box.
   a) Yes   b) No

If you ticked "No", please go to Question 23.

22 How often does your institution review its quality assurance policy? Please tick the appropriate box.

a) On an on-going basis
b) Every year
c) Every two years
d) Every three years
e) Other. Please specify: ……….

ESG Standard 1.2: Design and approval of programmes: Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.

---

23 Does your institution have in place (a) procedure(s) for the design and / or approval of programmes? Please tick the most appropriate answer in points "a" and "b". Our institution:

a) Has in place a formal procedure for the design of programmes
   In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study
b) Has in place a formal procedure for the approval of programmes
   In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

24 To what extent do the statements below apply to your institution? Please tick the most appropriate answer In each of the points below. Programmes at our institution:

a) Are designed in line with the institutional strategy, mission and vision
   In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study
b) Are designed in line with the objectives set for them
   In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study
c) Are designed by involving students
   In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study
d) Are designed by involving external stakeholders (employers and other partners)
   In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study
e) Are designed so as to enable smooth student progression
   In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study
f) Define intended learning outcomes to be achieved by students
   In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study
g) Define the expected student workload in terms of ECTS credits
   In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study
h) Include student practical placements where appropriate
   In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study
i) Lead to clearly specified qualifications which refer to the correct level of the National Qualifications Framework
   In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

---

ESG Standard 1.3: Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment: Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach.

---

25 To what extent do the statements below apply to your institution? Please tick the most appropriate answer in each of the points below. Our institution:

a) Provides programmes in different modes of delivery (e.g. full- and part-time, campus-based and distance-learning)

In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

b) Offers flexible learning paths to students (e.g. individual study programmes / paths)

In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

c) Uses a variety of teaching and learning methods, including those which encourage active and interactive engagement of students in their learning

In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

d) Evaluates and adjusts the modes of delivery of programmes on a regular basis

In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

e) Evaluates and adjusts teaching and learning methods on a regular basis

In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

26 Which of the statements below apply to your institution? You may tick <u>no, one or more</u> answer(s). If you tick "c", please additionally choose one of the answers available.

a) Student assessment procedures, methods and criteria are published

b) Procedures, methods and criteria enable assessing the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved by students

c) A procedure to ensure consistency and fairness in student assessment is in place

In your opinion, to what extent are consistency and fairness achieved through the procedure in place?

To no extent – To a little extent – To some extent – To a great extent –To a very great extent

d) Student performance is assessed by more than one examiner where possible

e) A procedure for student appeals is in place

ESG Standard 1.4: Student admission, progression, recognition and certification: *Institutions should consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student "life cycle", e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification.*

---

27 Which of the regulations concerning student admission, progression, recognition and certification listed below are published by your institution? You may tick <u>no, one or more</u> answer(s).

a) Regulations on student admission

b) Regulations on student progression

c) Regulations on certification / the award of diplomas and certificates

d) Regulations on the recognition of study periods completed at other institutions in the country and abroad

e) Regulations on the recognition of qualifications (degrees) awarded by other institutions in the country and abroad

f) Regulations on the recognition of non-formal and informal learning

28 Does your institution have in place (a) procedure(s) to ensure that the regulations concerning admission, progression, recognition and certification are applied consistently? Please tick the appropriate box.

a) Yes   b) No

ESG Standard 1.5: Teaching staff: *Institutions should assure themselves of the competence of their teachers. They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff.*

---

29 Which of the statements below apply to your institution? You may tick <u>no, one or more</u> answer(s). Our institution:

   a) Has in place a transparent and fair recruitment process for teaching staff
   b) Provides professional development opportunities to teaching staff
   c) Offers incentives to encourage professional development of teaching staff
   d) Offers incentives to encourage innovation in teaching
   e) Offers incentives to encourage the use of new technologies in teaching
   f) Has in place mechanisms for rewarding teaching achievements
   g) Regularly assesses the performance of teaching staff
   h) Regularly monitors teaching staff satisfaction

30 If you ticked "b", "c", "d", "e", "f" and / or "h" above, please give at least one example of professional development opportunities available and / or each type of (financial, promotion-related or other) incentive or mechanisms used.

   a) For "b" above: ……….
   b) For "c" above: ……….
   c) For "d" above: ……….
   d) For "e" above: ……….
   e) For "f" above: ……….
   f) For 'h" above: ……….

ESG Standard 1.6: Learning resources and student support: *Institutions should have appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and ensure that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided.*

---

31 Which of the statements below apply to your institution? You may tick <u>no, one or more</u> answer(s). Our institution:

   a) Provides academic support to its students
   b) Provides financial support to its students
   c) Provides advice and support to outgoing and incoming students
   d) Has in place mechanisms for informing students about the support and services available
   e) Has in place a mechanism for assessing whether learning resources are adequate and accessible
   f) Has in place a mechanism for assessing whether student support is adequate and accessible
   g) Has in place procedures to ensure that administrative staff are properly qualified to deliver support services to students
   h) Offers professional development opportunities to administrative staff providing support services to students

   32 If you ticked "e" and / or "f" above, please explain briefly how you measure the satisfaction of students with the learning resources and / or student support available? ….

ESG Standard 1.7: Information management: *Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.*

---

33 What kind of data does your institution collect on a regular basis? You may tick <u>no, one or more</u> answer(s).

   a) A defined set of key performance indicators for the institution
   b) Profile of the student population (e.g. age, gender, domicile; level, mode and subject of study)

    c) Student progression, success and drop-out rates
    d) Students' satisfaction with their programmes
    e) Learning resources and student support available
    f) Indicators of graduates' employability
    g) Indicators of internationalisation of the institution
    h) Other, please specify:
        1) ……….
        2) ……….
        3) ……….
        4) ……….
        5) ……….

34 Does your institution have a formal mechanism for analysing and using the data collected for quality improvement or enhancement purposes? Please tick the appropriate box.

    a) Yes   b) No

If you ticked "No", please go to Question 36.

35 Please give some examples of how the data collected has been used for quality improvement or enhancement purposes …..

ESG Standard 1.8: Public information: *Institutions should publish information about their activities, including programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible.*

36 Does your institution publish information about its programmes and graduate employment? Please tick the answer(s) that apply to your institution.

    a) Full information about programmes offered, including admission criteria, full curricula, syllabuses with all names and contact details, reading lists, intended learning outcomes, qualifications awarded and student assessment procedures
    b) Only selected information about programmes offered
       Please specify: …….
    c) No information about programmes
    d) Information about graduate employment

ESG Standard 1.9: On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes: *Institutions should monitor and periodically review their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society. These reviews should lead to continuous improvement of the programme. Any action planned or taken as a result should be communicated to all those concerned.*

37 Does your institution have in place (a) procedure(s) for on-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes? Please tick the most appropriate answer.

    In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

    If you ticked "In no field of study", please go to Question 41.

38 Please give some examples of how the evidence collected through your programme monitoring and / or review procedure(s) has been used …

39 How are students involved in the programme monitoring and / or review procedure at your institution? Please tick the most appropriate answer in points "a" to "e" below. Any additional ways of student involvement can be briefly described in point "f".

   a) Are involved as full members of bodies responsible for programme monitoring and / or review
       In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

   b) Fill in course evaluation surveys
       In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

   c) Regularly receive feedback on findings from course evaluation surveys
       In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

   d) Are regularly informed about measures to be taken as a result of course evaluation surveys
       In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

   e) Propose measures to improve curricula and / or teaching / learning methods
       In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

   f) Other. Please specify: …..

40 How are external stakeholders (employers and / or other partners) involved in the programme monitoring and / or review procedure at your institution? Please tick the most appropriate answer in points "a" to "c" below. Any additional ways of external stakeholder involvement can be briefly described in point "d".

   a) Are involved as full members of bodies responsible for programme monitoring and / or review
       In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

   b) Are involved as members of advisory / consultative bodies
       In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

   c) Provide feedback on the knowledge, skills and competences of graduates employed (e.g. as part of employers' surveys)
       In no field of study– In some fields of study– In most fields of study– In all fields of study

   d) Other. Please specify: …..

> **ESG Standard 1.10: Cyclical external quality assurance:** *Institutions should undergo external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis.*

41 In your opinion, does the external evaluation methodology (procedures and / or criteria) of the national quality assurance agency in your country encourage or hamper the development / enhancement of internal quality assurance at HEIs? Please tick the appropriate box.

   a) Encourages the development / enhancement of internal quality assurance
   b) Hinders the development / enhancement of internal quality assurance
   c) To some extent encourages and to some extent hinders the development / enhancement of internal quality assurance
   d) Neither encourages nor hinders the development / enhancement of internal quality assurance

42 Please explain briefly how the external evaluation methodology of the national quality assurance agency in your country could be improved / enhanced?

_____

43 In your opinion, which of ESG 1.1 to 1.10 addressed above would require further clarification and / or more detailed guidelines (in addition to those provided by ENQA under each Standard; full text of the ESG available at: (https://revisionesg.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/esg-draft-endoresed-

by-bfug.pdf) to be entirely clear and easily understandable to teaching staff and students? You may choose <u>one or more</u> answers:

a) 1.1   b) 1.2   c) 1.3   d) 1.4   e) 1.5   f) 1.6   g) 1.7   h) 1.8   i) 1.9   j) 1.10   k) None

44   Which of ESG 1.1 to 1.9 addressed above are or would be difficult to apply / integrate into your institution's internal quality assurance system? You may choose <u>one or more</u> answers:

a) 1.1   b) 1.2   c) 1.3   d) 1.4   e) 1.5   f) 1.6   g) 1.7   h) 1.8   i) 1.9   j) None

45 Please indicate five main problems which you have encountered or may encounter in integrating these standards into your system / applying these standards .....

      a.   ……….
      b.   ……….
      c.   ……….
      d.   ……….
      e.   ……….

OTHER COMMENTS (any other additional comments that you may wish to make regarding the questions in Section I and / or II of the questionnaire or related issues): …..

<div align="center">

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME!

</div>