

EIQAS

ENHANCING INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS

ERASMUS+ PROJECT

2014 - 2016



**REPORT ON
DRAFT FRAMEWORK
FOR THE FURTHER
INTERCULTURAL TRAINING OF EXPERTS
AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR EXCHANGE OF EXPERTS OF
QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) AGENCIES**



Univerza v Ljubljani



This publication has been funded by the European Commission as part of the Erasmus+ programme. The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views of the authors only, and neither the Commission nor the National Agency of the Erasmus+ programme can be held responsible for any use, which may be made of the information contained herein.

FREE PUBLICATION

Table of Content

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Part 1 Framework for the further intercultural training of experts..... | 5 |
| 1. Introduction..... | 5 |
| 2. Starting Point..... | 6 |
| 2.1. ECA tools..... | 7 |
| 2.2. ENQA tools..... | 7 |
| 2.3. EUA activities..... | 7 |
| 3. Methodology..... | 7 |
| 4. The experiment of intercultural training in the EIQAS project..... | 8 |
| 5. The results: standard by standard..... | 9 |
| ESG 1.1. Policy for quality assurance..... | 9 |
| ESG 1.2. Design and approval of programmes..... | 10 |
| ESG 1.3. Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment..... | 11 |
| ESG 1.4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification..... | 12 |
| ESG 1.5. Teaching staff..... | 13 |
| ESG 1.6. Learning resources and student support..... | 13 |
| ESG 1.7. Information management..... | 14 |
| ESG 1.8. Public information..... | 15 |
| ESG 1.9. On-going monitoring and periodic reviews of programmes..... | 15 |
| ESG 1.10. Cyclical external quality assurance..... | 16 |
| 6. A critical analysis of the results of the workshops..... | 16 |
| Part 2 Working arrangements which QA agencies may adopt for future exchange of experts..... | 18 |
| | |
| Annexes..... | 24 |
| Annex 1 Training Event 1 Warsaw, Poland, 26 th - 30 th June 2015..... | 25 |
| General description SEMINAR ON IQA & ESG PART 1..... | 25 |
| Programme..... | 26 |
| Parallel workshops scenario (27 th of June)..... | 28 |
| Annex 2 Training Event 2 Ljubljana, Slovenia, 7 th - 11 th December 2015..... | 31 |
| Programme STUDENT TRAINING ON IQA & ESG PART 1..... | 31 |
| Annex 3 Training Event 3 Lisboa, Portugal (A3ES), 18 th - 22 nd January 2016..... | 34 |
| Programme..... | 35 |
| Parallel workshops scenario (18 th of January)..... | 38 |
| Workshop 1. (18 th of January) Preparing the site - visits of day 2. Questions..... | 38 |
| Outcome of Workshop 1: questions to the HEIs..... | 41 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Workshop 2. (20 th of January) Have you got the answers? | |
| Positive and negative aspects of each HEI visited. How are IQAS delivering?..... | 46 |
| Outcome of Workshop 2: Have you got the answers? | |
| Positive and negative aspects of each HEI visited..... | 49 |
| Workshop 3. (20 th of January) IQAS and the Standards..... | 60 |
| Workshop 4. (20 th of January) Playing our role 1 st round..... | 63 |
| Workshop 5. (20 th of January) Playing our role 2 nd round..... | 64 |
| Workshop 6. (21 st of January) The magic stick workshop: | |
| The link between IQAS and the QA of teaching and learning. How are IQAS delivering?..... | 65 |

Authors: Madalena Fonseca, A3ES / Izabela Kwiatkowska-Sujka, PKA

Editorial Board: Madalena Fonseca, A3ES; Izabela Kwiatkowska-Sujka, PKA; Klemen Šubic, Jernej Širok, SQAA; Mila Penelova, Todor Shopov, Hristina Savova, NEAA¹

¹ List of used abbreviations:

A3ES Agência de Avaliação e Acreditação do Ensino Superior, Portugal

PKA Polish Accreditation Committee, Poland

NEAA National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency, Bulgaria

SQAA Slovenian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, Slovenia

Part 1 Framework for the further intercultural training of experts

1. Introduction

Quality Assurance Agencies (QAAs) in Europe are collaborating closer and closer, through various types of partnerships, as is the case with formal associations such as EUA, ENQA, EURASHE, EQAR, CEENQA or ECA and other arrangements for special projects with the aim of developing common Quality Assurance (QA) tools and methodologies.

Internationalisation is therefore currently a major strand in the accreditation agencies in Europe. The Erasmus+ project 'Enhancing Internal Quality Assurance Systems' – EIQAS - is one example of such initiatives and ran from 2014 to the end of 2016. EIQAS is a joint initiative of QAAs, rectors' conferences and HEIs of four countries: Poland (co-ordinator), Portugal, Bulgaria and Slovenia.

The originality of EIQAS approach and its potential added value to QA in Europe lies in the quest for a common understanding of the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) and on the intercultural awareness of internal quality assurance (IQA) with the development of common methodologies for external quality assurance (EQA) and transparent information provision by the different stakeholders (HEIs, students, QAAs, experts, etc.).

One of the core activities of the EIQAS project were the training events that took place in three different countries from the partners of the consortium and were targeted to three different types of stakeholders; namely higher education institutions, students and external experts.

This reporting guide has been developed with the aim of designing a framework for the intercultural training of external experts for external quality assurance processes and includes the methodology and the results of the intercultural training activities of the project.

The guide for the intercultural training of experts is also expected to disseminate some innovative outputs of the EIQAS project that can be applied elsewhere.

During the training events of the EIQAS project intensive discussions on the partner Agencies' methodologies for the assessment of IQA took place and, where possible, participants arrived at a common understanding of Part 1 of the ESG and identified key issues and features of best and innovative practice in IQA.

The EIQAS project had two main objectives. One of them was to increase the capacity of HEIs in the participating countries to develop IQA and build a quality culture by enhancing their awareness and understanding of Part 1 of the ESG and thereby identifying, developing and disseminating good innovative practice in internal quality assurance.

The second objective of EIQAS was to increase the capacity of the participating QA agencies in EQA by comparing their methodologies for the assessment of internal quality assurance and exchanging and developing good practice in IQA assessment. A reference framework for a comparative analysis of IQA assessment methodologies was developed at the beginning of the project. Later, the partners had the opportunity for face-to-face discussions and in-depth comparative analysis of the Agencies' methodologies. Conclusions provided the basis for a comparative report on IQA assessment methodologies posted on the website of the project. Agencies which had not worked closely together prior to this gained a good opportunity to get to know each other better with a view to initiating exchange of experts and concluding bilateral cooperation or recognition agreements in the future.

2. Starting Point

The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) are considered the most important milestone in the recent development of QA systems. Launched in 2005, they cover internal and external QA and QA in the accreditation agencies (QAAs). Ten years after the launch of the ESG, in July 2015, a revised version was approved at Yerevan, Armenia. The ESG are, as the name indicates, guidelines or references, subject to custom applications.

Quality, however, is still not an easy concept when it comes to QA in HE; there are different understandings of the concept of quality, not only by the different stakeholders, but throughout individual higher education institutions, countries or even regions. The perception of “quality” varies among stakeholders and across scientific areas. Stakeholders are also very diverse; such as in the case of students and so the perception of “quality” varies also inside groups of stakeholders.

Within Europe, the tendency and the actual practice in the accreditation processes is that the evaluation panels should include an expert from abroad. Therefore, intercultural training makes it easier for the exchange of foreign experts in the evaluation panels. In fact, one of the essential parts of each Quality Assurance Agency is a group of well-trained independent experts who perform the external evaluations at the HEIs. Those experts include academics, professionals and students. The main advantage of the intercultural training events is the exchange of good practices between the experts from different European QAAs, the representatives of the HEI’s, and students.

The main output of the EIQAS project is the GUIDE to IQA published on the website of the project as an ebook. The GUIDE to IQA should be considered a roadmap for further training events and is the point of departure for the present framework for the intercultural training of experts.

In fact, one of the most praised results of the EIQAS project was the development of an intercultural approach on IQA and EQA and, in this context, the framework is a complement to the GUIDE to IQA. This framework includes examples and suggestions for the organisation of the intercultural component of the training of experts for QAAs. The Annexes of this framework include not only the forms and programmes of the training events, but also some outputs of the working groups of the intercultural workshops organised for the discussions. This material should be considered quasi-confidential because most of it corresponds to texts that were elaborated in a short space of time during the workshops, rather than worked out afterwards. They should be taken as examples of the outputs that can be expected from such a programme. Participation of all stakeholders and trainees was critical and the outputs are a good mirror of the very dynamic discussions that took place. Most of the workshops were quite turbulent and the participants had some difficulty fitting in time for coffee breaks. By publishing this material, we aim to inspire others and lead by example.

It is worthwhile to note that this framework is also a complement to other experts’ trainings schemes and does not correspond to a complete training package in its own right.

All QAAs in Europe organise their own training and briefing of experts. Associations of QAAs and similar institutions, (as is the case of ECA, ENQA or EUA, among others) also organise training for different stakeholders and accreditation processes. The present tool (the framework for intercultural training) should be used to develop specific modules to be incorporated in the other training programmes.

There are several types of training for the different stakeholders and for the different types of assessments: ex-ante accreditation of programmes; regular accreditation and re-accreditation of programmes; institutional (or system) accreditation; and audits or certification of internal quality assurance systems, among others. Each training programme has to be designed taking into account the target group, the type of assessment, the national legal frameworks and the guidelines in use in the different QAAs.

Global training programmes and schemes can be found in the websites of those institutions. Below are some examples.

2.1. ECA tools

The European Consortium for Accreditation – ECA – developed a Portal for the organisation of training for experts, that includes several tools in the form of publications:

- ECA Guide to Good Practices for Training of Experts
- ECA Guidelines for Training of Experts
- Recommendations for training of experts
- ECA Handbook for the Training of Panel Members

The publication “ECA Guidelines for Training of Experts” is the outcome of the ECA's E-TRAIN project and presents guidelines and advice on the way forward in the development of the ECA's training of experts that take part in external quality assurance procedures.

[Http://ecahe.eu/w/images/c/ce/ECA Publication - Guidelines for Training of Experts.pdf](http://ecahe.eu/w/images/c/ce/ECA_Publication_-_Guidelines_for_Training_of_Experts.pdf)

2.2. ENQA tools

The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), in association with EQUAR, offers regular training of experts for various types of assessments and accreditation as well as different stakeholders:

<http://www.enqa.eu/index.php/reviews/training-of-experts/>

2.3. EUA activities

The European University Association (EUA) also offers several tools, research results and organises activities to support experts' training.

<http://www.eua.be/activities-services>

3. Methodology

The EIQAS project included 3 training events; one for representatives of the HEIs, the second for student experts involved in QA and the third one for experts (academics and professionals). There were approximately 40 participants per event; one or two representatives of the involved stakeholders per country and project partner and other local guests from the same stakeholders type.

Each event took 5 days and included several workshops with interactive parallel sessions in working groups (WG) encouraging people to engage in discussion and share their views on Part 1 ESG.

Each workshop gathered together representatives from the four countries in order to facilitate an intercultural experiment during each session. Participants moved from one workshop to another in several rounds of sessions in such a fashion that there were representatives of the four countries in all the sessions and across all the working groups.

Annex 1, 2 and 3 correspond to the Programmes and Guidelines for the Parallel workshops, of the three training events of EIQAS.

Each round of each workshop had a rapporteur, selected among the participants belonging to the partners of the project. The main goals of the workshops were to enrich the quantitative research which was conducted as an online survey on Part 1 of the ESG and to gather stakeholders' perceptions through the contributions of the participants.

Going through the standards, one by one, the perceptions gathered on the intercultural workshops of the training events of the project were analysed in a critical way and confronted with the tools and methodologies of the QAAs of the different countries in order to enrich the Guide to IQA as the main output of the project.

The project partners developed a set of focus questions that structured the different intercultural workshops of the training events for the different stakeholders:

1. What is the most important/crucial part of a given standard/or guidelines having a potential impact on the quality enhancement/or on the development of quality culture?
2. What are the main obstacles in the implementation of given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?
3. What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI and why?
4. Do you identify any good practice in relation to a given standard?

In a broader sense the focus questions should have been considered as a general framework for experts' reflections stimulated during the workshops. The questions were also intended to enhance discussion among participants of workshops as well as allowing them to exchange their experiences and views. Workshops' rapporteurs/moderators were responsible for facilitating the discussion on each standard of ESG by giving a helpful hand whenever it was needed. Additionally, the rapporteurs of each workshop had a "Moderators check sheet" in the guise of a guideline form to document the results of the discussion, deliver to the coordinators and present on a general meeting of the event (Annex 1 and 3). It should be noted that the workshops concept relied on a brainstorming and benchmarking approach to training that was rather softly guided by moderators. The intercultural aspects were emphasised in the process of training to build awareness of similarities and differences in understanding the same standards of ESG 2015.

Two training events of the EIQAS project included a site visit to several HEIs and the participation in a role-playing experience (Annex 2 and 3). This was rooted in learning by doing methods of teaching that were intended to stimulate the active participation of trainees in all activities. Practice was a core approach to the training of experts. Furthermore, it required teamwork activity in the international and intercultural provisions. The results of those training events were therefore more comprehensive in what concerns the perceptions of the stakeholders.

4. The experiment of intercultural training in the EIQAS project

Overall, considering the country reports based on the initial comprehensive questionnaire of the EIQAS project and the results of the 3 training events and the perceptions of the participants, it should be emphasised that there exists a good standard of knowledge of the ESG and all stakeholders expressed the capacity for an adequate interpretation of ESG standards.

The main challenge to the widespread application of ESG is on account of some barriers for the effective involvement of some stakeholders, especially teachers and students. The most mentioned priority actions were the training of experts for the panels and the generalisation of the preparation and publication of reports in English.

The aforementioned two topics evidence the importance of the intercultural communication among quality assurance agencies and different countries. This is not only for the purpose of accreditation of joint programmes, but also to support a large set of recognition tools and procedures crucial for the mobility of students and graduates and for the recognition of their qualifications, programmes and provisions.

What follows are the results of the training events and the contributions of the participants worked out in the framework of the ESG.

The remainder of this framework is included in chapter 5. The results of the experiment of the intercultural training of experts is organised standard by standard (Part I of ESG). For each standard a short snapshot of the state of the art in the four countries of the project, based on the country reports and on the initial cross-country report, is presented. The results of the intercultural workshops are summarised thereafter and include the contributions addressing the focus questions worked out at the workshops and a list of potential questions on the corresponding standard for a site visit.

The relevance of these materials lies in the fact that these are the result of an intercultural debate carried out in several rounds of discussion by groups of participants from the 4 countries of the project. The debates were complex due to the necessity to accommodate a diverse range of perspectives and perceptions in order to strive towards a common conclusion.

Beyond the 10 ESG, three other standards created by the Portuguese Agency in its audit model to IQAS have been further analysed, although in a more superficial way; those three extra standards cover the following areas: research, internationalisation and relations with community.

This report/ framework includes only the results of the training events in order to test the methodology and offer a snapshot of it. The authors did not add any new questions or topics regarding relevance, barriers or good practices beyond those gathered in the training events. Some arrangements and merges of similar sentences were conducted, with different wordings but no fresh comments were added. A broader discussion and deeper analysis was carried out for the GUIDE to IQA.

The aim of the present report or framework is to highlight the topics or issues which received the most attention from the different stakeholders, represented by the participants on the training events of the project and can be complemented with the other outputs posted on the website of the project.

It is intended that the framework should be used as a guideline or a model for further training events. It is presently an ongoing process and not yet a ready tool to use or a standard to adopt. It aims at being an example with results that are already being used in some of the participant countries.

5. The results: standard by standard

ESG 1.1. Policy for quality assurance

Approximately 60% of the HEIs that responded to the survey that took place in the four countries have a published policy for quality assurance and external stakeholders were involved in both the development and implementation of the policy. In most cases quality strategic goals are directly incorporated by HEIs into strategic plans and they do not develop separate documents for their quality assurance policy. Cooperation with external stakeholders shows as an increasing trend for the last few years and confirms the response of the HE sector to labour market needs. This standard corresponds to the procedure for initiating, discussing, implementing and assessing QA strategy and/ or policy. The institution's policy for QA must be visible and planned for all dimensions of the HEI's operation (teaching, learning, research, collaboration with environment, strategic planning, involvement of internal and external stakeholders etc.).

In what concerns relevance, obstacles, further development and good practices (topics addressed in the focus questions), all stakeholders recognise that Quality Assurance should be part of the institutional strategy; a policy of continuous improvement must be embedded in the HEIs. Not all institutions have or need a complex and formal system. Instead, internal quality assurance systems should be tailored and respond to the needs and expectations of the stakeholders; the most important issue is the development of a Quality Culture visible across all levels and incorporated into the academic tradition. The involvement of external stakeholders is very important in this regard.

Some risks have been identified. For example, HEIs may establish very complex and not flexible structures for Quality Management and dominant conservative culture may block the development of more innovative structures.

Guiding questions listed for a site visit, facing standard 1.1:

- ↳ What is your framework for building your IQAS?
- ↳ How is your QA policy linked to the strategic management of your institution?
- ↳ Who created the mission, the vision and the QA mission? Did all the stakeholders participate? Students?
- ↳ Are the strategic goals in line with the mission?
- ↳ How are internal and external stakeholders involved in the development and implementation of your IQAS? What are the good practices in this area? Do you have any innovative methodologies?
- ↳ How is the effectiveness of the IQAS assured and measured?
- ↳ How do you guarantee that all internal and external stakeholders have a common view and understanding of your quality assurance system?

ESG 1.2. Design and approval of programmes

The procedure for design and approval of programmes is not followed in all fields of study in all the HEIs of the four countries of the project. While the approval procedure does not generate a problem for respondents, the designing procedure is considered to be a weakness. Nevertheless, most programmes are designed in line with institutional strategies, mission statements and vision and refer to the National Qualification Framework. The involvement of external stakeholders in the procedure of design and approval still requires more attention. External stakeholders include, for example, alumni, graduates, employers from the business or public sector, other business partners, mentors, etc.

In what concerns this standard there are important barriers to implementation. There are difficulties in the definition and validation of the intended learning outcomes; difficulties with the involvement of external stakeholders (such as geographical distances between HEIs and external stakeholders); and variable design of programmes without internal consistency between the courses can be found more often than desired.

The mismatch between HEIs and the external stakeholders takes different aspects and exists at several levels: both stakeholders have different aims, different timelines and, above all, speak different languages. Accordingly some aspects of the standard need further clarification in order to foster a common understanding of the concepts by all stakeholders.

Procedures, institutional regulations and other mechanisms have to comply with the national law; in some countries there is a degree of over-regulation, frequent changes of the national legislation, too much bureaucracy and lack of autonomy of HEIs. Those aspects are also considered important barriers to the development of IQAS.

In terms of relevance, further development and good practices, stakeholders mentioned that HEIs need two properly constructed and implemented processes for design and approval of programmes.

Firstly, the design of the programmes must take into account the definition of the learning outcomes in line with the qualification framework (national and European), as definition and validation of intended learning outcomes represent a crucial part of the standard. HEIs should become aware of the fact that establishing intended learning outcomes represents 'a promise' to the students and HEIs

must thus ensure that the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Intended learning outcomes should encompass all three aspects – the knowledge, skills and competences obtained, and not merely focus on the competences achieved. Recognition of formal and informal learning should be improved in line with the implementation of the European and National Qualification Frameworks. (Although this issue is partly related to the standard 1.4).

Secondly, internal and external stakeholders should be included in the process. Internal stakeholders should be represented by not only teaching staff and students but also administrative staff. With regard to external employers, special attention should be devoted to alumni, most of whom are familiar with both the university (and its programmes) and, on the other hand, the current situation in the labour market. The issue of employability should be taken into account when adopting this kind of strategic approach. Teaching methods are also relevant to the achievement of learning objectives and outcomes.

The aspect of internationalisation should be considered as part of the standard (a missing topic).

A cyclical link should be established between standards 1.2 and 1.9.

Guiding questions listed for a site visit, facing standard 1.2:

- ↳ Who is involved in designing, approving and implementing your QA procedures? What is the procedure for designing and approval?
- ↳ How are the external stakeholders involved in the design of the programme? Any examples?
- ↳ How are the LOs concepts implemented? How do you check the alignment of ILOs with NQF and EQF?
- ↳ How does the institution relate the learning outcomes with the national qualification framework? How do you verify the achievement of ILOs?
- ↳ Why and when do you decide to launch a new programme?
- ↳ How are the programmes linked to labour market needs, social needs, and the development of the scientific disciplines?
- ↳ What is the system for the identification of achieved learning outcomes (only teachers, external examiners)?
- ↳ How do you validate the learning outcomes? (Both intended and achieved Learning Outcomes).

ESG 1.3. Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

Students are systematically involved in IQA activity, and student-centred learning, teaching and assessment is said to be well understood by HEIs all across the four countries. However, the actual implementation of this range of issues in the revised ESG should be more fully addressed, accordingly to the results of the country reports.

Fairness and consistency achieved through the procedure of student assessment was quite misunderstood by most HEIs and over 62% respondents decided to skip the question.

In what concerns relevance, obstacles, further development and good practices, all stakeholders recognise that the participation, collaboration and feedback of students is critical to the development of student-centred learning. Institutional support for good teaching practices and regular pedagogical monitoring are relevant. The institution should stimulate the motivation of the teachers to improve their pedagogical methods and develop flexible learning paths. The institution should stimulate the dialogue and self-reflection of students and their engagement in research activities. Some have instigated several good practices, including the creation of commissions for teaching and learning pedagogy, and projects involving innovation laboratories for teaching and learning, among others.

Guiding questions listed for a site visit, facing standard 1.3:

- ↳ How do you encourage students towards active learning and a self-reflection process?
- ↳ How do you motivate the teachers towards changing their approaches, methods, innovation in teaching, i.e., their teaching strategy?
- ↳ How did you change the assessment procedures in order to meet the students' active roles in creating the learning process?
- ↳ How does the assessment system reflect the student centred approach, critical thinking, new didactic methods?
- ↳ What is the policy regarding the improvement of teaching methods?
- ↳ How are the outcomes of the surveys communicated to students and staff?
- ↳ How do you ensure that the programmes are delivering? Which methodologies do you use to measure the learning outcomes achievement?
- ↳ How do you ensure / maximise the engagement of the students in the learning process? Any examples?
- ↳ How do you identify and address students with special needs?

ESG 1.4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

Standard 1.4 addresses the student's life-cycle, from admission, to progression, recognition and certification. HEIs apply consistent regulations concerning student admission, recognition and certification in the four countries. At present, the development of regulation on the recognition of non-formal and informal learning pose a great challenge for the development of IQAs. The recognition of progression in joint programmes and foreign qualifications are the most critical issues in the frame of this standard.

In fact, considering the relevance of the standard, obstacles for implementation and further development the topics addressed in the intercultural training events focused above all on the institutional mechanisms for recognition of prior learning.

Guiding questions listed for a site visit, facing standard 1.4:

- ↳ What is the biggest problem in the selection of candidates? 2nd and 3rd level?
- ↳ What is the policy of the institution for fair recognition of previous learning achievements ?(formal, informal and non-formal paths must be considered)
- ↳ How do you deal with the issue of recognition of the progression of the joint programmes' students?
- ↳ What kind of procedures and mechanisms/indicators have you developed/ put in place to successfully evaluate and recognise previous formal, non-formal and informal learning?
- ↳ How do you address the problem of recognition of foreign qualifications?
- ↳ Traceability of graduates? Do you identify the best students?
 - ↳ Are there processes to create a functional network of alumni?
- ↳ What kind of mechanisms do you have in place to monitor and prevent drop out?
- ↳ How do you ensure you have sufficient resources (human, material, financial) in order to guarantee the quality of teaching and learning?

ESG 1.5. Teaching staff

In the four countries of the EIQAS project, teaching staff are assessed on a regular basis since, in some cases, it is required by national regulations. The remaining activities which include professional development opportunities provided to teaching staff, incentives to encourage the professional development of teaching staff, incentives to encourage the use of new technologies in teaching, or mechanism for rewarding teaching achievements vary greatly among units and fields of study. The main challenge is linked to the regular monitoring of teaching staff satisfaction.

Some of the HEIs still report limited mechanisms for teachers support in the process of their development; weaknesses in the area of motivation and assessment of faculty can be observed (there are only formal assessments or written statements, generally). As such, questionnaire systems and development of pedagogy for teachers could be developed and the regular evaluation of the activities of teaching staff could be improved.

Some stakeholders assert that a manual of good practices could be developed.

Guiding questions listed for a site visit, facing standard 1.5:

- ↳ What is your policy for recruitment and development of teaching staff?
- ↳ How do you balance the research, teaching and organisational skills of your teachers and staff?
- ↳ What are the motivational schemes / methods adopted in the HEI?
- ↳ What are the assessment methods / procedures of the performance of the teaching staff? How are they connected with the development opportunities? Any examples?
- ↳ How does the HEI attract foreign academic staff?
- ↳ What are the procedures or mechanisms for recognition of academic excellence (excellence in teaching)?
- ↳ What are the indicators and definition of excellence in teaching, research, mentoring and motivating?
- ↳ How do you incorporate the results of students' questionnaires into the Self Evaluation Report?
- ↳ How often do you monitor the student satisfaction rates with teachers/staff and what kind of mechanisms do you have in place to periodically/annually/sufficiently react in instances where you have detected opportunities for improvement?
- ↳ How do you measure/evaluate staff satisfaction and how do you react in instances of a reduction in their satisfaction?

ESG 1.6. Learning resources and student support

The implementation of ESG 1.6 varies greatly among different fields of study and units throughout the four countries. At present, all responding HEIs provide academic, financial and personal advice to students. In addition, they have in place a mechanism for informing students about the support and services available. At the same time, there are still HEIs which declare that they do not have a mechanism for assessing the adequacy and accessibility of learning resources or student support, or do not have in place procedures to ensure that administrative staff are properly qualified to deliver support services.

Some contradictions exist in what concerns Standard 1.6 and most of the stakeholders are aware of them. Although very good resources and excellent learning means exist, most of the HEIs do not have any procedures for assessing them in place .

Some good practices and innovative tools are available in many HEIs, such as rooms for students available 24h a day, support for students with special disabilities, tutorial programmes for students, social support, among other infrastructures and services. There is however a need for efficient implementation of processes covering development, monitoring, assessment and improvement of learning resources and students support.

Massification and diversification of higher education increases the need for adequate learning resources and students support. Increasing numbers of students as well as the need for equally and actively including all strata of students in the study process requires paying ever more attention to student groups with special needs. Economic and political restraints however, are still a great challenge for HEIs, in the majority of cases.

Guiding questions listed for a site visit, facing standard 1.6:

- ↳ How do you assess the student support system, research and didactic infrastructure?
- ↳ Which new technologies have been implemented in the training process to achieve the learning outcomes?
- ↳ How do you assess the financial sustainability?
- ↳ What is the learning resources funding policy?
- ↳ What are the latest achievements in improving the learning resources?
- ↳ What are the development opportunities for administrative staff?

ESG 1.7. Information management

Efficient and effective internal quality assurance systems need to be supported by a reliable information management system. Most HEIs have a formal mechanism for analysing and using data collection for quality assurance enhancement purposes e.g. key performance indicators (KPI), profile of the student population, student progression, success and drop-out rates, students' satisfaction with programmes, etc. The overall analysis of the four countries shows a fairly good observance of standard requirements by HEIs; there is good feedback between data and decisions.

Very complex and advanced information systems are being developed all over Europe in the HEIs. Business intelligent systems, automatic analysis data tools, various open source tools for data warehouse, etc. etc. In each instance there are differentiated systems according to the nature of the HEI, the dimension of the data bases and the need for analysis.

One weakness regarding the implementation of Standard 1.7 can be found in the low level, or lack of indicators of internationalisation.

Guiding questions listed for a site visit, facing standard 1.7:

- ↳ Is your information system comprehensive enough to enable good management support?
- ↳ How do you use the collected data for the enhancement of the quality of teaching and learning?
- ↳ Are student questionnaires included in the IT system?
- ↳ What kind of analysis do you publish in order to assure the accountability of the institution?
- ↳ What kind of data is collected by the HEI? What kind of analysis is done and how is it used?
- ↳ What are the HEI's KPIs?
- ↳ Does the HEI perform any meta-analysis of the KPIs?
- ↳ Are there any preventive-oriented analyses? Any analyses?

- ↳ How does IM support responsible decision making and policy making processes?
- ↳ How do you ensure up to date information to support more responsible and efficient action plans and to ensure transparency of the HEI's operations?

ESG 1.8. Public information

HEIs in the four countries provide full information about the programmes they offer, including admission criteria, full curricula, syllabuses etc. However, some of them declare that some legal requirements (data protection law) might hinder public information activities. The website is the most common vehicle for information dissemination. A good dissemination of the information is critical in any IQAS. It is important to keep the feedback from students updated. There is a need for day to day monitoring.

As regards what concerns the accreditations reports all stakeholders agreed that they should be fully published and HEIs should define in which language(s) official documents will be written and published.

Guiding questions listed for a site visit, facing standard 1.8:

- ↳ What kind of data is there and to what extent is it publicly available? In what form?
- ↳ What kind of public relations strategy (including internationalisation) do you have in place?
- ↳ How does the HEI assure the actuality of information?
- ↳ What are the ways of updating the information?
- ↳ How do you ensure that relevant information is distributed to the target groups?
- ↳ How do you locate your target groups?

ESG 1.9. On-going monitoring and periodic reviews of programmes

Standard 1.9 is strongly linked with Standard 1.2. A formal procedure for on-going monitoring and periodic review should exist in all IQAS. The review must be done regularly. There should be an annual review of programmes with the participation of stakeholders, including alumni and employers; HEIs should raise the awareness of all stakeholders concerning the importance of their participation in the process.

In fact, the most critical issue in the implementation of this standard all over the four countries is the involvement of the external stakeholders in the on-going monitoring and periodic reviews of programmes. Even internal stakeholders should be aware of the importance of their involvement.

Another relevant topic is that the evaluation must be linked to the intended learning outcomes, in a combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches. Formal and informal approaches should be used. In most of the HEIs the procedures for on-going review are poorly formalised.

Effective communication and providing feedback to all stakeholders involved are crucial to ensure the successful closing of the 'quality circle'. In terms of providing on-going and regular monitoring and review of programmes, the diversity of various scientific disciplines covered by the programmes at certain HEIs should be taken into account.

Guiding questions listed for a site visit, facing standard 1.9:

- ↳ How is the continuous improvement of the programmes assured?
- ↳ How do you build the system of monitoring to enhance IQAS?
- ↳ How do you involve students?

- ↳ How are the external stakeholders involved in the periodic evaluations?
- ↳ Do you perform and analyse surveys on students, employers and alumni?
- ↳ Are the surveys statistically representative?
- ↳ Why have you decided for this period, not longer/ shorter?
- ↳ How are different stakeholders included in the monitoring system?
- ↳ How are the reviews organised?
- ↳ Is the workload of the periodic reviews an issue?
- ↳ How are the needs of society identified and included into the programmes?
- ↳ How do you check the adequacy of the learning environment and the support service for the purpose of programme delivery?

ESG. 1.10. Cyclical external quality assurance

Globally all stakeholders involved in the EIQAS training event assert that the interest in the analysis of EQA impact on IQA is still very limited and that the gap reduction between EQA and IQA is still relevant and a challenge for HEIs and QAAs. Legislative frameworks may disturb the efficiency and relation between EQA and IQA processes. Some good practices have been identified such as organising public presentations of audits reports and following discussions on further improvement across HEIs, increasing interest among HEIs in international external quality evaluation, and reference to ESG in the national legislative framework.

According to the HEIs of the four countries the external evaluation methodology of quality assurance agencies could be improved in the aspect of the criteria and methodology of assessment, time and quality-related costs, training of experts as well as further support and consultancy. In some countries however, as is the case of Portugal, HEIs are very satisfied with the work of the QAA. A complex and multi-area impact study on the influence of EQA on IQA could improve the knowledge of the respective quality assurance agency and facilitate its adjustment to relevant expectations and needs.

Guiding questions for a site visit:

- ↳ To what extent does the external evaluation contribute to the enhancement of your IQAS?
- ↳ Would you apply for a non-mandatory external evaluation?
- ↳ How are EQA outcomes integrated into IQA?
- ↳ What kind of mechanisms do you have in place for follow-up activities?
- ↳ Do you observe/measure the positive or negative impact of external quality assurance? Do you observe any impact? What are the main hindrances or challenges?

6. A critical analysis of the results of the workshops

In the last two decades HEIs in the four countries of the project – Poland, Portugal, Slovenia and Bulgaria, have witnessed a pronounced and dynamic development of IQAs. In all countries there appeared external bodies responsible for QA. In addition, some crucial changes in law on higher education systems took places that imposed, in some cases, legal requirements to establish an IQA system. Correspondingly, HEIs turned to a more systematic approach to IQA and to the formalisation of solutions to this issue. HEIs currently have IQA systems in place whose functioning varies greatly among faculties/units and fields of study. Partial lack of consistency and complexity may be caused by rather low awareness of quality management principles among internal stakeholders, especially

teaching staff and students. Quality managers still meet internal and external obstacles in developing sufficient IQAs but at the same time they provide many good examples of activities undertaken in that area and observe beneficial qualitative and quantitative changes. Furthermore, frequent changes of legal requirements cause some dissatisfaction among those involved in IQA at management as well as operational levels, particularly in some countries. HEIs and representatives of the different stakeholders declare difficulties related to bureaucracy which can be considered something of a 'hot potato' in the higher education and quality assurance system at present.

The development of those systems and their effectiveness is monitored on an ongoing basis and evaluated by the QA agencies. All agencies from partners' countries were externally reviewed. The continuous improvement of the external quality assurance systems of the agencies is a priority for their future operations.

In terms of the revised ESG 2015, the HEIs are willing and ready to follow them, in spite of the short history in IQA systems development in some countries and their maturity. Some of the HEIs that were aware of beneficial changes in the quality management area as well as the importance of quality culture decided to introduce and develop IQA systems on their own initiative without external pressure. Nevertheless, further clarification of individual standards and their popularisation is greatly required since the majority of stakeholders still identify internal and external obstacles in applying the revised ESG. The results of the project express a need by HEIs for further support in IQA enhancement and should imply the activities at the national level (policy makers, QA agencies, conferences of rectors) as well as at the European level (ESU, EURASHE, ENQA etc.).

In what concerns the core issues of the implementation of the ESG, a short list can be highlighted.

First of all, all stakeholders should be aware of the fact that the set of standards is not a 'checklist', i.e. a compliance exercise to be performed, therefore the methodology referring to the implementation of the given standards should be explained and widely discussed.

Secondly, definition and assessment of learning outcomes; student-centred learning and mutual recognition of qualifications delivered in other HEIs or countries are still poorly developed even if, each time, more discussed.

Thirdly, the involvement of the stakeholders, both internal and external, is still far below the desirable level. For instance, there is some degree of low engagement and low motivation of students (in certain cases also of staff) in what concerns evaluation and quality assurance procedures. Sometimes the low level of participation is a result of a lack of understanding of the objectives. In fact, internal communication inside the HEIs corresponds in some cases to the dissemination of information but a real discussion and critical analysis does not always take place.

Fourthly, a general lack of funding in the Higher Education Systems affects the implementation of the standards, since the institutions are understaffed and lack financial resources.

On balance, we may conclude that policies are more complex than what is formulated in the written documents. The agency of the different stakeholders is a long learning process.

Part 2 Working arrangements which QA agencies may adopt for future exchange of experts.

Exchange of experts is still identified as a challenge for QA agencies operating within European Higher Education Area. EIQAS project's partners decided to face this challenges by testing some approach that may facilitate the regular exchange of experts and boost internationalization of assessment procedure via involvement of foreigners. In this chapter, the experience of EIQAS project is shared with wider audience. It could be treated as a reference point for further practices in this area and do not have any obligatory character. Since EIQAS project focused on Part 1 of ESG and IQA systems we targeted at experts that can assess internal quality assurance practices within HEIs.

For stating the art of works within QA agencies participating in EIQAS project it was developed a reference framework for a comparative analysis of agencies IQA's assessment methodology. The reference framework defined an approach to comparative analysis of methodologies that the participating QA Agencies use in assessing IQA systems at their HEIs. Each partner agency was responsible for providing contribution to the development of a reference framework. Similarities and differences among agencies assessment methodology was identified with the use of reference framework for a comparative analysis.

The final report compares assessment frameworks with special regard to IQA systems as currently existing in each country, methodologies (assessment procedures, standards and criteria) used by the Agencies and their policies for the publication of evaluation outcomes. It includes a criteria reference table showing similarities and differences between the Agencies' approaches to the assessment of IQAs and final conclusions. A separate section of the report identifies elements of the methodology of each Agency which are recognised by the other partners as good practice, as well as innovative approaches or arrangements that emerged from the discussion during the seminar which are considered worth transferring to other countries, both within and outside of the Partnership.

As it was stated in 'Comparative analysis of the methodology used by QA agencies for IQA assessment' "(...) the agencies from Bulgaria, Portugal, Poland and Slovenia cover all quality indicators from the ESG, which are related to internal quality assurance. These address internal quality policies, quality culture, transparency of internal quality assurance regulations and procedures, involvement and consideration of stakeholders, closure of quality loops (i.e. methodological and procedural completion), extent of quality related topics covered, as well as revision and development of study programmes, resources, etc. The agencies predominantly promote the ideology and the emphases of the ESG." Only follow-up procedure differs considerably, however, the methodology in follow-up procedures is similar to that applied in audits, ex-post or re-accreditations with a difference in the sole emphasis on the implementation of clearly elaborated recommendations or demands for improvement. As you can notice from Reference Table that was elaborated in mentioned above 'Comparative analysis'.

It seems that similarities identified in comparative reports overbalanced differences and laid the foundation for further arrangement striving towards exchange of experts and enhancement of internationalization of assessment procedures.

| Reference Table of Similarities and Differences between the Agencies' Approaches to the Assessment of IQAS² | | | | |
|--|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Item | PKA | NEAA | SQAA | A3ES |
| Legal Framework | | | | |
| Quality standards are defined by law, i.e. general regulations. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Quality standards are (also) defined by specific, executive regulations. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency uses specific quality standards that refer to IQA. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✗ |
| The external assessment of IQA mostly focuses on quality of management and organization of key activities of higher education institutions. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency fully applies the ESG in assessing IQA. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency has a special audit procedure for externally assessing IQA. | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ |
| Agency decisions on accreditation are legally binding. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| In order to receive accreditation, the higher education institutions must implement the required improvements and comply with quality standards. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency has the possibility of limiting accreditation until the shortcomings have been remedied. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency has a formal appeal procedure in place. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Procedural framework | | | | |
| Initial/ex-ante accreditations assess the design and set-up of IQA. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Re-accreditations, ex-post accreditations or audits are bound to assessing the already functioning IQA. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Item | PKA | NEAA | SQAA | A3ES |
| The agency considers other non-ESG systemic and methodological approaches to quality assurance (i.e. ISO or other). | ✓ | ✓ | ✗ | ✓ |
| Assessments must be based on hard evidence when determining compliance with minimum standards. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| In decision-making, the agency considers the outcomes of previous procedures only when following up on the implementation of expert or agency recommendations. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency does not refer to other procedures, higher education institutions or their study programmes in content, but only when checking argumentative, procedural or other formal solutions. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency accepts internal evaluations as enhancement procedures and evidence of active IQA processes. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency considers the findings of internal evaluations as evidence, which would replace external evaluation. | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ |
| In external assessments, the agency carries out peer reviews. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

² Comparative analysis of the QA agencies' methodologies for assessment of IQAS, Ljubljana 2015/2016, EIQAS project.

| | | | | |
|--|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| External assessments may also include elements of inspection. | x | x | ✓ | x |
| Experts are appointed from agency's internal pool of experts. | ✓ | x | ✓ | ✓ |
| Higher education institutions may appeal if they disagree with the appointed group of experts. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agencies organize trainings for experts. | ✓ | x | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency has to appoint student experts as well. | ✓ | x | ✓ | ✓ |
| Agency staff and members of decision-making bodies steer and harmonize the work of experts. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Audit, ex-post or re-accreditation procedures require site visits. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Initial or ex-ante procedures always require site visits. | x | ✓ | x | x |
| In audits, ex-post or re-accreditation procedures, the agency enables higher education institutions to respond to expert reports. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| In initial or ex-ante procedures, the agency has to send the expert report to the higher education institution for response. | ✓ | ✓ | x | ✓ |
| An expert report is a single common report reflecting the opinion of the entire group of experts. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Methodological framework | | | | |
| Experts are expected to check for compliance with minimum standards. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Experts are expected to evaluate and grade also the aspects of quality exceeding the minimum threshold, propose recommendations for improvement and point to good and poor practices. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency encourages experts towards benchmarking or referring to relevant national or international studies and statistics or research to better substantiate and contextualize their opinion. | x | x | x | x |
| Item | PKA | NEAA | SQAA | A3ES |
| The agency uses grading when externally assessing quality and expressing the amount of compliance with quality standards or level of development. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency publicly ranks higher education institutions according to grades. | x | x | x | x |
| Experts may hold preparatory meetings and prepare questions prior to site visits. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| When collecting testimonies in interviews, experts may cross examine critical information with several groups of stakeholders and documented contents. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| After the experts have gathered the information, they create a narrative that most suits the reality of the assessed matter. They check for authenticity of gathered information and decide on its relevance. Afterwards, they put it into context and through interpreting, comparing, referencing, analysing, inducing, deducing, etc. conceptualize matters of quality. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

| | | | | |
|---|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| The agency is dedicated to assure that the external assessment by experts is a process of autonomous and impartial critical thinking. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| After the experts have established the actual state of affairs, they evaluate and grade it. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency has several regulative, organisational and methodological instruments of achieving comparability of external quality assessments. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency is of the opinion that the proposed incentives and recommendations for improvement contribute to the development of higher education institutions. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency is of the opinion that external quality assurance contributes to the impetus in enhancing quality culture and progress also from the bottom up. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency evaluates the efficiency and sufficiency of external quality assessments in its self-evaluation reports. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency believes that its external assessment methods lead to establishing the actual state of affairs and provide undisputable and valid evidence and findings. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Quality indicators for IQA | | | | |
| Quality indicators for IQA in particular lack clear objective boundaries of what is acceptable, what is not, what is good and what could be better. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| National regulations on quality assurance determine principal properties of IQA. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency assesses accountability related policies of higher education institutions. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency evaluates elements of quality culture. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency assesses transparency and applicability of IQA regulations at higher education institutions. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Consideration of stakeholder opinions and incentives within IQA is an important quality indicator. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Item | PKA | NEAA | SQAA | A3ES |
| IQA procedures should treat stakeholders equally and provide proper impartiality. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency assesses mechanisms for approval, monitoring and periodic review of study programmes. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| External quality assessments check the extent of topics covered in IQA and whether all important areas of quality have been addressed. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency externally assesses methodological completion of IQA. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Follow-up | | | | |
| The agency has a formal follow-up in place. | ✓ | ✓ | ✗ | ✓ |
| System-wide analyses | | | | |
| The agency produces system-wide analyses. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The agency has a special department for analytical work. | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ |

List of abbreviations used in Reference Table of Similarities and Differences between the Agencies' Approaches to the Assessment of IQAS:

PKA: Polska Komisja Akredytacyjna / Polish Accreditation Committee, Poland

NEAA: Nacionalna Agencija za Ocenjavanje i Akreditacija / National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency, Bulgaria

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

A3ES: Agência de Avaliação e Acreditação do Ensino Superior, Portugal

Bearing above in mind working arrangements for exchange of experts may include following steps:

- 1) In-depth analysis of standards and methodology used by interested QA agencies as a starting point of working arrangements for regular experts' exchange. As one may have noticed ESG was treated a reference framework for such an analysis in EIQAS project since all QA agencies operating in European Higher Education Area are required to comply with European standards for quality assurance. The results of comparative analysis were disseminated on project's website with some general conclusion.
- 2) Common intercultural trainings of experts targeted at experts hired by the QA agencies to participate in their external evaluations. Its general purpose is to discuss the experts' perspective on Part 1 of the ESG and EQA methodologies, in particular the assessment of IQA as part of EQA. The detailed methodology was described in previous chapter.
- 3) Pilot exchange of experts (for programme evaluations in selected fields of study or institutional evaluations) that gives an opportunity to share experience and gain additional knowledge on the assessment procedures used by national providers as well as strengthen the operational skills of experts. The exchange of experts should be based on bilateral understanding of parties interested (e.g. bilateral agreements). The group of experts to exchange should be agreed by both interested parties based on common trainings results. The pilot exchange programme should be developed on the basis of mutual understanding of agencies taking into account the challenges identified during previous trainings. It should cover at least the following items: type of exchange, objectives/learning outcomes, requirements (professional, financial, etc.) duration, expected results, feedback from receiving and sending agency. The discussion on the real effects and consequences of exchange should contribute to further development of trainings and exchange framework.

The common trainings results, that was referred in previous paragraph, could be used as a provisional basis/or pre-condition for further practical (operational) approach to trainings on site. It is assumed that a group of experts trained within the Training Event 3 framework in January 2016 achieved its results satisfactorily and could be considered as potential candidates of pilot exchange programme or even expert-job seekers. Some agencies may decide to skip the first step in working arrangements for exchange of experts and move to the second one.

- 4) Real exchange of experts that provides opportunity to hire (foreign) individuals as experts for programme evaluations in selected fields of study or institutional evaluations. It is mainly based on the needs issued by agency and passed to the partner agency. Similarly, to the pilot exchange of experts the programme, the real exchange programme might be arranged within the bilateral agreement framework specifying objectives, requirements (professional and financial) as well as its timing and responsibilities of interested parties (sending and receiving agency). The match of needs and opportunities seems to be of utmost importance for interested parties and should be identified at the beginning of exchange process. Besides it is assumed, based on EIQAS project results, that preceding trainings of experts may facilitate further exchange by providing common ground for understanding of standards and methodologies used.

To enhance the efficiency of exchange, the regular monitoring and assessment should be in place. However, reliable assessment of exchange of experts should always relies on its objectives and should be done on regular basis by both parties. Moreover, impact of such an exchange could be also considered in a broader sense but it would require a wide-analysis approach and engagement of all stakeholders.

Annexes

Annex 1

Training Event 1 Warsaw, Poland, 26th – 30th June 2015

(Target group: representatives of Higher Education Institutions)

General description

SEMINAR ON IQA & ESG PART 1

The five-day Seminar on IQA and the ESG will be held in Warsaw on 26-30 June 2015. Its purpose is to discuss the partner Agencies' methodologies for the assessment of IQA, to discuss and, where possible, arrive at a common understanding of Part 1 of the ESG, and to identify key issues and features of the best and most innovative practices in IQA. It will be attended by 50 participants /24 individuals from project partners and 26 representatives of Polish Higher Education Institutions.

Training Event 1 (Seminar on IQA and the ESG) is a key activity with regard to the achievement of the project objectives. The EIQAS project has two objectives. One of them is to increase the capacity of HEIs in the participating countries to develop IQA and build a quality culture by enhancing their awareness and understanding of Part 1 of the ESG and identifying, developing and disseminating good innovative practice in internal quality assurance. The training seminar will include presentations on Part 1 of the ESG and IQA systems, and discussion workshops in smaller groups focussed on how each aspect of Part 1 of the ESG can be interpreted and incorporated as good practice in IQA. The Seminar will be the only project event for the Agencies and HEIs specifically devoted to in-depth discussions on the ESG and IQA. Ideas and suggestions collected there will also provide the most significant input to the Guide to IQA promoting the ESG. While a proposed methodology for the identification of good practice examples had been developed before the seminar, modifications can still be made after the seminar to take into account suggestions made during workshop discussions. Furthermore, although examples of good practice in IQA to be disseminated through the Guide will be selected mainly on the basis of the evidence already collected by the Agencies through their EQA processes and the academic project partners' knowledge of institutional approaches, other examples may be discussed during the seminar and then included in the Guide.

As the EIQAS project as a whole is financed from the Polish Erasmus+ budget the Seminar will be held in Poland and the seminar will be attended by a larger number of representatives of Polish HEIs. This will increase the impact on Polish higher education in terms of enhancing the understanding of the ESG and the awareness of good practice arrangements in IQA, as envisaged in the project objectives.

The second objective of EIQAS is to increase the capacity of the participating QA agencies in EQA by comparing their methodologies for the assessment of internal quality assurance and exchanging and developing good practice in IQA assessment. A reference framework for a comparative analysis of IQA assessment methodologies was developed prior to the seminar via online discussion/ meeting. However, a discussion workshop during the seminar will be the only opportunity for a face-to-face discussion and an in-depth comparative analysis of the Agencies' methodologies. Conclusions will provide the basis for a comparative report on IQA assessment methodologies to be produced after the seminar. Furthermore, in broader terms, as the seminar is planned for five days, it will give the Agencies which have not worked closely together yet a good opportunity to get to know each other better with a view to initiating exchange of experts and concluding bilateral cooperation or recognition agreements in the future.

Training Event 1 Warsaw, Poland, 26th - 30th June 2015

Programme

| Day 1 /26th of June/ | | |
|---|--|--|
| 11.00 - 12.00 p.m. | Preparatory meeting of the Project Management Group | |
| 12.00 – 12.30 p.m. | Welcome speech Overview of the EIQAS project | Coord. |
| 12.30-2 p.m. | Presentation of Part 1 ESG – after Yerevan communique and discussion | |
| 2 – 2.30 p.m. | Presentations by students on key IQA issues from their perspectives | ESU representative |
| 2.30 – 3.00 p.m. | Lunch | |
| 3.00-5.00 p.m. | Presentation of findings from online survey on IQA and the ESG - Country reports/Cross country report | Report authors from PKA, NEAA, SQAA, A3ES |
| Day 2 /27th of June/ | | |
| 10.00 a.m.- 1 p.m. /after 45 minutes session change of participants/ 11.45 p.m. Coffee Break | 3 parallel workshops in smaller groups (how each aspect of Part 1 ESG is interpreted by HEIs, which aspects are unclear and how they are understood in HEIs' practice, where more detailed guidelines would be particularly helpful – qualitative interview) ESG standards analysed: | Moderators: |
| | 1.1. Policy for quality assurance and 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance | Representatives of the partners of the project |
| | 1.2. Design and approval of programmes and 1.9 On-going and periodic review of programmes | 2 Representatives of the partners of the project |
| | 1.3. Student centred learning, teaching and assessment and 1.4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification | 2 Representatives of the partners of the project |
| 1.00 – 2.00 p.m. | Findings from workshop, discussion | Moderators reports from morning sessions |
| 2.00 – 3.00 p.m. | Lunch | |
| 3.00 – 4.30 p.m. /after 45 minutes session change of participants/ | 2 parallel workshops in smaller groups (how each aspect of Part 1 ESG is interpreted by HEIs, which aspects are unclear and how they are understood in HEIs' practice, where more detailed guidelines would be particularly helpful – qualitative interview) ESG standards analysed: | Moderators: |
| | 1.7 Information management and 1.8 Public information | 2 Representatives of the partners of the project |
| | 1.5 Teaching staff and 1.6 Learning resources and student support | 2 Representatives of the partners of the project |
| 4.30-5.00 p.m. | Findings from workshops, discussion | Moderators reports from afternoon sessions |

| Day 3 /28th of June/ | | |
|--|---|---|
| 10.00-10.30 a.m. | Presentation of the methodology for the identification of IQA good practice agreed by the Partnership, followed by discussion on the definition of good practice and methodology for the identification of good practice | WG5 leader |
| 10.30-1.30 p.m. | Presentations on IQA systems given by HEIs Polytechnic Institute of Viana do Castelo University of Sofia University of Ljubljana University of Minho | Representatives of the partners of the project |
| 1.30-2.00 p.m. | Lunch | |
| 2.00-4.30 p.m. | Presentations on IQA systems given by HEIs University of Coimbra University of Madeira University of Social Sciences Warsaw/Lodz/Cracow/ London University of Nova Gorica University of Beira Interior | Representatives of the partners of the project |
| Day 4 /29th of June/ | | |
| 10.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m. | A discussion workshop to compare quality assurance agencies methodologies for the assessment of IQA according to an agreed reference framework and to identify good and transferable practice: a presentation of each Agency's methodology followed by a discussion | Facilitator WG3 leader - a representative of the partners of the project Presentations: PKA, NEAA, SQAA, A3ES |
| 1.00 – 2.00 p.m. | Lunch | |
| 2.00 p.m. – 3.30 p.m. | The workshop for the Agencies cont.: summary of the discussion on the Agencies' approaches to the assessment of IQA and the identification of good and innovative practice which may be usefully transferred to other countries within and outside of the Partnership | Facilitator WG 3 leader - a representative of the partners of the project |
| 3.30 – 4.00 p.m. | ESG and IQA from teaching staff perspective | |
| Day 5 /30th of June/ | | |
| 10.00-12.00 a.m. | Wrap-up discussion on the interpretation of the ESG and good practice; summary conclusions from each workshop by partners. | Facilitator: PKA representative |
| 12- 2 p.m. | Final discussion on the structure of Guide to IQA. | |

Parallel workshops scenario 27th of June

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Goals | <p>The main goals of the workshops are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) to enrich quantitative research which was conducted as an online survey in Part 1 ESG & IQA in March; 2) to gather opinions from participants on how each of the standards of Part 1 ESG is interpreted by HEIs, which aspects are unclear and how they are understood in HEIs' practice, where more detailed guidelines would be particularly helpful; 3) to provide further input to the Guide to IQA. |
| Form | <p>Interactive parallel sessions encouraging participants to discuss and share their views on Part 1 ESG. The outline of the meeting will be focussing on pairs of standards which are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. Policy for quality assurance and 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance; 1.2. Design and approval of programmes and 1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes; 1.3. Student centred learning, teaching and assessment and 1.4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification; 1.7. Information management and 1.8 Public information; 1.5. Teaching staff and 1.6 Learning resources and student support. |
| Time | 2-3 rounds for 45 minutes each session |
| Attendees | <p>Individuals who filled in the survey questionnaire on Part 1 ESG & IQA - circa 26 representatives of HEIs (coordinators for IQA, heads of departments, executives etc.), most of them from Poland. Attendees will be divided into 2-3 groups to give each participant a chance to discuss and bring forwards ones view.</p> |
| Moderators | <p>2 people dealing with one pair of standards. One of their tasks is to establish a dialogue aimed at moderating the participants to develop their answers related to a specific focus question and specific area of Part 1 ESG. The other responsibility is to prepare a short report on findings from workshops.</p> |
| Focus questions | <p>Focus questions relate to the goals and were developed commonly by the project partners. As the time of session is quite short it seems of utmost importance to receive answers on the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the most important/crucial part of a given standard/or guidelines having a potential impact on the quality enhancement/or on the development of quality culture? 2. What are the main obstacles in the implementation of a given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard? 3. What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI's and why? 4. Do you identify any good practices in relation to a given standard? <p>Key questions together with handouts will be sent to participants prior to the meeting in order to make discussion more efficient. Additionally,</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | participants will be requested to write about their relevant needs and expectations for interpretation of each standard. |
| Additional questions | Further questions should result from discussion with participants and will be developed by moderators in the course of the workshop. Their role should be supportive to the main questions rather than to create other issues. |
| After workshop | Making the findings from the workshops available to the others through the plenary session – short reports of moderators. |
| Sustainability | Open box on project webpage with special attention to further interpretation regarding needs of Part 1 ESG. |

Moderators check sheet

1. What is the most important/crucial part of a given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by a HEI?
2. What are the main obstacles in the implementation of a given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?
3. What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI's and why?
4. Can you identify any good practices in relation to a given standard?

| Output question 1 | Output question 2 |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| | |
| Output question 3 | Output question 4 |
| | |

Annex 2

Training Event 2 Ljubljana, Slovenia, 7th - 11th December 2015

(Target group: Students)

Programme

STUDENT TRAINING ON IQA & ESG - PART 1

Day 1, Monday, 7th December

INTERCULTURAL AWARENESS WORKSHOPS: presentations and discussions on the national HE and QA systems, including their strengths and weaknesses; student engagement in IQA and the assessment of IQA as part of EQA.

11.00 – 12.00 Registration of participants

12.00 – 13.00 Light Lunch (to be served at tables)

13.00 – 13.15 Words of welcome by the Director of the Agency

13.15 – 13.45 Lecture: **The role of students in IQA and EQA**

13.45 – 14.15 **EIQAS - Project outline** - Main coordinator of EIQAS Project

14.15 – 15.00 Lecture: **ESU and Student engagement in IQA**

15.00 – 16.00 Lecture: **Bologna process and global challenges in HE**

16.00-17.00 National frameworks of HE and QA systems with special attention paid to strengths and weaknesses regarding student engagement in IQA and EQA (15 mins presentations made by country representatives- Bulgaria, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia)

17.00–17.30 Wrap-up discussion of the day

18.00 Dinner (self-service)

Day 2, Tuesday, 8th December

DISCUSSION WORKSHOPS ON PART 1 OF THE ESG: A presentation on the ESG-related conclusions from Training Event 1; each standard discussed from the student perspective and most relevant issues identified. Key issues to be included in the Student Guide to Part 1 of the ESG identified and the structure of the Guide agreed.

10.00 – 10.40 Presentation on the ESG-related conclusions from TE 1

10.45 – 11.25 Key differences between the old and revised ESG (SQAA staff)

11.30 – 12.00 Coffee break

12.00 – 13.30 Workshops: Each ESG Part 1 standard discussed from the student perspective and most relevant issues identified; Discussion on the structure of the Students' guide on IQA (Division of the students into two groups, each group consisting of 10 students; each group has a reporter).

13.30 – 14.30 Light Lunch (to be served at tables)

14.35 – 16.30 Final preparation for study visits (SQAA staff)

16.30 – 17.00 Wrap-up discussion of the day (2 reports)

18.00 Dinner (self-service)

Day 3, Wednesday, 9th December

VISITS by smaller multinational sub-groups to local HEIs, incl. meetings with the university authorities and student self-government bodies to share experience in IQA. Key findings summarised and a list of key success factors in introducing IQA systems developed at the end of the day.

10.00 – 10.40 Division of tasks, determination of the chairperson, organisation of two groups of students experts (each group consist of 10 students and 2 staff representatives)

11.00 – 11.15 Travel to two HEI's by bus (Ljubljana, Aškerčeva c.)

a) University of Ljubljana Faculty of Pharmacy;

b) Higher Vocational School, Ljubljana

11.30 – 14.00 2 Site visits (interviews with Management, Quality commission, the Student representatives, students and random students) relating participation and engagement of students in IQA, visit to the premises)

14.00 – 15.30 Lunch in the city

15.30 – 16.30 At premises of Slovenian Quality Assurance Agency: Key findings from the visits – presentations on success factors in introducing IQA systems made by chairpersons, exchange of views

16.30 – 17.00 Travel to Hotel and wrap-up of the day

18.00 Dinner (self-service)

Day 4, Thursday, 10th December

DISCUSSION WORKSHOPS ON STUDENTS' ENGAGEMENT IN IQA AND THE ASSESSMENT OF IQA AS PART OF EQA IN THE CONTEXT OF PART 1 ESG, involving the student group and representatives of the SQAA: a presentation on the Slovenian approaches (EQA procedures, experience and challenges, in particular related to student engagement in IQA and EQA).

10.00 – 11.00 Slovenian approach (EQA procedures, experience and challenges)

11.00 – 12.00 Training for student experts – Slovenian Student Union training (representative of Slovenian Students Organisation)

12.00 – 13.00 Light Lunch (to be served at tables)

13.05 – 16.00 Workshops

Workshop No. 1 – Examples of best practices in engagement of students in IQA and EQA

Workshop No.2 – Challenges related to students in IQA and EQA

Workshop No.3 – Interpretation of ESG Part 1 from students perspective

Workshop No. 4 – The clearness of ESG Part 1, impact on the IQA systems and main obstacles in their implementation into the IQA

16.00 – 17.00 Wrap-up of the day

18.00 Dinner (self-service)

Day 5, Friday, 11th December

Wrap-up and the way forward: a summary of the key outcomes of the training event; a detailed plan for the production, and an outline, of the Student Guide to Part 1 of the ESG agreed; suggestions for possible future training for students-experts in multinational groups collected.

9.00 – 12.00 Wrap-up and the way forward (parallel discussions among agencies members and among students on the structure of the guide, division of tasks and a detailed plan for the production, organising future training for students-experts, students' role in trainings, future cooperation between students and agencies)

12.00 – 13.00 Light Lunch (to be served at tables)

13.00 – 14.00 Final discussion (any other business) and departure of participants

Annex 3

Training Event 3 Lisboa, Portugal (A3ES), 18th - 22nd January 2016

(Target group: external experts)

Training Event 3 (TE3) is targeted at experts hired by the QA Agencies to participate in their external evaluations. Its purpose is to discuss the experts' perspectives on the ESG and EQA methodologies, in particular the assessment of IQA as part of EQA.

Several presentations from top managers of QAAs, experts, teachers from HEIs and other guests will take place in order to analyse relevant case studies and compare methodologies for external evaluation.

The core of Training Event 3, however, is the Workshops and intercultural work. In workshops 1, 2, 3 and 6, each working group will work separately for about 90 minutes and there will be a plenary session afterwards. Workshops 4 and 5 will consist of a simulation game and the groups are going to play the role of a panel and of an higher education institution (HEI) meeting in a site visit, for an external evaluation process, with a focus on 3 or 4 standards from the ESG part 1.

The participants/ experts should work in groups as much as possible. This is time for all of us and we should feel that this training is intensive and beneficial to everyone involved. We tried to set up clearly the aims of each of the group sessions or workshops. We did not appoint a chair as such; the groups themselves should not have too strong a chair, because it might hinder the engagement of all the participants. Leaving the group initially unstructured could have the same risks. So, we decided to indicate 2 facilitators or supporters per group as a suggestion for starting the work. We expect that the facilitators will describe the task of the workshop and answer potential questions. Groups should however make their own arrangements and appoint a chair if they choose to do so; this would force quicker ice-breaking among the participants since they will have to cooperate from the very first minute. Workshop 6 will be organised by invitation of the facilitators that will volunteer for each group.

During the workshops, simulation games and 'role play' exercises, we are going to use the electronic platform of A3ES, forms and guidelines for self-evaluation reports, and forms and guidelines for the external evaluation reports of the panels..

Each participant will receive a login and a password for accessing the platform.

A Portuguese institution has allowed the use of its own process and self-evaluation report for the Training Event. It is the Instituto Politécnico de Viana do Castelo and the Audit process was carried out in 2012.

Training Event 3 Lisboa, Portugal (A3ES), 18th - 22nd January 2016

Programme

| Day 1 /18 th of January/ 40 participants | | |
|--|--|---------------------|
| 11:00 - 12:00 H | Preparatory meeting of the Project Management Group | |
| 12:00 – 12:30 H | Welcome speech – Words of welcome by the Board of A3ES – Agency for Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education. A snapshot of the Agency, creation and activities: 2009/... | |
| 12:30 – 14:00 H | Lunch - 40 participants | |
| 14:00 - 14.15 H | EIQAS - Project outline - Main coordinator of the EIQAS Project | |
| 14:15 - 15:00 H | Intercultural awareness presentations: national frameworks of HE and QA systems with special attention paid to strengths and weaknesses regarding the assessment of IQAS (15 mins presentations made by country representative). | |
| 15:00 – 15:15 H | Coffee | |
| 15:15 - 15:45 H | SHORT TALK 1: An Introduction to / Fundamentals of Internal Quality Assurance. ESG 2015. Presentation and discussion of the Introduction to the EIQAS GUIDE. A proposal/ draft. | |
| 15:45 – 17:00 H | Working Groups organisation and kick-off meeting of the 4 WG; each WG gathers a representative from each country and guests from PT including students. A representative of each country will chair. Workshop 1. Preparing the visits of day 2. QUESTIONS. Questions on HEIs to be visited. IQAS design and implementation; barriers; outcomes; pros & cons; certification process; site visit; reports; other practical problems. Problem 1??; Problems 2??, etc.. Outcome of Workshop 1: lists of problems and questions. How are IQAS delivering? | |
| 17:00 - 17:30 H | Wrap-up discussion of the day- Roadmap for the visits of the second day | Sala 02.1 Aberta |
| 19:30h | Dinner | |
| Day 2 /19 th of January/ Visits to 3 HEIs | | |
| ½ or 1 day | Study visits to HEIs: Visits by smaller multinational sub-groups to local HEIs, incl. meetings with the university authorities and QA teams to share experiences of introducing IQA systems in the context of Part 1 of ESG. | |
| 9:30 - 12:30 H | Visit 1: HEI 1 – 10 - 15 participants (Lunch: free) | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 9:30 - 12:30 H | Visit 2: HEI 2 - 10 - 15 participants (Lunch: free) | |
| 8:30 - 17:30 H | Visit 3: HEI 3 (outside Lisboa) - 10 - 15 participants (Lunch at the HEI 3) | |
| 19:30H/ ... | Dinner (free) | |
| Day 3 /20th of January/ 40 participants | | |
| 9:30 – 10:30 H | <p>Working Groups work: 4 WG; each WG gathers a representative from each country and guests from PT including students. A representative of each country will chair. Workshops on different approaches to introducing IQA and to the assessment of IQA as part of EQA.</p> <p>Workshop 2: did you get the answers?? Positive and negative aspects of each HEI visited. How are IQAS delivering?</p> <p>At 9:00H there will be a short presentation on the use of the electronic platform of A3ES on the ASIGQ processes (Assessment of IQAS) for the support of the workshops of the Training Event. Every participant will receive a login and a password in order to test the platform and play the role of an expert in the A3ES audit process (simulation).</p> | |
| 10:30 – 11:15 H | SHORT TALK 2 – focus on Standard 1.2 Design and Approval of Programmes - Involvement of external stakeholders (With debate). | |
| 11:15 – 11:30 H | Coffee | |
| 11:30 – 12:30 H | <p>Working Groups work: 4 WG; each WG gathers a representative from each country and guests from PT including students. A representative of each country will chair. Workshops on different approaches to introducing IQA and to the assessment of IQA as part of EQA.</p> <p>Workshop 3: IQAS and the Standards</p> | |
| 12.30 – 14.00 H | Lunch – 40 participants | |
| 14:00 – 15:30 H | <p>Working Groups work: 4 WG; each WG gathers a representative from each country and guests from PT including students. A representative of each country will chair. Workshops on different approaches to introducing IQA and to the assessment of IQA as part of EQA.</p> <p>Workshop 4: Simulation game. Playing our role 1.</p> | |
| 15:30 – 15:45 H | Coffee | |
| 15:45 – 17:00 H | <p>W5. Working Groups work: 4 WG; each WG gathers a representative from each country and guests from PT including students. A representative of each country will chair. Workshops on different approaches to introducing IQA and to the assessment of IQA as part of EQA.</p> <p>Workshop 5: Simulation game. Playing our role 2.</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| 17:00 – 17:30 H | SHORT TALK 3: A critical view of the External Assessment of IQAS. President of the Agency. | |
| 19:30 H | Dinner | |
| Day 4 /21st of January/ 40 participants A3ES Audit Programme | | |
| 10:00 – 10:30 H | The Portuguese System | |
| 10:30 – 11:00 H | The experience of the panel of the Audit Programme in Portugal by the Chair of the Portuguese panel for external assessment of IQAS. | |
| 11:00 – 11:15 H | Coffee | |
| 11:15 – 11:45 H | Questions; debate. | |
| 11:45 – 12:30 H | SHORT TALK 4 – focus on Standard 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment and 1.4. – The involvement of students in IQA and EQA, with special focus on the Audit Panel of A3ES (With debate). Presentation by the group of Students that have participate in the Training Event 2 in Ljubljana. | |
| 12:30 – 14.00 H | Lunch – 40 participants | |
| 14:00 – 15:30 H | W6. Working Groups work: 4 WG; each WG gathers a representative from each country and guests from PT including students. A representative of each country will chair. Workshops on different approaches to introducing IQA and to the assessment of IQA as part of EQA . Workshop 6 -The Magic Stick workshop: The link between IQAS and the QA of teaching and learning. How are IQAS delivering?? | |
| 15:30 – 15:45 H | Coffee | |
| 15:45 – 16:30 H | SHORT TALK 5 – focus on Standard 1.10 Cyclical External Quality Assurance – The meta-assessment of IQAS. The case study of a military HEIs that went through an Audit process in Portugal, with Debate. | |
| 16:30 – 17:00 H | Final discussion (any other business) and Farewell to guest and trainees. | |
| Day 5 /22nd of January (Partnership) | | |
| 10.00 - 2.00 H | Wrap-up discussion; summary conclusions from each workshop by partners; discussion on arrangements for further training of experts and exchange of experts among the QA Agencies to be presented in a report produced after the event; the structure and outline contents of the report agreed. | |

Parallel workshops scenario

18th of January

Workshop 1. Preparing the site - visits of day 2. QUESTIONS.

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Goals | <p>The main goals of the workshop are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To prepare for the visits of HEIs on the 19th January; 2) Questions to visited HEIs on different topics; 3) IQAS design and implementation; 4) Barriers; outcomes; pros & cons; certification process; 5) Site visit; reports; 6) Other practical problems. Problem 1???. Problems 2???, etc.. <p>Outcome of Workshop 1: lists of problems and questions. How are IQAS delivering?</p> |
| Form | Interactive parallel sessions encouraging people to engage in discussion and share their views on ESG Part 1 bearing in mind the following process of external evaluation and ESG Part 2. |
| Time | 15:45 – 17:00 H |
| Attendees | <p>Experts from four countries, staff from four Agencies and other guests (other experts, coordinators for IQA, heads of departments, executives etc.), most of them from Portugal.</p> <p>Attendees will be divided into 4 working groups to give each participant a chance to discuss and bring forwards ones' view.</p> |
| Facilitators | 2 people. One of their tasks is to establish a dialogue aimed at moderating the participants to develop their questions to the HEIs of day 2. Related to ESG Part 1. The other responsibility is to prepare a short report on findings from workshops. |
| Focus questions | <p>Focus questions relate to the goals and were developed commonly by the project partners. As the time of session is quite short it seems of utmost importance to receive answers on the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the most important/crucial part of the design and implementation of an IQAS and the alignment with the standards/or guidelines having a potential impact on the quality enhancement/or on the development of quality culture? 2. What are the main obstacles in the implementation of an IQAS and the standards and why? Are they derived from the content of the standards? 3. What are the needs for further interpretation of the standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for the experts and why? <p>Key questions together with handouts will be sent to participants prior to the meeting in order to make discussion more efficient.</p> |
| Additional questions | Further questions should result from discussion with participants and will be developed by moderators during the workshop. Their role should be supportive to the main questions rather than to create other issues. |
| After workshop | Making the findings from the workshops available to the others through the plenary session – short reports of moderators. |
| Sustainability | The output of Workshop 1 should be incorporated in the Guide to IQA as a tool for self-evaluation and monitoring or review of IQAS. |

Facilitators sheet

Participants “To Do List”

1. To prepare the site-visits to the HEIs on the 19th January;
2. Questions to HEIs for the visits purpose on different topics:
3. IQAS design and implementation
4. Barriers; outcomes; pros & cons; certification process;
5. Site visit; reports
6. Other practical problems. Problem 1???, Problems 2???, etc..

| Output question 1 | Output question 2 |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| | |
| Output question 3 | Output question 4 |
| | |

| Output question 5 | Output question 6 |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| | |
| Output question 7 | Output question 8 |
| | |

Training Event 3 Lisboa, Portugal (A3ES), 18th - 22nd January 2016

Outcome of Workshop 1: QUESTIONS TO THE HEIs

Lists of problems and questions. How are IQAS delivering?

Lisboa, 18th January 2016

Working Group 1 (WG 1)

Which standard seems the most difficult to be fulfilled?

ESG 1.1

What is your framework for building your IQAS?

Are you familiar with ESG 2015? How do you find it comparing with ESG 2005?

How is your QA policy linked to the strategic management of your institution?

How are internal and external stakeholders involved in the development and implementation of your IQAS?

What are the main barriers/obstacles for the implementation of IQAS?

What impact does the social responsibility of your institution have on the IQAS you have adopted?

ESG 1.2.

Who is involved in designing, approving and implementing your QA procedures? What is the procedure?

How does the institution relate the learning outcomes to the national qualification framework?

Why and when do you decide to launch a new programme?

How are the programmes linked to the labour market needs, social needs, and development of the scientific disciplines?

What is the system of identification of achieved learning outcomes (only teachers, external examiners)?

How do you validate the learning outcomes?

ESG 1.3.

How do you encourage students towards active learning?

How do you motivate the teachers towards changing the teaching strategy?

How did you change the assessment procedures?

In what way does the assessment system reflect the student centred approach, critical thinking, new didactic methods?

What is the policy for improvement of teaching methods?

How are the outcomes of the surveys communicated with students and staff?

ESG 1.4.

What is the biggest problem in the selection of the candidates? 2nd and 3rd level?

Traceability of graduates? Do you identify the best students?

What is the policy of the institution for fair recognition of previous learning achievements?

Do you have any policy to prevent/control drop out?

ESG 1.5

What is your policy for recruitment and development of staff?

How do you balance the research, teaching and organisational skills of your teachers and staff?

ESG 1.6

How do you assess the student support system, research and didactic infrastructure?

Which new technologies have been implemented in the training process to achieve the learning outcomes?

How do you assess the financial sustainability?

ESG 1.7

Is your information system comprehensive enough to enable good management support?

How do you use the collected data for the enhancement of the quality of teaching?

Are student questionnaires included in the IT system?

What kind of analysis do you publish in order to ensure the accountability of the institution?

ESG 1.8

What kind of data and to what extent is it publicly available? In what form?

ESG 1.9

How do you build the system of monitoring to enhance IQAS?

Do you perform and analyse surveys on students, employers and alumni?

Are the surveys statistically representative?

What is the review period?

How are different stakeholders included in the monitoring system?

ESG 1.10

To what extent does the external evaluation contribute to the enhancement of your IQAS?

Would you apply for no mandatory external evaluation as well? Like EQUIS or similar?

Working Group 2 (WG 2)

ESG 1.1.

How is the effectiveness of IQAS assured and measured?

How are external and internal stakeholders involved into the IQA processes? What are the good practices in this area?

What are successful and / or unsuccessful examples of intervention of the IQAS?

ESG 1.2.

How are the external stakeholders involved into the design of the programme? Any examples?

How are the LOs concepts implemented?

How do you check the alignment of ILOs with NQF and EQF?

How do you verify the achievement of ILOs?

ESG 1.3.

How do you ensure / maximise the engagement of the students in the learning process? Any examples?

How do you identify and address the special needs of students?

ESG 1.4.

How do you deal with the issue of recognition of the progression of the joint programmes' students?

How do you address the problem of recognition of foreign qualifications?

ESG 1.5.

What are the motivational schemes / methods adopted in the HEI?

What are the assessment methods / procedures of measuring the performance of the teaching staff?

How are they connected with development opportunities? Any examples?

How does the HEI attract foreign academic staff?

Does the HEI support different career paths of the academic staff?

ESG 1.6.

What is the learning resources funding policy?

What are the latest achievements in improving the learning resources?

What are the development opportunities for administrative staff?

ESG 1.7.

What kind of data is collected by the HEI? What kind of analyses are done and how they are used?

What are the HEI's KPIs?

Does the HEI perform any meta-analysis of the KPIs?

Are there any preventive-oriented analyses? Any analyses?

ESG 1.8.

How does the HEI assure the actuality of information?

What are the ways of updating the information?

How does the HEI verify if the public information is up to date?

ESG 1.9.

How are the reviews organised? Is the workload of the periodic reviews an issue?

How are the external stakeholders involved in the periodic evaluations?

How are students involved?

How are the needs of society identified and included into the programmes?

How is the continuous improvement of the programmes ensured?

ESG 1.10.

How are EQA outcomes integrated into IQA?

Working Group 3 (WG 3)

1. System: does it work as a system or as a collection of procedures. Is it alive?
2. Changes after the implementation of their IQAS: Did you improve something??
3. Meta-evaluation: do you carry out some monitoring of your IQAS after the certification?
4. Impact of IQAS in different groups: students and management (questions to address to the different groups)
5. How does the system covers the different degrees: bachelors, master and PhD??
6. Were there any recommendations with the certification of A3ES?? Did you implement them? Did you got something out of it?
7. How do they define Quality?? How do they measure it? What KPI?? Business intelligence?? Dashboard??
8. ESG 1.1. The same approach in the 4 countries. Who created the mission, the vision and the QA mission? Did all the stakeholders participate?? Students??
9. Are the strategic goals in line with the mission?
10. Did you use the ESG to design and implement your IQAS? Is the ESG useful?? Do you need us? Does our work on the ESG help HEIs to implement IQAS?
11. ESG 1.7. Information system: does your system work? Does it identify the problems and the reactions?
12. Involvement of internal and external stakeholders: How?? Do you have some innovative methodologies?

13. How is the System working on what concerns the improvement of teaching staff ?
14. ESG 1.3. How do you ensure that the programmes are delivering? Which methodologies do you use to measure the learning outcomes achievement?
15. Do you use any KPI's?
16. Society satisfaction?
17. What do you think about our questions? What are your requests for us, as experts?

Working Group 4 (WG 4)

ESG 1.1

How do you guarantee that all internal and external stakeholders have a common view and understanding of your quality assurance system?

ESG 1.7

How is the information produced by your Quality Assurance System:

- a) analysed
- b) integrated
- c) disseminated

ESG 1.1 / 1.3 / 1.5

How do you incentivise teachers to be more involved in QA procedures (esp. QA policy, Student centred teaching and assessment)?

ESG 1.5

What mechanisms do you have in place to support teachers' personal development (e.g. teaching, research, teacher's evaluation)?

ESG1.3 / 1.6

How do you incorporate students' and teachers' feedback in the continuous improvement of curricula?

ESG 1.3 / 1.6 / 1.7

How can students appraise and influence changes in the learning process (e.g. assessment, teaching methods)?

ESG 1.6

What system do you have in place to evaluate the quality and development needs of your student support services?

20th of January
Workshop 2: *have you got the answers?*
Positive and negative aspects of each HEI visited.
How are IQAS delivering?

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Goals | <p>The main goals of workshop are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) IQAS design and implementation; 2) Barriers; outcomes; pros & cons; certification process; 3) Site visit; reports; 4) Other practical problems. Problem 1???. Problems 2???, etc.. <p>Outcome of Workshop 1: lists of problems and questions. How are IQAS delivering?</p> |
| Form | Interactive parallel sessions encouraging participants to discuss and share their views on Part 1 ESG bearing in mind the following process of external evaluation and Part 2 of ESG. |
| Time | 9:30 – 10:30 H |
| Attendees | Experts from the four countries, staff from the four Agencies and other guests (other experts, coordinators for IQA, heads of departments, executives etc.), most of them from Portugal. Attendees will be divided into 4 groups to give each participant a chance to discuss and bring forwards ones view. |
| Facilitators | 2 people. One of their tasks is to establish a dialogue aimed at moderating the participants to develop their questions to the HEIs of day 2. Related to Part 1 ESG. The other responsibility is to prepare a short report on findings from workshops. |
| Focus questions | <p>Focus questions relate to the goals and were developed commonly by the project partners. As the time of the session is quite short it seems of utmost importance to receive answers on the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the most important/crucial part of the design and implementation of an IQAS and the alignment with the standards/or guidelines having a potential impact on the quality enhancement/or on the development of quality culture? 2. What are the main obstacles in the implementation of an IQAS and the standards and why? Are they derived from the content of the standards? 3. What are the needs for further interpretation of the standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for the experts and why? <p>Key questions together with handouts will be sent to participants prior to the meeting in order to make discussion more efficient.</p> |
| Additional questions | Further questions should result from discussion with participants and will be developed by moderators in the course of the workshop. Their role should be supportive to the main questions rather than to create other issues. |
| After workshop | Making the findings from the workshops available to the others through the plenary session – short reports of moderators. |
| Sustainability | The output of Workshop 1 should be incorporated in the GUIDE as a tool for self-evaluation and monitoring or review of IQAS. |

Facilitators sheet
Participants *"To Do List"*

| Output question 1 | Output question 2 |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| | |
| Output question 3 | Output question 4 |
| | |

| Output question 5 | Output question 6 |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| | |
| Output question 7 | Output question 8 |
| | |

Training Event 3 Lisboa, Portugal (A3ES), 18th - 22nd January 2016

Outcome of Workshop 2: HAVE YOU GOT THE ANSWERS? Positive and negative aspects of each HEI visited

Lisboa, 20th January 2016

Working Group 1 (WG 1)

| ESG Part 1 | HEI 1 | HEI 2 | HEI 3 |
|------------|--|---|---|
| 1.1 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality Assurance part of strategy; 2. Complex & formal system; 3. Quality culture; 4. Structured programme Quality Management Board. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality Assurance Strategy; 2. Involvement of ext.; 3. Good team & culture; 4. In the process of excellence; 5. Very complex, inflexible structure of Quality Management. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong Quality Culture in academic tradition; 2. Developed procedures connected to strategy; 3. Problem of conservative culture vs. innovative structures. |
| 1.2 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In line with framework (national and EU); 2. Two properly constructed & implemented procedures for design & approval of programme; 3. External & internal stakeholders participate in Quality Management. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deep reflection about national & European framework; 2. Developed communication model; 3. Proper organisational process; 4. External & internal stakeholders participate in Quality Management. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Designed on learning outcomes QF fit to EU & national framework; 2. Benchmarking process; 3. External & internal stakeholders participate in Quality Management. |
| 1.3 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. System developed; 2. Large participation of students; 3. Dialogue & reflection of students by question; 4. 70% response rate. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Active participation of student union; 2. Students participate in Quality process; 3. 80% response rate. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Involvement in student culture by student union; 2. 80% response rate; 3. Commissions Teaching & Learning Pedagogy; 4. Project of Innovation Laboratory. |

| ESG Part 1 | HEI 1 | HEI 2 | HEI 3 |
|---|--|--|---|
| 1.4 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring of students cycle; 2. Design intervention if something wrong. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formalised system with reflective part. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highly advanced IT system for QM; 2. Are teachers involved – it is very complex? |
| 1.5 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Questionnaire system & development of pedagogy for teacher; 2. Prizes for best teachers. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advanced preparation for courses; 2. Limited mechanism for teachers support. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong support in teaching port; 2. Weak in area of motivation & assessment of faculty (only formal). |
| 1.6 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very good resources; 2. No knowledge of Quality Assurance procedures. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Many support tools; | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong support; 2. Excellent learning resources; 3. Constant improvement. |
| 1.7 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have a complex and very advanced system; 2. Lack of indicators of internationalisation. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Good feedback between data & quality decisions. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IT developed; 2. Very differentiated & complex system; 3. Large amount of data & analysis. |
| 1.8 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong feedback from students; 2. Fully published report for questions. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Good dissemination; 2. Day by day monitoring. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong feedback from students; 2. Fully published report for questions. |
| 1.9 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formal procedure; 2. Bottom up approach. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Done regularly; 2. Poorly formalised. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annual review of programmes. |
| 1.10 | A3ES. | A3ES and International. | A3ES. |
| ESG Part 1+3 (Portuguese system) | | | |
| Research | Applied & technical. | Social & economical sciences more applied. | Typical research University; (45 R units). |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Internationalisation | 10% international; Moderate level of internationalisation. | 17 % international students; 18 programmes in English; High level internationalisation. | 10% international students (try to increase); Training learning support. |
| Relations with community | Many channels; Advanced. | High involvement; Many relations with businesses. | Academic town; Cultural role of University. |

Working Group 2 (WG 2)

| | HEI 1 | HEI 2 | HEI 3 |
|------------|---|--|--|
| 1.1 | <p>Quality culture is very visible; Policy of continuous improvement;</p> <p>Consolidated information System;</p> <p>Involvement of stakeholders – students and external.</p> | <p>Quality culture is very visible at all levels;</p> <p>Quality culture related to the strategic plan;</p> <p>Policy of continuous improvement;</p> <p>Consolidated information system Involvement of stakeholders – students and external.</p> | <p>Quality culture is very visible;</p> <p>Policy of continuous improvement;</p> <p>Consolidated information system;</p> <p>Involvement of stakeholders – students and external;</p> <p>IQAS is based on risk analysis.</p> |
| 1.2 | <p>Mechanisms for QA related to national law and institutional regulations;</p> <p>Multi-level approval of proposals of study cycles of QA.</p> | <p>ESG;</p> <p>Mechanisms for QA related to national law and institutional regulations;</p> <p>Multi-level approval of proposals of study cycles of QA;</p> <p>Teaching methods relevant to achievement of learning objectives and outcomes.</p> | <p>ESG;</p> <p>Mechanisms for QA related to national law and institutional regulations;</p> <p>Multi-level approval of proposals of study cycles of QA;</p> <p>Teaching methods relevant to achievement of learning objectives and outcomes.</p> |
| 1.3 | <p>Participation and feedback of students;</p> <p>Institutional support for good teaching practices.</p> | <p>Regular pedagogical monitoring;</p> <p>The institution stimulates teachers to improve the pedagogical methods.</p> | <p>Engagement of the students in research activities;</p> <p>Lab for Teaching and Learning Innovations.</p> |
| 1.4 | <p>Award for the best teacher each year;</p> | <p>Welcome week with participation of different stakeholders;</p> <p>Award for the best teacher each year;</p> | <p>Regular monitoring of students activities;</p> <p>Automatic certification.</p> |

| | | | |
|-------------|---|--|--|
| | Institutional mechanisms for recognition of prior learning. | Institutional mechanisms for recognition of prior learning. | |
| 1.5 | Annual evaluation of the activities of teaching staff; Manual of good practices. | Annual evaluation of the activities of teaching staff; Award for best teachers- Book of the month. | Annual evaluation of the activities of teaching staff; Biannual surveys to teachers (and students). |
| 1.6 | Rooms for students open 24h. | Support for students with special disabilities; Rooms for students; Tutorial programmes for students. | Social support for students; Tutorial programmes for students. |
| 1.7 | The IS consolidates all the information of the Quality system. | Business intelligent system which allows integrated information; Automatic analysis of data; Integrated information. | Open source tools for data warehouse. |
| 1.8 | Public information through website. | Public information through website. | Public information through website. |
| 1.9 | Periodic revision of programme with participation of stakeholders – although mainly internal. | Annual monitoring and periodic revision of programme with participation of stakeholders, including alumni and employers. | Periodic revision of programme with participation of stakeholders – although mainly internal. |
| 1.10 | Cyclical; External QA – A3ES (Eurace, Equis). | Cyclical; External QA – A3ES. | Cyclical; External QA – A3ES. |

Working Group 3 (WG 3)

| ESG | HEI 2 | HEI 3 |
|-----|---|---|
| 1.1 | <p>Aligned with strategic plan and annual activities plan;</p> <p>Involvement of teachers is not completely clear;</p> <p>Strong involvement of Student Union;</p> <p>Students involved in quality council and in information recall (surveys);</p> <p>Alumni involved in student integration and project planning;</p> <p>External connection is good, particularly in business scientific area;</p> <p>They build a quality culture with the ISO implementation and regular audits – is considered an introduction to this quality culture for the academic community; in particular for teachers;</p> <p>They presented a SWOT analysis of the system.</p> | <p>A traditional university and a strong leadership: quality is strategic not merely viewed as a government imposition;</p> <p>ISO is related to support services but also with faculty programmes (PDCA cycle);</p> <p>Very clear quality plan and objectives monetisation;</p> <p>Very clear and complete IQAS presentation -mention of the two more difficult implementation standards: learning outcomes and student centred learning;</p> <p>Engagement of students mainly in operational level but also in quality council;</p> <p>Full compliance.</p> |
| 1.2 | <p>Have clear and consolidated procedure for design and approval of their programmes;</p> | <p>Procedures implemented with Answers which have to be answered during the process – <u>why</u> to modify, <u>how</u> (include benchmarking with other programmes), <u>What</u> kind of competences should be obtained;</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| | <p>Well organised and supported by an integrated information system that produces indicators and reports at different levels;</p> <p>They consider the feedback of the student survey, UC report, customers, and alumni employability.</p> | <p>This standard connects with 1.9 due to interaction with internationalisation and research;</p> <p>The main general question is to be more efficient in <u>How</u> to measure.</p> |
| 1.3 | <p>Involved in different decision structures, and they have delegates per classes and in each of the programmes;</p> <p>The students union of HEI 2 is completely involved in quality council and in macro and micro processes.</p> | <p>Difficult to balance the proportion between students groups and tutors;</p> <p>Students involved in different commissions and Pedagogical council;</p> <p>Incentives for teachers for develop supporting teaching innovation methods;</p> <p>Criteria for assessment is published.</p> |
| 1.4 | <p>They have the YYY system;</p> <p>Some difficulty with double degrees certification and validation;</p> <p>Preventive indicators to react before final results is in development.</p> | <p>Academic management System XXX, available for students, teachers, monitoring all life cycle of the students;</p> <p>The traceability of students and alumni: success cases and where are now “the best student” and what they do;</p> <p>They control the dropout.</p> |
| 1.5 | <p>I-meritus information system for teacher evaluation integrated with SAP that includes information of teaching assessment by students, CV’s, etc.;</p> <p>They related this information to teacher evaluation;</p> | <p>Some Procedures for teaching recruitment but in internal discussion;</p> <p>A teacher training programme is in development;</p> <p>The most important question related to teachers: How produce good support teaching materials</p> |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | <p>They have a regular teaching programme with internal workshop about best practices and training in new technologies;</p> <p>Well organised Support services to help teachers and course coordinators in information analysis, reports elaboration, (academic, library and information system support).</p> | <p>and articles with pedagogical and research impact;</p> <p>At the moment SAP is not completely integrated with XXX- the interface is being developed (some information about teachers is dispersed).</p> |
| 1.6 | <p>Working group rooms available in different parts of HEI 2 (e.g. library);</p> <p>In the first week of the year they have tutors to support integration;</p> <p>E-learning support system.</p> | <p>They provide many social services;</p> <p>Is a full complex because it includes international students.</p> |
| 1.7 | <p>Very well integrated information system with continuous indicators monitoring system;</p> <p>They have in development an integrated intelligence business system;</p> <p>Class attendance system.</p> | <p>Data warehouse;</p> <p>Excellent system regularly brought up-to date.</p> |
| 1.8 | Website in Portuguese, English and Chinese. | Website. |
| 1.9 | <p>Business intelligence system;</p> <p>Annual report of programmes (based on pedagogic monitoring, available online).</p> | <p>Annual surveys, self-evaluation reports;</p> <p>Procedure for review programmes;</p> <p>They have made a SWOT analysis.</p> |
| 1.1 | Try to integrate other certifications with ISO and ESG in an unique matrix (e.g. EURACE, AMBA) | |

Working Group 4 (WG 4)

| ESG P 1 | HEI 1 | HEI 2 | HEI 3 |
|---------|---|---|---|
| 1.1. | 5 + clear to all; + integrated. | 5 + mature IQAS, 2nd edition; + transparent, published. | 4 +1st generation; + adjusted to the faculties, departments, decentralised; ? if students, professors, staff know them. |
| 1.2. | 5 + good monitoring is basis for design/revision of programme. | 5 + comprehensive system, many committees in departments, schools; + guidelines for changing study programmes. | 4 + coordinator for each programme, responsible also for QA + commission for quality, new programme include all stakeholders; + SWOT analysis. |
| 1.3. | 5 + representation of students; + feedback from students; + manual for good practice. | 5 + clear learning outcomes; + monitoring; + feedback from students. | 4 + guide for teachers with learning outcomes; + tutors for students; ? implementation of guide recommend. - this (SCL) is the most problematic standard. |
| 1.4. | 5 + no problems, in national context of traditional university; + actions for attracting students; + scholarships; | 5 + good information for students about programmes (also for international students, i.e. web site in Chinese); + training for soft skills. | 4 + good student administration, certificates online - depended on demographic changes; ? admission policy of university. (to attract the best, also foreign students, male students). |

| | | | |
|-------------|---|--|--|
| | + small drop out. | | |
| 1.5. | 5 + support for teachers, offers for training; + group for monitoring of teaching; + competition for new teachers. | 5 + independent teachers; + support for teacher training; + QAS manual; + monitoring; + incentives for participation. | 5 + high requirement for new staff; + training programme for teachers; + evaluation of teachers by indicators; + student surveys of teachers; + evaluation of teacher's cooperation with soc./com; + managerial skills of teachers, responding in information systems. |
| 1.6. | 4 + equipment; + modern spaces, new buildings; + 3 campuses; + different fields -focused on research, not on students. | 5 + special service for pedagogic support; + services for 1., 2. degree, for scholarships; + e- learning platform; + disabled students /with special needs, on-line; + library excellent. | 4 + system for e-learning; + tutoring; + for students with special needs, international students; + student administration on line; + beautiful old library and e- lib.& databases; ? how does all this work. |
| 1.7. | 5 + information system integrated, mature; + design of information systems also conducted for | 5 + integrated, complete (administrative + academic); + team for analyses. | 5 + developed; + support decision making. |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| | other universities. | | |
| 1.8. | 5 +public oriented. | 5 + publications for public; + publications in Chinese. | 4 + try to be complete, up-to-date information; + accessible to all; -web site in English. |
| 1.9. | 5 + monitoring. | 5 + developed inform system, similar to Coimbra university. | 5 + meeting with students every semester; + discussions in departments; + reports; + monitoring. |
| 1.10. | 5 + benefit of external audit. | 5 + all programmes accredited. | 5 + helpful recommendation from external auditors. |
| P1.+3Pt | | | |
| 1. Research | + monitoring. | + evaluation of each teacher's research. | + using of data from external sources on research; + incubators, research centres. |
| 2. International | + partnership with international universities; + also in research projects. | + cooperation with Brazil (students). | + participation in EU research programmes; + exchange of professors. |
| 3. Community | + network of partners with industry. | + incubators, technology Park. | + monitoring of teacher's cooperation with community; + botanic garden; + university theatre; + tourists, visitors on university. |

20th of January
Workshop 3: IQAS and the Standards

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Goals | <p>The main goals of workshop are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) QAS design and implementation; 2) Barriers; outcomes; pros & cons; certification process; 3) Site visit; reports; 4) Other practical problems. Problem 1???. Problems 2???, etc.. <p>Outcome of Workshop 3 ...</p> |
| Form | Interactive parallel sessions encouraging participants to discuss and share their views on Part 1 ESG bearing in mind the following process of external evaluation and Part 2 of ESG. |
| Time | 11:30 – 12:30 H |
| Attendees | Experts from the four countries, staff from the four Agencies and other guests (other experts, coordinators for IQA, heads of departments, executives etc.), most of them from Portugal. Attendees will be divided into 4 groups to give each participant a chance to discuss and bring forwards ones view. |
| Facilitators | 2 people. One of their tasks is to establish a dialogue aimed at moderating the participants to develop their questions to the HEIs of day 2. Related to Part 1 ESG. The other responsibility is to prepare a short report on findings from workshops. |
| Focus questions | <p>Focus questions relate to the goals and were developed commonly by the project partners. As the time of session is quite short it seems of utmost importance to receive answers on following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the most important/crucial part of the design and implementation of an IQAS and the alignment with the standards/or guidelines having a potential impact on the quality enhancement/or on the development of quality culture? 2. What are the main obstacles in the implementation of an IQAS and the standards and why? Are they derived from the content of the standards? 3. What are the needs for further interpretation of the standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for the experts and why? <p>Key questions together with handouts will be sent to participants prior to the meeting in order to make discussion more efficient.</p> |
| Additional questions | Further questions should result from discussion with participants and will be developed by moderators in the course of the workshop. Their role should be supportive to the main questions rather than to create other issues. |
| After workshop | Making the findings from the workshops available to the others through the plenary session – short reports of moderators. |
| Sustainability | The output of Workshop 1 should be incorporated in the GUIDE as a tool for self-evaluation and monitoring or review of IQAS. |

Facilitators sheet
Participants *"To Do List"*

| Output question 1 | Output question 2 |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| | |
| Output question 3 | Output question 4 |
| | |

| Output question 5 | Output question 6 |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| | |
| Output question 7 | Output question 8 |
| | |

20th of January
Workshop 4: Playing our role 1st round

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Goals | <p>The main goals of the workshop are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Identify methodologies for external evaluation; 2) Develop guidelines for external evaluation and site visits; 3) Contribution to the development of Audit Manuals for the QAAs; 4) Contribution to the development of IQAS for the HEIs. <p>Outcome of Workshop 3: Contributions to the GUIDE</p> |
| Form | <p>Interactive parallel sessions encouraging participants to discuss and share their views on the ESG bearing in mind the process of external evaluation of IQAS.</p> <p>In the 1st round, Group 1 will play the PANEL and will face Group 2 as an HEI; Group 3 will play the PANEL and will meet Group 4 that is playing the HEI.</p> <p>Group 1 versus Group 2 will focus on the standards: 1.1.; 1.2.; 1.9. and 1.10.</p> <p>Group 2 versus Group 4 will focus on the standards: 1.2.; 1.3.; 1.4.</p> |
| Time | 14:00 – 15:30H |
| Attendees | Experts from the four countries, staff from the four Agencies and other guests (other experts, coordinators for IQA, heads of departments, executives etc.), most of them from Portugal. Attendees will be divided into 4 groups that will play the roles of a Panel and an HEI, in two rounds of a simulation game. |
| Facilitators | 2 people. One of their tasks is to establish a dialogue aimed at moderating the participants and the simulation games. |
| Focus questions | <p>Group 1 versus Group 2 will focus on the standards: 1.1.; 1.2.; 1.9. and 1.10.</p> <p>Group 2 versus Group 4 will focus on the standards: 1.2.; 1.3.; 1.4.</p> |
| Additional questions | Further questions should result from discussion with participants and will be developed by moderators in the course of the workshop. Their role should be supportive to the main questions rather than to create other issues. |
| After workshop | Making the findings from the workshops available to the others through the plenary session – short reports of moderators. |
| Sustainability | The output of Workshop 4 should be incorporated in the GUIDE as a tool for self-evaluation and monitoring or review of IQAS. |

20th of January
Workshop 5: Playing our role 2nd round

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Goals | <p>The main goals of the workshop are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Identify methodologies for external evaluation; 2) Develop guidelines for external evaluation and site visits; 3) Contribution to the development of Audit Manuals for the QAAs; 4) Contribution to the development of IQAS for the HEIs. <p>Outcome of Workshop 3: Contributions to the GUIDE</p> |
| Form | <p>Interactive parallel sessions encouraging participants to discuss and share their views on the ESG bearing in mind the process of external evaluation of IQAS.</p> <p>In the 2nd round, Group 2 will play the PANEL and will face Group 3 as an HEI; Group 4 will play the PANEL and will meet Group 1 that is playing the HEI.</p> <p>Group 2 versus Group 3 will focus on the standards: 1.1.; 1.5.; 1.6. Group 4 versus Group 1 will focus on the standards: 1.2.; 1.7.; 1.8.</p> |
| Time | 15:45 – 17:00 H |
| Attendees | Experts from the four countries, staff from the four Agencies and other guests (other experts, coordinators for IQA, heads of departments, executives etc.), most of them from Portugal. Attendees will be divided into 4 groups that will play the roles of a Panel and an HEI, in two rounds of a simulation game. |
| Facilitators | 2 people. One of their tasks is to establish a dialogue aimed at moderating the participants and the simulation games. |
| Focus questions | Group 2 versus Group 3 will focus on the standards: 1.1.; 1.5.; 1.6. Group 4 versus Group 1 will focus on the standards: 1.2.; 1.7.; 1.8. |
| Additional questions | Further questions should result from discussion with participants and will be developed by moderators in the course of the workshop. Their role should be supportive to the main questions rather than to create other issues. |
| After workshop | Making the findings from the workshops available to the others through the plenary session – short reports of moderators. |
| Sustainability | The output of Workshop 4 should be incorporated in the GUIDE as a tool for self-evaluation and monitoring or review of IQAS. |

21st of January

Workshop 6 -The Magic Stick workshop: The link between IQAS and the QA of teaching and learning. How are IQAS delivering?

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Goals | <p>The main goal of workshop is to answer the question: 1) How are IQAS delivering? Outcome of Workshop 6: Contributions to the GUIDE</p> |
| Form | Interactive parallel session encouraging participants to discuss and share their views on Part 1 ESG bearing in mind the following process of external evaluation and Part 2 of ESG. |
| Time | 14:00 – 15:30 H |
| Attendees | Experts from the four countries, staff from the four Agencies and other guests (other experts, coordinators for IQA, heads of departments, executives etc.), most of them from Portugal. Attendees will be divided into 4 groups to give each participant a chance to discuss and bring forwards ones view. |
| Facilitators | 2 people that will volunteer. They will invite the other members of the group from among the participants. |
| Focus questions | <p>Focus questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the most important/crucial part of the design and implementation of an IQAS and the alignment with the standards/or guidelines having a potential impact on the quality enhancement/or on the development of quality culture? 2. What are the main obstacles in the implementation of an IQAS and the standards and why? Are they derived from the content of the standards? 3. What are the needs for further interpretation of the standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for the experts and why? <p>Key questions together with handouts will be sent to participants prior to the meeting in order to make discussion more efficient.</p> |
| Additional questions | Further questions should result from discussion with participants and will be developed by moderators in the course of the workshop. Their role should be supportive to the main questions rather than to create other issues. |
| After workshop | Making the findings from the workshops available to the others through the plenary session – short reports of moderators. |
| Sustainability | The output of Workshop 6 should be incorporated in the GUIDE as a tool for self-evaluation and monitoring or review of IQAS. |