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List of commonly used abbreviations:

ESG - Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area
EURASHE - European Association of Institutions in Higher Education
EUA - European University Association
EHEA - European Higher Education Area
HEI/s - Higher Education Institution/s
QA - Quality Assurance
PQA - Policy for Quality Assurance
IQA - Internal Quality Assurance
EQA - External Quality Assurance
IQAS - Internal Quality Assurance System
ECTS - European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System
SCL - Student-Centred Learning
In 2005, Ministers responsible for higher education in Europe adopted the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) prepared by the so called “E4 group”, namely ENQA (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education) in cooperation with ESU (European Students’ Union), EURASHE (the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education) and EUA (European University Association). In 2012-2015 ESGs were revised to “improve their clarity, applicability and usefulness, including their scope” since its adoption. EQAR (European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education), Education International and Business Europe also joined the initial E4 group. This resulted in the adoption of new Standards and Guidelines (ESG 2015) by the ministers in the Ministerial Conference in Yerevan in May 2015.

Quality assurance in Higher Education activities should be built on top of the successful implementation of an internal quality assurance system which provide information concerning quality of the institution’s activities and provide advice and recommendations on how to improve these activities. Quality assurance and quality enhancement are thus inter-connected, generating trust in the higher education institution’s performance.

It is assumed that ESG 2015 apply to all higher education institutions (HEIs) of the EHEA, regardless of study cycle or place of delivery, as a model and a reference document for internal and external quality assurance. A key goal of ESG2015 is to contribute to a common understanding of quality assurance for learning and teaching among all stakeholders. The focus of the ESG is on quality assurance related to learning and teaching in higher education, including the learning environment and relevant links to research and innovation. According to ESG2015, quality assurance should ensure a learning environment in which the content of programmes, learning opportunities and facilities are fit for their purpose.

The ESG are based on four principles for quality assurance: (i) HEI have primary responsibility for the quality of their provision and its assurance; (ii) quality assurance responds to the diversity of higher education systems, institutions, programs and students; (iii) quality assurance supports the development of a quality culture and (iv) quality assurance takes into account the needs and expectations of students, all other stakeholders and society.

‘Enhancing internal quality assurance systems’ (EIQAS), the Erasmus+ Strategic Partnership project approved for funding in autumn 2014. EIQAS was a joint initiative of national QA agencies and Rectors’ Conferences and/or HEIs. Partners of the project: Polska Komisja Akredytacyjna, Konferencja Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich, Agência de Avaliação e Acreditação do Ensino Superior, Conselho Reitores das Universidades Portuguesas, Universidade do Minho, Nacionalna agencija RS za kakovost v visokem solstvu, Univerza v Novi Gorici, Univerza v Ljubljani, Nacionalna Agencija za Ocenjavane i Akreditacije. First of all, the partners were chosen to represent both QA agencies and HEIs to integrate external and internal QA perspectives. It had two objectives. Firstly, it aimed to support
HEIs in the further development of their internal quality assurance (IQA) systems by enhancing their awareness and understanding of Part 1 of the ESG. Secondly, it aimed to support the national agencies in the further development of their methodologies for the external assessment of IQA systems at HEIs, thus addressing one of the standards in Part 2 of the ESG.

The EIQAS is the project specifically designed to support the development of IQA and bringing together both national QA agencies and HEIs. It produced four main intellectual outputs: a reference framework for comparative analysis of the participating Agencies’ methodologies for the assessment of IQA as part of EQA and a comparative report on their methodologies, a Guide to IQA including more detailed practical guidelines on Part 1 of the ESG and examples of good practice, and a Student Guide to Part 1 of the ESG. The project is directly targeted at all HEIs, the QA Agencies and their external experts, including students, in the participating countries. Indirectly, the project will address QA agencies and HEIs in other countries of the European Higher Education Area through dissemination activities. The two main outputs of the project will be a Guide to IQA based on Part 1 of the ESG and a reference framework for comparative analysis of the participating agencies’ methodologies for the external assessment of IQA.

EIQAS is expected to have immediate impact on the project partners and participants and non-participating HEIs as its target group in terms of enhanced awareness or understanding of Part 1 of the ESG and good innovative practice in IQA. For the partners and participants, this will be achieved through their direct involvement in, and contribution to, the project activities, in particular the work carried out in the WPGs and the training events. For non-participating HEIs, this ‘enhanced capacity’ effect will be achieved through the Guide to IQA and the Student Guide available to all, used by HEIs in developing their IQA systems, and through dissemination activities (see below).
The five-day Seminar on IQA and the ESG was held in Warsaw in 26-30 June 2015. Its purpose was 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 best and innovative practice in IQA. It was attended by ca. 50 participants / individuals from project partners and representatives of Polish Higher Education Institutions.

Training Event 1 (Seminar on IQA and the ESG) was 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 included presentations on Part 1 of the ESG and IQA systems, and discussion workshops in smaller groups on how each of Part 1 ESG can be interpreted and on good practice in IQA. The Seminar was 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 also provided 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 was still made after the seminar to take into account suggestions made during workshop discussions.

As the EIQAS project as a whole is financed from the Polish Erasmus+ budget the Seminar was held in Poland and the seminar was attended by a larger number of representatives of Polish HEIs. This increased 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 had been developed before the seminar and on the online discussion/meeting. However, a discussion workshop during the seminar was the only opportunity for a face-to-face discussion and an in-depth comparative analysis of the Agencies’ methodologies. Conclusions provided the basis for a comparative report on IQA assessment methodologies to be produced after the seminar. Further, in broader terms, as the seminar was planned for five days, it gave the Agencies which had 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter/Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.00 - 12.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Preparatory meeting of Project Management Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 - 12.30 p.m.</td>
<td>Welcome speech, Overview of EIQAS project</td>
<td>Danuta Strahl, PKA Vice President, Project Coordinator Izabela Kwiatkowska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 - 2.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Presentation of Part 1 ESG - after Yerevan communique and discussion</td>
<td>Tove Blytt Holment, EIQAS Advisory Board, ENQA Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 - 2.30 p.m.</td>
<td>Presentations by students on key IQA issues from their perspective</td>
<td>Blazhe Todorovski, ESU representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30 - 3.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch Hotel Mercure Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 5.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Presentation of findings from online survey on IQA and the ESG - Country reports/Cross country report</td>
<td>Report authors from PKA, NEAA, SQAA, A3ES: Izabela Kwiatkowska, Todor Shopov, Klemen Subic, Madalena Fonseca, Mieczysław W. Socha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Moderators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 - 1.00 p.m. /after 45 minutes session change of participants/</td>
<td>3 parallel workshops in smaller groups (how each 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: 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 and periodic review of programmes 1.3. Student centred learning, teaching and assessment and 1.4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification</td>
<td>Mieczysław W. Socha and Maciej Markowski Madalena Fonseca and Veronika Piccinini Vanja Perovsek and Todor Shopov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45 p.m. Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 2.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Findings from workshops, discussion</td>
<td>Moderators reports from morning sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 - 3.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch Hotel Mercure Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 4.30 p.m. /after 45 minutes session change of participants/</td>
<td>2 parallel workshops in smaller groups (how each 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: 1.7. Information management and 1.8 Public information 1.5. Teaching staff and 1.6 Learning resources and student support</td>
<td>Klemen Subic and Maciej Markowski Andrzej Kraśniewski and Jernej Širok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30 - 5.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Findings from workshops, discussion</td>
<td>Moderators reports from afternoon sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Dinner Smaki Warszawy Restaurant (meeting at the Hotel lobby 7.45 p.m.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Day 3 /28th of June/
Hotel Mercure conference room Scherzo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Speakers/Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.30 - 10.00 a.m.</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>WG5 leader: NEAA Todor Shopov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 - 1.30 p.m.</td>
<td>Presentations on IQA systems and good practices given by HEIs: Polytechnic Institute of Viana do Castelo University of Sofia University of Ljubljana University of Minho WSB Schools of Banking</td>
<td>Ana Sofia Rodrigues Anastas Gerjikov Vanja Perovsek Isabel Santos Anna Trzuskawska-Grzesińska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 - 2.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch Hotel Mercure Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 - 4.30 p.m.</td>
<td>Presentations on IQA systems and good practices given by HEIs: University of Coimbra University of Madeira University of Social Sciences Warsaw/Lodz/Chopow/Cracow/London University of Nova Gorica University of Beira Interior</td>
<td>Madelana Alarcão Custodia Drumond Justyna Kopańska Veronika Piccinini Isabel Cunha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Facilitator/Presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 - 1.00 p.m.</td>
<td>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 transferrable practice: a presentation of each Agency’s methodology followed by a discussion</td>
<td>Facilitator WG3 leader: SQAA Jernej Širok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations: PKA, NEAA, SQAA, A3ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 2.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch Żurawina Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 - 3.30 p.m.</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Facilitator WG 3 leader: SQAA Jernej Širok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 - 4.00 p.m.</td>
<td>ESG and IQA from teaching staff perspective</td>
<td>Maria João Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 5 /30th of June/ Polish Accreditation Committee Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 - 12.00 a.m.</td>
<td>Wrap-up discussion on the interpretation of the ESG and good practice within the Partnership; summary conclusions from each workshop by partners. Final discussion on the structure of Guide to IQA.</td>
<td>Facilitator: PKA representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 - 1.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch Żurawina Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 3.00 p.m.</td>
<td>Final meeting</td>
<td>Facilitator: PKA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**List of abbreviations used in programme:**

- **PKA** Polska Komisja Akredytacyjna / Polish Accreditation Committee, Poland
- **A3ES** Agência de Avaliação e Acreditação do Ensino Superior, Portugal
- **NEAA** Nacionalna Agencija za Ocenjavane i Akreditacija / National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency, Bulgaria
- **KRASP** Konferencja Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich / Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland, Poland
- **CRUP** Conselho Reitores das Universidades Portuguesas, Portugal
- **SQAA** Nacionalna agencija RS za kakovost v visokem solstvu / Slovenian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, Slovenia
- **ENQA** European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
- **ESU** European Students’ Union
Izabela Kwiatkowska – Sujka – Project Manager, PKA

Blazhe Todorowski – ESU
Todor Shopov, NEAA

Klemen Subic, NAKVIS
PART I

PRESENTATION ON EI QAS PROJECT CONCEPT AND EXPECTED RESULTS
1.1.

Presentation 1

EIQAS ENHANCING INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS ERASMUS PLUS PROJECT 2014-2016

Author:
Izabela Kwiatkowska-Sujka, PKA
EIQAS objectives

to increase the capacity of HEIs in the participating countries to develop internal quality assurance systems and build quality culture by enhancing their awareness and understanding of Part 1 of ESG and identifying, developing and disseminating good innovative practice in internal quality assurance.

to increase the capacity of the participating QA agencies by comparing their methodologies for the assessment of internal quality assurance and exchanging and developing good practice in IQA assessment.
EIQAS target

- HEIs
- QA agencies
- Experts incl. students

Map of Europe with pins indicating various countries.
**EIQAS partners**

**EIQAS milestones**

- Questionnaire on IQA and ESG and country/cross country reports on survey findings
- Methodology for identification good practice in IQA
- Reference framework for comparative assessment of QA agencies methodologies
- Comparative report on the methodologies of IQAs assessment by QA agencies
- Guide to IQA based on the ESG and including good practice examples
- Students’ Guide to Part 1 ESG
- Report on a draft framework for further training of experts and arrangements for exchange of experts among QA Agencies
EIQAS implementation

- Survey and Training Event 1 on IQA and ESG
- Comparative analysis of agencies’ IQA assessment methodology
- ESG
- Identification of good practice in IQA
- Production of Guide to IQA
- Students’ Training Event 2 and Students’ Guide to IQA
- Experts’ Training Event 3
- Dissemination Events

Project Management Team (contact person from each partner country)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Coordination Group (partners from each country)</td>
<td>National Coordination Group (partners from each country)</td>
<td>National Coordination Group (partners from each country)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External experts

UK, Spain, Germany, Norway

Feedback

4 NATIONAL CONSULTATION GROUPS
(QA coordinator from HEIs from Poland (30), Bulgaria (10), Portugal (12), Slovenia (4))
Training Event 1 goals

- Disseminate results of the project
- Discuss and arrive to common understanding of ESG Part 1, identify real problems and expectations
- Identify key issue of good practice in IQA
- Share knowledge, expertise and experience

Drawings
I wish you a fruitful Training Event 1!
PART II

PRESENTATIONS ON EUROPEAN STANDARD AND GUIDELINES / ESG PART 1
INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
2.1.

Presentation 2

QUALITY — TRANSPARENCY — TRUST — MOBILITY.
STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA
(ESG FOR THE EHEA)

Author:
Tove Blytt Holmen, ENQA
I will try to answer questions for clarification all along. However, this is an overview of my topics:

- What is ENQA?
- International influence, the Bologna process
- The ESG
  - Revised version; news and does
  - Purpose, but what if not compliant?
- Questions and debate
ENQA is the largest association of quality assurance agencies committed to agreed European standards, i.e. ESG.

ENQA drives the development of quality assurance by:
- Representing, supporting and providing agencies nationally as well as internationally
- Promoting the development of a quality culture in higher education and in this also promoting the enhancement of quality


ENQA

- 48 members from 25 (of 47) EHEA member countries
- All members of ENQA have undergone an external review against the European Standards and Guidelines (2005)
Background to ENQA - members

ENQA Occasional Papers 17 (2011): Mapping and application of the ESG:

“It can generally be concluded that there is clear evidence that the ESG have been widely implemented and have impacted significantly on QA in the EHEA. Impact can be seen in processes for both internal and external QA and also at national and system level.

However, further work could be done to raise awareness and ownership of the ESG even further, particularly amongst faculty staff directly involved in the student learning and teaching-process.”
Scope and Concepts

Quality, whilst not easy to define, is mainly a result of the interaction between teachers, students and the institutional learning environment. Quality should ensure learning environment in which the content of the programmes, learning opportunities and facilities are fit for purpose.

Part 1: Institutions’ internal quality assurance

Part 2: External quality assurance

Part 3: Accountability of the quality assurance agencies
Part 1: Institutions' internal quality assurance

1.1 Policy for quality assurance
1.2 Design and approval of programmes

1.3 Student-centered learning, teaching and assessment
1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

1.5 Teaching staff
1.6 Learning resources and support
1.7 Information management
1.8 Public information

1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes
1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance


1.2 Design and approval of programmes

... ... including the intended learning outcomes ... ....... and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.

1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment
Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach.
1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes

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

ESG 2.1 Consideration of internal quality assurance

External quality assurance should address (ESG 2005: “take into account”) the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance processes as described in Part 1 of the ESG.

What do you know about the effects of the institution’s internal quality assurance on quality itself?

What do the institutions know about ESG - Part 1?
Part 2: External quality assurance

2.3 Implementing processes
External quality assurance processes should be reliable, useful, pre-defined, implemented consistently and published. They include

- a self-assessment or equivalent;
- an external assessment normally including a site visit;
- a report resulting from the external assessment;
- a consistent follow-up.

A consistent, value-adding Follow-up

- A friendly reminder, stimulating a continuous awareness for quality
- Enhancement approach
- Obligatory report by the Agency
- Site-visit? (for ENQA members this will be obligatory)

- Could you (the institution) make your local quality assurance agency?
Part 2: External quality assurance

2.4 Peer-review experts
External quality assurance should be carried out by groups of experts that include (a) student member(s).
ESG purposes

- They set a common framework for quality assurance systems for learning and teaching at European, national and institutional level
- They enables the assurance and improvement of quality of higher education in the EHEA
- They provide information on quality assurance in the EHEA
- They support mutual trust, thus facilitating recognition and mobility within and across national borders

Consequences if one does not do not comply?

· What do you think may be a specific advantage by using ESG Part 1 as a tool for your internal quality assurance?

· Measures/Indicators on quality: How do you secure that the information you get from internal quality assurance, is the best knowledge/impression of quality and the effectiveness of your quality work?

· Is there any standard that will be particularly challenging to comply with?
2.2.
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Key Internal Quality Assurance Issues
Students’ Perspective
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Blazhe Todorovski (Executive Committee Member)

1 What is ESU?
Who we are?

The European Students’ Union (ESU) is the umbrella organisation of 45 National Unions of Students (NUS) from 38 countries. Our members are student-run, autonomous, representative and operate according to democratic principles.

ESU’s work centres around supporting its members through organising seminars, trainings, campaigns and conferences relevant to students, conducting European-wide research, partnership projects and campaigns, providing information services and producing a variety of publications for both students, policy-makers and higher education professionals.
Our role

Mission
ESU’s mission is to represent, defend and strengthen students’ educational, democratic, political and social rights. ESU will work for sustainable, accessible and high quality higher education in Europe.

Vision
Equal educational and social opportunities in an open and democratic Europe where students shape a sustainable future.

ESU involvement in QA...

• In designing and promoting the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ESG)
• Has performed in 2008 the first QA agency audit (ARACIS) entirely carried out by a student review panel;
• Has been involved in the revision of UNESCO/ OECD guidelines for quality provision in cross-border higher education (2005);
• Overview of QA implementation in the BP → BWSE and BAFL.
ESU involvement in QA...

- EUA’s Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP)
- ENQA quality assurance agencies’ evaluations
- Institutional evaluations organized by national quality assurance agencies.
- LLP funded project 2009-2012 Quest for Quality for Students
- LLP funded common project of E4 (MAP- ESG)
- ESPAQ Project – Tempus Project (Armenia)
• www.quest.esu-online.org

• All publications and documents that are related with QA can be found on this web-site!!!
ESU work on QA...

- ESU QA experts pool

**Principles of the pool:**
- Balanced by region and field of studies
- Student-led
- Cycllical renewal
- Bringing student experience together
- Enhancing the role of students in Quality Assurance
- Acting as multipliers

Currently there are **over 60 students:**
- 28 different European countries
- first, second and third cycle
- with previous experience

**Cooperation:**
- National Students’ Pools
- Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) of EUA
- ENQA - External evaluation of Quality Assurance Agencies
- Quality Assurance Agencies
- Higher Education Institutions

- 55% women, 45% men
- variety of study programmes
- trained

---

## Internal QA

2
Student Involvement in IQA

- Main roles of students:
  - As an information source (filling out questionnaires, focus groups, etc)
  - In the follow-up actions (implementation of recommendations, etc.)
  - As observers within the bodies of internal assessment processes
  - As full-members (voting rights) within the bodies of internal assessment processes
- European Standards and Guidelines

ESU’s policy on IQA

- As full members of the academic community and competent co-responsible partners, students should be fully involved in defining the quality assurance policy of the institutions and its internal system.
- Internal quality assurance systems should be aligned with HEIs’ mission and strategic priorities and act as an integral part of the managerial structures of HEIs.
- ESU also emphasises that while quality assurance bodies are a supportive structure within the HEIs, they can neither replace governance bodies and student participation within these bodies, nor undertake their responsibilities.
Barriers

**Fig. 3** What are the main barriers that students find in their involvement?

- The QA processes are not transparent enough, and the reports are not published in a clear and accessible way
- No genuine participation, only a formal one, in a tokenistic way
- No recognition of this labour
- There is not training about quality assurance
- There is a lack of info about QA among the student body
- Students think that these processes are useless because there is not any consequence
- Selection and nomination procedures are not transparent
- Students are not seen as a full member of the academic community

Usefulness/Purposes of QA

**Fig. 1** The usefulness/purposes of QA is generally seen by your national union of students (NUS) as:

- Promoting mobility
- Improving recognition processes
- Holding the institutions accountable
- A tool for public control of Higher Education
- Provision of information
- Enhancing study conditions
- Boosting employability
3 BWSE2015: Main findings & recommendations

bwse2015.esu-online.org

Main findings (IQA processes)

• Only one out of 39 respondents of the BWSE survey have stated that students in their country do not take part in the internal QA processes
  - As an information source (filling out questionnaires, focus groups, etc) (29)
  - In the follow-up actions (implementation of recommendations, etc.) (10)
  - As observers within the bodies of internal assessment processes (9)
  - As full-members (voting rights) within the bodies of internal assessment processes (26)

bwse2015.esu-online.org
Main findings (EQA processes)

- 4 out of 38 respondents have declared that students in their country do not take part in EQA processes
  - As an information source (as in interview during external reviews, etc) (23)
  - As observers within the external review panel (7)
  - As full-members within the external review panel (29)
  - Students can take the position chair/secretary of the external review panel (3)

Main findings (QA governance)

- Are students involved in the governance of quality assurance (QA) agencies?
  - YES (28)  NO (6)  No QA Agency (4)
  - Their involvement in the QA agencies (28 responds)
    - As full-members of the governance bodies (decision-making bodies) (22)
    - As members of the consultative bodies (11)
    - As observers of the governance bodies (decision-making bodies) (5)
    - As planners of the evaluation/accredination programmes (5)
    - Are Students consulted by the Government about QA issues
      - YES (22)  NO (11)  Don’t know (5)
Recommendations

- Quality Assurance must continue to be a priority for higher education systems in order to remove obstacles to take up, pursue with and successfully complete degrees. It has to ensure academic freedom, integration of teaching, learning and research as well as prepare students for being active citizens in the future without excluding any of the groups within the society.

Recommendations

- Quality Assurance systems should be based on the principles and values of trust, participation and ownership of stakeholders and a drive for real improvement.
- The internal QA should embrace evaluating and monitoring all of education activities within a HEI. The reports from the evaluation have to be accessible for students, other stakeholders and wider public and include the recommendations that should serve for the action plans for future improvement. HEIs need to make sure that the progress in monitored.
- Independent QA agencies have to be established in every country across the EHEA to provide the complementary reviews and support HEIs in enhancing quality on institutional and programme level. The autonomous responsibility for their operations should ensure non-political character of the conclusions and recommendations.
Recommendations

- The meaningful representation of students is a must in the QA. Students have to be recognised as competent and equal partners and act as full members in the decision-making bodies of internal and external QA.

- It is essential that the revised version of the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ESG) in the EHEA are rapidly implemented in cooperation with national stakeholders. The student-centered learning standard is of an utmost importance and the countries across the EHEA should strive for full transformation of the national provisions to execute this standard in practice while carrying out the reviews with full and meaningful engagement of students.

- The possibilities for further development of EQAR should be explored in order to provide information about quality-assured higher education provision in EHEA. This could achieved, for instance, by establishing a database of official degrees and study programmes offered within EHEA.

bwse2015.esu-online.org
Thank you for your attention!

blazhe@esu-online.org

@ESUtwt

European Students’ Union

The European Students’ Union
Rue de l’Industrie 10 · 1000 Brussels, Belgium · Tel: +32 2 893 25 45 · Fax: +32 2 706 48 26 · www.esu-online.org
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Cross-country survey results on IQA and ESG

Survey’s goals

to collect data on overall progress that HEIs had made in the implementation of their IQA systems, the extent to which (elements of) Part 1 ESG are integrated into their IQA systems, and the problems HEIs had faced and / or might face when integrating the ESG into their IQA systems
to feed in Training Event 1; besides survey findings together with suggestions and conclusions from the Training Event, they will also be used to develop the above-mentioned Guide to IQA which will be available to all HEIs concerned
Description

- the questionnaire was designed to provide mainly quantitative data as a basis for an in-depth and qualitative analysis during the EIQAS Training Seminar on IQA and the ESG;
- survey questionnaire comprised 40 questions (general&detailed), multiple choice answers or open-end answers;
- questionnaire and survey process was consulted with National Consultation Groups (representatives of HEIs);
- the survey was conducted online between 3 February and 3 March 2015 among HEIs in all four countries participating in EIQAS (Bulgaria, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia);

GENERAL INFORMATION
General

178 HEIs responded to the survey questionnaire from Poland (116), Portugal (42), Slovenia (11) and Bulgaria (9).
What is your function / position at your institution? Please tick the appropriate box.

Answer Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rector / President</td>
<td>12,7%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Rector / Vice-President</td>
<td>25,4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Quality Assurance Coordinator</td>
<td>19,1%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of the Quality Assurance Unit / Office</td>
<td>17,9%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>11,0%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>13,9%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 173
skipped question 5
OVERVIEW ON INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS
What prompted your institution to establish a formal internal quality assurance system? Please tick the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The system had been established entirely on our own initiative before relevant requirements or evaluation criteria were introduced at national level.</td>
<td>30,5%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decision to establish the system was prompted by a requirement in national legislation.</td>
<td>46,6%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decision to establish the system was prompted by external evaluation criteria of the national quality assurance agency.</td>
<td>4,2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decision to establish the system was prompted by a requirement in national legislation and external evaluation criteria of the national quality assurance agency.</td>
<td>16,9%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td>1,7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 118
skipped question 60
What areas of activity does the internal quality assurance system (or, in case a formal system is not yet in place, do the internal quality assurance arrangements) at your institution cover? Please tick all boxes that apply to your institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and learning</td>
<td>97,1%</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>53,6%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>54,3%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 138
skipped question 40

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

- [ ] All units (faculties, departments, etc.) are at the same stage of implementation.
- [ ] Progress in the implementation varies to some extent among units.
- [ ] Progress in the implementation varies considerably among units.
- [ ] Any additional comments you may have...
Problems with IQA

- Bulgaria – external stakeholders involvement, students’ engagement, lack of trained specialists
- Poland – academic staff reluctance, financial and legislative obstacles, bureaucracy
- Slovenia – diverse situation at level of faculties, lack of support of leadership in the implementing IQAs, poor surveys response rate
- Portugal - absence of quality culture, institutional organization, absence of information system

Beneficial qualitative and quantitative changes

- on teaching/learning processes on academic development and appraisal of staff
- on implementation of ECTS,
- on achieving excellence in research,
- on achieving student-centeredness,
- on improvement of degree programmes and learning outcomes,
- on quality of administrative services,
- on development of new QA mechanism and revision of existing one,
- on teaching and learning resources
Do internal quality assurance documents of your institution refer to the ESG? Please tick the appropriate box.

- Refer explicitly to the ESG
- Refer implicitly to the ESG as they are based on national legislation / national external evaluation criteria in which the ESG are integrated
- Do not refer explicitly or implicitly to the ESG
- Other (please explain)

How does your institution use the 2005 version of Part 1 of the ESG in its internal quality assurance? Please tick the appropriate box.

- As a strict checklist to ensure full compliance with the ESG
- As an indicative checklist to ensure broad compliance with the ESG
- As broad guidelines for selected elements of the internal quality assurance system
- ESG integrated into the institution’s own standards and guidelines
- ESG not used at all
- Other (e.g., a combination of any above). Please explain...
What activities has your institution undertaken to familiarise its internal stakeholders (teaching staff, students, quality assurance coordinators / advisers and others) with internal quality assurance and / or the 2005 version of Part 1 of the ESG? You may choose one or more answer(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training events and / or seminars on internal quality assurance where the ESG were explicitly discussed</td>
<td>31,5%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training events and / or seminars on internal quality assurance where the ESG were not explicitly discussed</td>
<td>38,6%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training events and / or seminars specifically devoted to the ESG</td>
<td>8,7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the ESG provided on the institution’s (quality assurance) website</td>
<td>17,3%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit reference to the ESG made in internal quality assurance documents</td>
<td>26,0%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No activities undertaken</td>
<td>17,3%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>10,2%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 127
skipped question 51

PART 1 ESG
ESG 1.1: Policy for quality assurance

Does your institution have a policy for quality assurance that is published and specifies structures and processes through which it is implemented? Please tick the appropriate box.

- 60.0%: A published policy that specifies structures and processes
- 15.4%: A published policy that does not specify structures and processes
- 13.1%: A policy that specifies structures and processes but is not published
- 8.5%: No policy / Policy not yet developed
- 3.1%: Other (please explain)

---

ESG 1.1: Policy for quality assurance

Were / are external stakeholders (employers and / or other external partners) involved in the development and / or implementation of your institution's quality assurance policy? Please tick the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involved in both the development and implementation of the policy</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in the development of the policy but not involved in its implementation</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved in the development of the policy but involved in its implementation</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know / It is hard to say</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 118
skipped question 60
ESG 1.2: Design and approval of programmes

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>In no field of study</th>
<th>In some fields of study</th>
<th>In most fields of study</th>
<th>In all fields of study</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has in place a formal procedure for the design of programmes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has in place a formal procedure for the approval of programmes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 130
skipped question 48

ESG 1.2: Design and approval of programmes

- Provide programmes in different modes of delivery (e.g. full- and part-time, campus-based and distance-learning) in most fields of study (28%)
- Offer flexible learning paths to students (e.g. individual study programmes/paths) in all fields of study (45%)
- Use a variety of teaching and learning methods, including those which encourage active and interactive engagement of students in their learning in all fields of study (59%)

Evaluate and adjust the modes of delivery of programmes and teaching and learning methods on a regular basis in all fields of study (65%)
ESG 1.2: Design and approval of programmes

Programmes

- Are designed in line with strategy, mission statement and vision
- Lead to specified qualifications which refer to the relevant level of the NQF
- Define intended LO without students and external stakeholders involvement
- Have expected student workload

ESG 1.3: Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

Which of the statements below apply to your institution? You may tick no, one or more answer(s).

- Student assessment procedures, methods and criteria are published
- Procedures, methods and criteria enable assessing the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved by students
- A procedure to ensure consistency and fairness in student assessment is in place
- Student performance is assessed by more than one examiner where possible
- A procedure for student appeals is in place
ESG 1.3: Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

In your opinion, to what extent are consistency and fairness achieved through the procedure of student assessment (previous question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>I don’t know / It is hard to say</th>
<th>To no extent</th>
<th>To a little extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,81</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESG 1.4: Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

Regulations

- on student admission (in all fields of study 92%);
- on student progression (in all fields of study 83%);
- on certification / the award of diplomas and certificates (in all fields of study 95%);
- on the recognition of study periods completed at other institutions in the country and abroad (in all fields of study 81%);
- on the recognition of qualifications (degrees) awarded by other institutions in the country and abroad (in all fields of study 71%);
- on the recognition of non-formal and informal learning (in all fields of study 31%).
ESG 1.5: Teaching staff

- Have operated a transparent and fair recruitment process for teaching staff (in all fields of study 80%);
- Provide professional development opportunities to teaching staff (in all fields of study 60%);
- Offer incentives to encourage the professional development of teaching staff (in all fields of study 52%);
- Offer incentives to encourage innovation in teaching (in all fields of study 41%);
- Offer incentives to encourage the use of new technologies in teaching (in all fields of study 45%);
- Have in place mechanisms for rewarding teaching achievements (in all fields of study 55%);
- Regularly assess teaching staff performance (in all fields of study 84%);
- Regularly monitor teaching staff satisfaction (in all fields of study 43%).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>In no field of study</th>
<th>In some fields of study</th>
<th>In most fields of study</th>
<th>In all fields of study</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly monitors teaching staff satisfaction</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 121
skipped question 57
ESG 1.6: Learning resources and student support

Mechanism for assessing whether students support and learning resources are adequate and accessible

Support

academic (students (advice and support to incoming and outgoing students)

for academic and administrative staff

Professional development of competences

ESG 1.6: Learning resources and student support

Periodic survey of students' satisfaction

Focus groups

Students engagement in HE bodies or students union
ESG 1.7: Information management

The majority of responding HEIs (83.9%) confirmed that they have a formal mechanism for analysing and using data collected for the purposes of quality improvement or enhancement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A defined set of key performance indicators for the institution</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of the student population (e.g. age, gender, domicile; level, mode and subject of study)</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student progression, success and drop-out rates</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ satisfaction with their programmes</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning resources and student support available</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of graduates’ employability</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of internationalisation of the institution</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examplary answer

– “the data collected are analyzed by sociologists and the reports compiled are given to the heads of faculties. The Faculty Boards discuss the results of the analyses and make a managerial decision about changes in work organization, curricula, or whatever else might be necessary.”
Examplary answer

– "evaluating the Strategic plan of the university on the base of key performance indicators, using profile of students and students satisfaction surveys when developing agenda for improvements and developing new programmes and courses”

– "the indicators constitute a part of institutional annual plan and action plans with measures for improvement on a regular basis”

Examplary answer

"reports are published by the data analysis section and recommendation for the departments are formulated”
### ESG 1.8: Public information

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full information about programmes offered, including admission criteria, full curricula, syllabuses with all names and contact details, reading lists, intended learning outcomes, qualifications awarded and student assessment procedures</td>
<td>69,4%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only selected information about programmes offered</td>
<td>24,0%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information about programmes</td>
<td>4,1%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about graduate employment</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 121
skipped question 57

### ESG 1.9: On-going monitoring and periodic programme reviews

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>In no field of study</th>
<th>In some fields of study</th>
<th>In most fields of study</th>
<th>In all fields of study</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3,37</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 121
skipped question 57
How are students involved in the programme monitoring and / or review procedure at your institution? Please tick the most appropriate answer in points below. Any additional ways of student involvement can be briefly described in “Other” box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>In no field of study</th>
<th>In some fields of study</th>
<th>In most fields of study</th>
<th>In all fields of study</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are involved as full members of bodies responsible for programme monitoring and / or review</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3,55</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill in course evaluation surveys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3,79</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly receive feedback on findings from course evaluation surveys</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3,24</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are regularly informed about measures to be taken as a result of course evaluation surveys</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3,12</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose measures to improve curricula and / or teaching / learning methods</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3,18</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 106
skipped question 72

How are external stakeholders involved in the programme monitoring and/or review procedure at your institution?

- Provide feedback on the knowledge, skills and competences of graduates employed (e.g. as part of employers' surveys)
- Are involved as members of advisory / consultative bodies
- Are involved as full members of bodies responsible for programme monitoring and / or review
ESG 1.10: Cyclical external quality assurance

In your opinion does external evaluation methodology (procedures/or criteria) of the national quality assurance agency in your country encourage or hinder the development/enhancement of internal quality assurance at HEIs?

- Encourages the development/enhancement of internal quality assurance (55.4%)
- Hinders the development/enhancement of internal quality assurance (34.7%)
- To some extent encourages and to some extent hinders the development/enhancement of internal quality assurance (5.0%)
- Neither encourages nor hinders the development/enhancement of internal quality assurance (4.1%)
- Don't know/It is hard to say (0.8%)
Further clarifications Part 1 ESG

- ESG 1.2 Design and approval of programmes
- ESG 1.1 Policy for quality assurance
- ESG 1.7 Information management
- ESG 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment
- ESG 1.5 Teaching staff
- ESG 1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic reviews of programmes
- ESG 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification
- ESG 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance
- ESG 1.8 Public information

Difficulties Part 1 ESG

- ESG 1.5 Teaching staff
- ESG 1.8. Public information
- ESG 1.2. Design and approval of programmes
- ESG 1.3. Student-centred learning, teaching, assessment
- ESG. 1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes
- ESG 1.2 Design and approval of programmes
- ESG 1.1. Policy for quality assurance
- ESG 1.8 Public information
- ESG 1.6 Learning resources
- ESG 1.7 Information management
- ESG 1.4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification.
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COUNTRY REPORT: BULGARIA

Author:
Todor Shopov, NEAA
CONCLUSIONS

- IQA General:
Bulgaria’s NEAA has recently been evaluated as fully compliant with the majority of ESGs (substantially compliant with a small number of standards). Interest in implementation of ESGs in IQA area is attested by the participation and further involvement in the work of ENQA’s IQA Group. Another proof is the participation of NEAA in the QPP Project of ENQA in which good practices at European level were reported.

NEAA has developed a system of evaluation and accreditation criteria based on the classical notion of tertiary education being based on the classical union of teaching/learning and research. It is fully in line with ESGs. Thus NEAA integrates traditional educational values and modern innovative issues in QA in EHEA.

- ESG: Progress made
Progress made in the implementation of ESGs is considerable. Half of the institutions surveyed report using ESGs in one way or another. An aspect of improvement is to support institutions in this direction at national and European level.

- ESG: Accents
Institutions have IQA systems in place which function uniformly for all faculties/units. At faculty and department levels practices vary. Partial lack of consistency is due to inexperience.

Students are involved systematically in IQA activity (e.g. in expert groups and in bodies of the agency) and student-centred learning in theory is well understood. The actual implementation of this range of issues is to be addressed more fully.

External stakeholders are involved in IQA. This is an ongoing process and NEAA has made progress in this respect. International experts are involved in accreditation procedures.

- ESG: Standards which are not entirely clear
Respondents have expressed a need for clarification of standard 1.3 Student-centred learning. Interviewees informed that this standard should be made clear with regard to current pedagogy (e.g. post-method condition), educational ideology (e.g. constructivism), educational sociology (e.g. cooperation principle), etc.

HEIs do not find difficulties in integrating the new standards for IQA in their local IQA systems. In line with the abovementioned concerns, HEIs report that they find difficult to apply in their IQA systems the following IQA standards:

- ESG 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment (13%)
- ESG 1.5 Teaching staff (13%)
- ESG 1.6 Learning resources (25%)
- ESG 1.8 Public information (13)

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

HEIs report the need for support in the area of IQA at national and international level. This can be accomplished by provision of information, consultation and participation of all those involved (the stakeholders). For example support can be provided by publishing a manual on IQS in ESG. It should contain descriptions of generally accepted practice backed up by relevant theory. The manual should be available in the national language.
- Other: N/A
- Other, EIQAS Seminar & Guide: Aspects of IQA systems and ESG which should be given special attention at the Training Seminar and in the Guide to IQA;

Historical overview (e.g. Crozier 2011)
Interpretation of 10 standards of Part 1
Interpretation of guidelines to standards of Part 1
Discussion of the notion of “IQA system”
Discussion of the notion of “quality culture”
Discussion of the notion of “compliance with an ESG standard”
Discussion of relationship between ESG and current national evaluation and accreditation criteria
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COUNTRY REPORT: SLOVENIA

Author:
Klemen Subic, SQAA
COUNTRY REPORT: SLOVENIA
Findings from the questionnaire survey on
Part I of the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance
and Internal Quality Assurance Systems

Slovenian quality assurance agency for higher education

Klemen Šubic, SQAA

EVEN IF YOU’RE ON THE RIGHT TRACK, YOU’LL GET RUN OVER IF YOU JUST SIT THERE!

Will Rogers
EIQAS SURVEY: Slovenia

- Focused on IQA of the HEI’s in the context of Part 1 of the ESG
- Aimed to:
  - collect data on overall progress in implementation of IQA systems,
  - identify the extend to which Part 1 of the ESG are being integrated in IQA,
  - identify challenges when integrating the ESG into IQA systems.
- Survey among 9 HEI’s, (16.3% of all HEI’s), representing more than 90% of all student population in Slovenia
- 8 HEI’s have been involved in IQA for more than 5 years (1 more than 10 and 1 more than 15)

Overview of IQA systems

- 1993 – adoption of the new HEA, HEI’s developed certain form of formal IQA systems (self-evaluation)
- Project PHARE – NCOHE + HEI’s established network of committees for regular self-evaluation
- 2000 and 2001: preparation of self-evaluation report according to the modified PHARE project guidelines (for each HEI separately)
- 90’s: CRE (now EUA) performed external evaluations at UL and UM
- 2006: new HEA reformed CHE (Council for HE), development and improvement of IQA (promotion of self-evaluation)
- Since 2007: annual self-evaluation reports
- 2009: amendments of the HEA – establishment of SQAA (integration of ESG’s in the IQA and EQA)
Problems and challenges

1. Very diverse situations regarding IQA on different faculties (the size of the uni, lack of integration, organisational culture, diverse response from teachers, lack of experience etc.)

2. Lack of support from the leadership in implementing the IQA systems (week interest from the students, subjectivity, to much administration work)

3. Lack of incentives/resources to develop institution-wide mechanisms and tools (week responsiveness of employers, of graduates and poor survey-response rate)

Overview on EQA system

- Since 2000: growing number of privat (non-state) HEI's and HVC's
- Need for formal EQA (accreditation and external evaluation)
- SQAA EQA activities focused on the institutions own internal policies and procedures for QA (self-evaluation and QE procedures)
- Accreditations and external evaluation: initial and re-accreditation of HEI's and study programmes (granted for max. 7 years or shortened to 3 years or less), external evaluation of HVC's (max. 5 years or shortened to 3 or less), extraordinary evaluation of HEI's, study programmes and HVC's (carried out during accreditation validity)
- SQAA requirement:
  - IQA Manual (Quality Manual) is obligatory for all accredited HEI's,
  - Initial accreditation: appropriate mechanisms for monitoring and improving internal quality systems (self-evaluation procedures and mechanisms)
  - Re-accreditation and external evaluation: special attention is given to the IQA systems, their effectiveness and to quality enhancement
Enhancement of the EQA system  
(based on the opinion of the HEI's)

- Exclusion of evaluation procedures out of accreditation, which is stifled by legislation (no room for QE),
- Distinction between areas that need to be evaluated (in case of institutional or programme evaluation – risk of multiplication of work-burden),
- More effort towards additional calibration of Agencies Staff, Experts and Council members (to improve transparency, ensuring similar decisions in similar procedures),
- Procedures should be more aligned with their purpose,
- SQAA's information system should be more „user friendly”,
- Strengthening the advisory functions of the Agency, which would contribute to the development of IQA and EQA systems,
- Transition to institutional evaluation (providing guidance on the criteria of research, appropriate structure of lecturers, monitoring of employability),
- Special focus on assessment of new technologies and approaches (e-learning, open access education, accessibility for persons with special needs/disabilities …).

Most difficult ESG in Part 1

Only 3 HEIs have expressed their opinion regarding which ESG in Part 1 that needs additional clarification and/or more detailed guidelines:

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

40 % of the HEIs did not find difficulties in integrating the new ESG in their institutional IQA systems. As the most difficult to apply in their IQA system the following standards are pointed out:

- ESG 1.1 Policy for Quality Assurance (20%)
- ESG 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment (12,5%)
- ESG 1.6 Learning resources and student support (40%)
Key issues in establishing IQA

Key issues raised by the higher education institutions in establishing IQA are divided into five sections:

1. individual HEI's reported the lack of resources (for different study process, trainings, IT support), difficulties of full implementation of student-centered learning;

2. institutions state the lack of focus in favor of research, not teaching, full implementation of constant assessment;

3. institutions declare issues regarding justified fear of using subjective feedbacks, which can be used for T&L improvements, as quasi-subjective tool, on-going monitoring involving all parts, lack of stimulation;

4. additional problems are identified in capacity issue (teachers overburdened already), and with mechanisms for on-going staff development;

5. danger of over-regulating instead of enabling, encouraging, approving of programmes

Thank you for your attention!

www.nakvis.si
klemen.subic@nakvis.si
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COUNTRY REPORT: PORTUGAL

Author:
Madalena Fonseca, A3ES
2014 Report of the European Commission on Progress in Quality Assurance in Higher Education:

- Despite formal requirements for involvement of employers in external QA in many countries, their participation in external review teams (e.g. in institutional audits) is still limited.

- The impact of ESG on institutional and academic level, as well as on students, alumni and employers is limited.
2014 Report of the European Commission on Progress in Quality Assurance in Higher Education:

- QA can support HEIs to involve employers in designing work-based learning around relevant learning outcomes and assessment, and by more systematic cooperation of QA agencies and HEIs with VET.

- Few HEIs track or survey their alumni.

- QA can be used to demonstrate that programmes meet labour market needs, feeding knowledge on graduate career paths in design and delivery of programmes (e.g. linking graduate tracking to funding or re-accreditation) and tracking graduate employment.

A3ES:
- AISQS 2012/...
- On a voluntary basis
- 17 HEIs
Audit Manual for ASIGQ
The Frame of Reference for internal quality assurance systems in Portuguese higher education institutions = ESG +3

Reference 1 – Definition of a quality policy and objectives
Reference 2 – Definition and quality assurance of educational offer
Reference 3 – Quality assurance of learning and of student support
Reference 4 – Research and development
Reference 5 – External relations
Reference 6 – Human resources
Reference 7 – Material resources and services
Reference 8 – Information systems
Reference 9 – Public Information
Reference 10 – Internationalisation

Guidelines: specific areas of analysis

1. The institutional policy for quality (objectives, functions, actors and levels of responsibility within the internal quality assurance system) and how it is documented.
2. The scope and effectiveness of the procedures and structures for quality assurance related to each of the core aspects of the institutional mission:
   2.1 teaching and learning;
   2.2 research and development;
   2.3 interaction with society;
   2.4 policies for staff management;
   2.5 support services;
   2.6 internationalisation.
3. The relationship between the quality assurance system and the governance and management bodies of the institution.
4. The participation of internal and external stakeholders in the quality assurance processes.
5. The information system (mechanisms for the collection, analysis and internal dissemination of information; scope and relevance of gathered information).
6. The publication of information relevant to external stakeholders.
7. The monitoring, evaluation and continuous improvement of the internal quality assurance system.
8. The internal quality assurance system, taken as a whole.
Audit Manual for ASIGQ

Criteria to assess the specific areas of analysis

1 – *Insufficient development*
2 – *Partial development*
3 – *Substantial development*
4 – *Very advanced*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typologies</th>
<th>Higher Education Institutions</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Enrolled Students 2011</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Average size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Public Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12,50</td>
<td>182859</td>
<td>48,45</td>
<td>11428,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16,67</td>
<td>108943</td>
<td>28,87</td>
<td>4034,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29,17</td>
<td>291802</td>
<td><strong>77,32</strong></td>
<td>6786,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Military Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,50</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>0,28</td>
<td>350,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0,02</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>0,30</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,50</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>0,30</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Private Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33,33</td>
<td>58572</td>
<td>15,52</td>
<td>1464,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35,00</td>
<td>25893</td>
<td>6,86</td>
<td>507,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68,33</td>
<td>84465</td>
<td><strong>22,38</strong></td>
<td>928,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL Higher Education
What is your function / position at your institution?

Q4 - What is your function / position at your institution?

- Rector / President, 26.2%
- Vice-Rector / Vice-President, 14.3%
- Institutional Quality Assurance Coordinator, 16.7%
- Head of the Quality Assurance Unit / Office, 26.2%
- Administrator, 2.4%
- Other, 14.3%

What stage has your institution reached in the implementation of its internal quality assurance system?

(answered: 36; skipped: 6)

- A formal internal quality assurance system (i.e. a formally adopted and organised collection of components, including multiple and interrelated procedures and tools) - 17
- A number of unrelated procedures which do not yet form a system - 16
- A single procedure (e.g. a programme review procedure) or tool (e.g. a student evaluation survey) - 2

OBS: 1 HEI selected option “other”
### Main problems encountered when developing an internal quality assurance system

(answered: 28; skipped: 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence of a quality culture</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional organisation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of an information system</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive bureaucracy/time-related issues</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of qualified administrative staff</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in the involvement of the</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of the governing bodies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of teaching and learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of cutting-edge research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain specific procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Main benefits introduced with the development of an internal quality assurance system

(answered: 27; skipped: 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement and effective QA process</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More information, formal data, better understanding</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More collaboration/communication</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impact on teaching and learning</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update of the Study Programmes/Retooling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information System/site/platform</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dissemination of a quality culture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern system</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration between disciplines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between teaching and research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation, new knowledge production, research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of adoption of the 2005 version of Part 1 of the ESG in internal quality assurance

(answered: 29; skipped: 13)

1 - Strict checklist to ensure full compliance with the ESG
   - Number: 2

2 - Indicative checklist to ensure broad compliance with the ESG
   - Number: 7

3 - Broad guidelines for selected elements of the internal quality assurance system
   - Number: 9

4 - ESG integrated into the institution’s own standards and guidelines
   - Number: 4

5 - ESG not used at all
   - Number: 3

6 - Other (e.g. a combination of any above)
   - Number: 4

OBS: 4 HEIs selected option “other”

Published regulations concerning student admission, progression, recognition and certification - by fields of study

(answered: 30; skipped: 12)
Examples of how the data collected has been used for quality improvement or enhancement purposes
(answered: 16; skipped: 26)

- Improvement of the assessment process of curricular units: 9
- Programme evaluation and accreditation: 8
- Detect problems within the learning process and solve them: 5
- For effectiveness management of our programmes and other activities: 4
- Improvement of web pages/uniformization of information display: 3
- Human resources management: 1
- Dismissal of invited teaching staff: 1
- Meta assessment/improvement measures for the quality assessment: 1
- Students satisfaction: 1

How are students involved in the programme monitoring and/or review procedure at your institution?
(answered: 22; skipped: 20)

- Fill in course evaluation surveys: 19
- Are involved as full members of bodies responsible for programme monitoring and/or review: 17
- Are regularly informed about measures to be taken as a result of course evaluation surveys: 15
- Regularly receive feedback on findings from course evaluation surveys: 14
- Propose measures to improve curricula and/or teaching/learning methods: 12
How are external stakeholders (employers and / or other partners) involved in the programme monitoring and / or review procedure at your institution?

(Answered questions for all fields of study)

(answered: 22; skipped: 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>In no field of study</th>
<th>In some fields of study</th>
<th>In most fields of study</th>
<th>In all fields of study</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are involved as full members of bodies responsible for programme monitoring and / or review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are involved as members of advisory / consultative bodies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18,18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27,27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide feedback on the knowledge, skills and competences of graduates employed (e.g. as part of employers’ surveys)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18,18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,64</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How are external stakeholders (employers and / or other partners) involved in the programme monitoring and / or review procedure at your institution?

(Answered questions for all fields of study)

(answered: 22; skipped: 20)

- Provide feedback on the knowledge, skills and competences of graduates employed (e.g. as part of employers’ surveys) - 13
- Are involved as members of advisory / consultative bodies - 9
- Are involved as full members of bodies responsible for programme monitoring and / or review - 8
### Does the external evaluation methodology of A3ES in your country encourage or hamper the development / enhancement of internal quality assurance at HEIs?

(Answered: 29; Skipped: 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourages the development / enhancement of internal quality assurance</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent encourages and to some extent hinders the development / enhancement of internal quality assurance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know / It is hard to say</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither encourages nor hinders the development / enhancement of internal quality assurance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How the external evaluation methodology of the national quality assurance agency in your country could be improved / enhanced?

(Answered: 18; Skipped: 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing to suggest</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of the electronic platform allowing the production of templates outside the submission periods, or the importation of information and data, larger fields</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better dissemination of its rules, regulations and general information / dissemination of good practices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of the experts evaluation methodologies (selection of experts, better scientific competences and CV, transparency, ethics, professionalism, consistency of...)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce taxes/fees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate methodologies to the different HEIs nature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less bureaucracy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of procedures for interdisciplinary programmes; for e-learning programmes; for international join programmes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which of ESG 1.1 to 1.10 would require further clarification and/or more detailed guidelines to be entirely clear and easily understandable to teaching staff and students?
(answered: 26; skipped: 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Design and approval of programmes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Information management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Teaching staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Public information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Learning resources and student support</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Policy for quality assurance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of ESG 1.1 to 1.9 are or would be difficult to apply/integrate into your institution’s internal quality assurance system?
(answered: 25; skipped: 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Teaching staff</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Information management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Learning resources and student support</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Policy for quality assurance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Public information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Design and approval of programmes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- It is a learning process
- There are no “one size fits all”
- HEIs are doing great efforts to develop their own IQAS

STILL (BUT),
- There is much room for improvement and critical thinking
- How bureaucratic are IQAS??

Thank you for your attention

Madalena Fonseca

A3ES
3.5.
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PKA criteria related to IQA in institutional evaluation

- 1.2.4 staff providing and supporting the educational process and the staff policy
- 2.2.5 material resources, including teaching and academic facilities as well as resources available to support students and doctoral students
- 2.2.6 managing information relating to the educational process, e.g.: the method of collecting, analysing and using relevant information for the purposes of education quality assurance,
- 2.2.7 public access to the current education quality policy, updated and objective information on the study programmes, expected learning outcomes, and the organisation and procedures of study programmes.

- 2.3 The unit monitors the operation of the internal quality assurance system, regularly evaluates its effectiveness and uses the results thereof to improve the quality policy and to build an education quality culture.

Polish External Quality Assurance System

- Fundamentals of the EQA are described in the LoHE
- PKA (established in 2001) is the sole legal body responsible for EQA in higher education
- Program accreditation (since 2002), for both academic and practical-oriented programs (since 2015), and institutional accreditation (since 2011)
- PKA uses of its own system of criteria for institutional and programme evaluations
- However, since 2015 they have to be accepted by the Minister of Science and Higher Education
IQA in Poland. Basic facts

· Before 2007 only some Polish HEIs had developed IQAs on their own initiatives
· Since 2007 HEIs have been obliged by the Minister of Science and Higher Education to introduce IQA
· The amendment of the LoHE in 2011
  · the obligation to have IQA in place has been stipulated in the Regulation on the conditions for the provision of degree programmes
  · Some elements of IQA have been defined: student opinion questionnaires, periodical academic staff evaluations, and monitoring the careers of graduates on the labour market
  · other elements (a.o. core academic staff) of the system have been identified in the implementing regulations of Minister of Science and Higher Education

Internal Quality Assurance in Poland.

· The Polish law did not refer explicitly to ESG
· HEIs develop their own IQA systems which take into account the individual characteristics of a HEI, its mission, strategy, education profile, population of students, staff, academic traditions and external conditions
· However, PKA included ESG in its methodology for institutional and programme evaluations procedures
· In most of the cases IQAs refer to the ESG as they are based on national legislation/national evaluation criteria in which the ESG are integrated
Criteria for program evaluation

1. The unit has formulated a concept of education and implements a study programme as part of the programme under evaluation allowing for the achievement of intended learning outcomes.

2. The number and quality of research and teaching staff as well as research conducted in the unit ensure that the programme of study under evaluation is implemented and that students achieve their intended learning outcomes.

3. The unit cooperates with the social, economic and cultural environment in the educational process.

Criteria for program evaluation

4. The unit provides adequate teaching and research facilities ensuring the implementation of general academic profile study programmes and students' achievement of intended learning outcomes while enabling the conduct of scientific research.

5. The unit supports students in the process of learning, conducting research and entering the labour market.

6. The unit has developed an effective IQA system geared towards assessing learning outcomes and improving the programme of study as well as towards achieving high education quality culture within the programme under evaluation.
Criteria for institutional evaluation

· 1. The unit acts in accordance with the mission statement and development strategy of the higher education institution.
· 2. The unit operates and improves an internal quality assurance system.
· 3. The unit operates an efficient staff policy.
· 4. The unit ensures that the teaching and scientific facilities are developed in line with its development strategy.
· 5. The unit cooperates with the social, economic and cultural environments, and with national and international academic and scientific institutions.
· 6. The unit operates a system supporting students and doctoral students.
· 7. Doctoral programmes education quality.
· 8. Postgraduate non-degree programmes education quality.

PKA’s criteria related to IQA in institutional criteria

· 1.1 The unit operates a coherent system of internal regulations governing the internal quality assurance system and its improvement, compliant with the unit strategy, quality assurance policy and general legislation in force determining:
  · 1.1.1 the scope and objectives of the internal quality assurance system,
  · 1.1.2 a transparent organisational structure and the assignment of responsibilities and rights,
  · 1.1.3 the participation of internal and external stakeholders in ensuring education quality,
  · 1.1.4 key processes in the area of study, and procedures as well as tools serving the purpose of the monitoring, assessment and improvement of education quality as well as of the system
PKA’s criteria related to IQA in institutional evaluation

2. The internal quality assurance procedures are comprehensive, prevent pathologies and ensure that the unit can verify, assess and improve the quality of all identified processes, in particular in the scope of:

- 1.2.1 the designing, approving and periodical reviewing of programmes and evaluations of expected learning outcomes for first-cycle, second-cycle, long-cycle, third-cycle and postgraduate non-degree programmes,
- 1.2.2 the participation of labour market representatives, including employers, in the determination and evaluation of learning outcomes
- 1.2.3 student admission, evaluation of students’, doctoral students’ and post-graduate students’ learning progress and making use of the results of graduates’ career monitoring in order to evaluate learning outcomes on the labour market, as well as the principles, conditions and mode of confirming learning outcomes achieved outside of the higher education system

PKA criteria related to IQA in institutional evaluation

- 1.2.4 staff providing and supporting the educational process and the staff policy
- 2.2.5 material resources, including teaching and academic facilities as well as resources available to support students and doctoral students
- 2.2.6 managing information relating to the educational process, e.g.: the method of collecting, analysing and using relevant information for the purposes of education quality assurance,
- 2.2.7 public access to the current education quality policy, updated and objective information on the study programmes, expected learning outcomes, and the organisation and procedures of study programmes.

2.3 The unit monitors the operation of the internal quality assurance system, regularly evaluates its effectiveness and uses the results thereof to improve the quality policy and to build an education quality culture.
Main Findings based on Survey

- In the last decade Polish HEIs have witnessed a pronounced and dynamic development of internal quality assurance systems (systemic approach and formalisation). From PKA perspective, progress made in the development of IQAs has been significant.

- On the basis of the survey results it is difficult to perform a comparative study with the previous period as no similar study has been conducted in Poland as yet.

- Only 13% of responding HEIs have a number of unrelated procedures which do not yet form a system.

- Responding HEIs have IQA systems in place whose functioning varies greatly among faculties/units and fields of study.

Main Conclusions based on Survey

- The IQAs mainly focus on teaching and learning activity while research and governance is not yet satisfactorily covered.

- The survey results showed that the decision to establish the system was mainly prompted by a requirement in national legislation.

- Survey showed that universities face difficulties in the building the modern IQA systems.

- In most cases responding HEIs decided to skip some survey questions which might have had demonstrated that awareness of Part 1 ESG principles was rather low or that there was still great need for improvement, or both.
Main Conclusions based on Survey

- Quality Coordinators still meet internal obstacles in developing IQAs but at the same time they provide many good examples of activities undertaken in that area and observe beneficial qualitative and quantitative changes
- HEIs report law awareness of quality management principles among internal stakeholders, especially teaching Staff, insufficient resources, organizational deficiencies
- However, only 18% of HEIs organized training events or seminars dedicated to ESG

Main Conclusions based on Survey

- Frequent changes of legal requirements, ambiguity of legal regulations, weak support from external quality assurance providers cause some dissatisfaction among people involved in IQA at management as well as operational levels
- HEIs declare difficulties related to bureaucracy which can be considered a hot potato in the higher education system at the moment.
- PKA (CRASP) should intensify efforts aimed further support for the enhancement of the IQA
Main Conclusions based on Survey

· ESG 1.1. Policy for quality assurance
  · Over 50% of HEIs have a published policy for quality assurance and external stakeholders were involved in both the development and implementation of the policy.

· ESG 1.2. Design and approval of programmes
  · The majority of programmes are designed in line with institutional strategies, mission statements and refer to the NQF.
  · While the approval procedure does not generate a problem for respondents, the designing procedure is declared as a weakness.

Main Conclusions based on Survey

· 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.
  · Fairness and consistency achieved through the procedure of student assessment was quite misunderstood by most HEIs and over 70% respondents decided to skip the question.

· ESG 1.4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification
  · HEIs apply consistent regulations concerning student admission, recognition and certification.
  · 2016: system of recognition of non-formal and informal LO
Main Conclusions based on Survey

· **ESG 1.5. Teaching staff**
  
  · the survey results confirmed that the performance of teaching staff is assessed on a regular basis.
  
  · However, 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
  
  · The main problem is linked to the regular monitoring of teaching staff satisfaction.

Main Conclusions based on Survey

· **ESG 1.6. Learning resources and student support**
  
  · the compliance with this standard varies greatly among different fields of study and units
  
  · 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

· **ESG 1.7. Information management**
  
  · The majority of HEIs have a formal mechanism for analyzing and using data collecting for quality assurance enhancement purposes e.g. key performance indicators, profile of the student population, student progression, success and drop-out rates, students’ satisfaction with programmes, etc.
Main Conclusions based on Survey

· ESG 1.8. Public information
  · HEIs 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.

· ESG 1.9. On-going monitoring and periodic reviews of programmes
  · External stakeholders are still not fully involved in the on-going monitoring and periodic reviews of programmes.

ESG which are not entirely clear

· ESG 1.1 Policy for quality assurance
· ESG 1.2 Design and approval of programmes
· ESG 1.8 Information management
· ESG 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment
· ESG 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification
· ESG 1.5 Teaching staff
· ESG 1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic reviews of programmes
Difficulties in applying ESG in IQA

- ESG 1.5 Teaching staff (26%)
- ESG 1.8. Public information (19.5%)
- ESG 1.2. Design and approval of programmes (18.2%)
- ESG 1.7. Information management (15.6%)
- ESG 1.3. Student-centred learning, teaching, assessment (16.9%)
- ESG. 1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic reviews of programmes (14.3%)
- ESG 1.1. Policy for quality assurance (14.3%)
- ESG 1.6 Learning resources (10.4%)
- ESG 1.4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification (9.1%).

Thank you for your attention
PART IV

REPORTS ON FINDINGS OF THE WORKSHOPS ON THE INTERPRETATION OF ESG PART 1 IQA STANDARDS 1.1 - 1.10.
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Parallel workshops scenario
27th of June

| Goals | The main goals of workshop are as follows:
1) to enrich quantitative research which was conducted as an online survey on Part 1 ESG&IQA in March,
2) to gather opinions from participants how each 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 Guide to IQA |
| Form | Interactive parallel sessions encouraging people to discussion and sharing their views on Part 1 ESG. The outline of the meeting will be focusing on pairs of standards which are as follows:
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 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 | People who filled in the survey questionnaire on Part 1 ESG & IQA - ca 26 representatives of HEIs (coordinators for IQA, heads of departments, executives etc.), most of them from Poland. Attendees will be divided in 2-3 groups to give each participant a chance to discuss and bring forwards ones view. |
| Moderators | 2 people dealing with one pair of standards. One of their task is to establish a dialogue aiming at moderating the participants to develop theirs answers related to a specific focus question and specific area of Part 1 ESG. The other responsibility is to prepare short report on findings from workshops. |
| Focus questions | 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:
1. What is the most important/crucial part of given standard/or guidelines having the 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? Key questions together with handouts will be sent to participants prior to the meeting in order to make discussion more efficient. Besides 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 workshop. Their role should be rather supportive to the main questions than create the other issues. |
| After workshop | Making findings of 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 needs of Part 1 ESG |
Moderators check sheet

1. What is the most important/crucial part of given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by HEI?

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output question 1</th>
<th>Output question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output question 3</th>
<th>Output question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Group A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 - 10.45</td>
<td>Morning session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference room</td>
<td>Scherzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 - 11.45</td>
<td>Morning session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference room</td>
<td>Ballada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 - 12.45</td>
<td>Morning session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference room</td>
<td>Etiuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zbigniew Pakieła</td>
<td>Bohdan Macukow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justyna Bugaj</td>
<td>Ewa Chmielecka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Włodzimierz Salejda</td>
<td>Teresa Gardocka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewa Profaska</td>
<td>Łukasz Wyszyński</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogdan Gorczyca</td>
<td>Agata Wrocyńska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariusz Maciejczak</td>
<td>Anasas Gavrikov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custódia Drumond</td>
<td>Veronika Piccini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elżbieta Wojniłko</td>
<td>Ana Sofia Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justyna Kopańska</td>
<td>Jakub Mikiciuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justyna Lotka</td>
<td>Isabel Cunha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon session</td>
<td>Scherzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 p.m. - 3.45</td>
<td>conference room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference room</td>
<td>Scherzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 p.m. - 4.30</td>
<td>conference room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zbigniew Pakieła</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohdan Macukow</td>
<td>Ewa Chmielecka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Gardocka</td>
<td>Łukasz Wyszyński</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justyna Bugaj</td>
<td>Barbara Kliszczewicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prof. Włodzimierz Salejda</td>
<td>Radosław Stanczewski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewa Profaska</td>
<td>Dominika Tracz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agata Wrocyńska</td>
<td>Anasas Gavrikov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronika Piccini</td>
<td>Ana Sofia Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogdan Gorczyca</td>
<td>Jolanta Żyśko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariusz Maciejczak</td>
<td>Madalena Alarcão</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custódia Drumond</td>
<td>Isabel Santos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elżbieta Wojniłko</td>
<td>Katarzyna Prill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justyna Kopańska</td>
<td>Jakub Mikiciuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnieszka Mielczarek</td>
<td>Justyna Lotka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Cunha</td>
<td>Olga Skierniewska - Małys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Todor Shopov, NEAA, Vanja Perovsek, University of Ljubljana
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### 1.1 Policy for quality assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the most important/crucial part of given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by HEI?</th>
<th>What are the main obstacles in the implementation of given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>System – the complex approach to the quality assurance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Raising awareness of the staff members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement of the internal and external stakeholders in the development of the IQAS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finding common language among all stakeholders groups</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The values that come from the policy</td>
<td><strong>Prejudices towards cooperation with external stakeholders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement – reference to the Deming cycle</td>
<td><strong>Misperception of the external quality assurance / accreditation meaning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress that IQAS needs to be tailored</td>
<td><strong>Lack of knowledge about how to operationalize quality policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation for formulation of the explicit quality policy</td>
<td>How to engage the whole community – how to show added value to community members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI and why?</th>
<th>Do you identify any good practice in relation to a given standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the meaning of the policy – statement of responsibility for the quality</strong></td>
<td><strong>Use the external standards to create internal indicator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud</strong></td>
<td><strong>HEIs mission, vision and strategy should be clearly linked with the quality policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of continuous improvement, added value, etc.</td>
<td><strong>The monitoring of the strategy accomplishment should also include the monitoring of the implementation of the quality policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud</td>
<td><strong>The HEI should develop the quality standards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how to build transparency and common understating of the underlying values</td>
<td><strong>Yearly evaluations in order to find 3-4 main improvements, as a success stories</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to connect the formal IQAS with the quality culture</strong></td>
<td>Yearly reports including action plans and expected results as a form of continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to develop quality policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the most important/crucial part of given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by HEI?</th>
<th>What are the main obstacles in the implementation of given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Bringing in the external perspective, feedback and incentives for quality improvement**  
Also supports cohesion among all stakeholders  
Identification of good practices  
Fostering engagement and internal reflection | **Openness of the system and willingness for use the critical remarks from the external review**  
Reluctance of the academic staff / managers |
| What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI and why? | Do you identify any good practice in relation to a given standard? |
| To include a glossary with key terms  
Decrease the gap between the internal/external QA  
How to increase the use of the external reports for internal improvement | National legislation should explicitly refer to the ESG  
External audits of internal quality assurance system  
Include some more development/quality enhancement advice  
Seek for international external quality evaluation  
Improvement recommendations in the review reports  
Organizing public presentations of the reports  
HEI publish the eternal report on their webpage |

Report drawn up by: Mieczysław W. Socha and Maciej Markowski
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REPORTS 3&4

ESG STANDARDS 1.2 (DESIGN AND APPROVAL OF PROGRAMMES) AND 1.9 (ON-GOING AND PERIODIC REVIEW OF PROGRAMMES)
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The main goals of the workshop were to gather the opinions from the participants of the EIQAS Training Event 1 on their own interpretation of the standards 1.2 and 1.9 of the revised Part 1 ESG (May 2015), as seen by HEIs. The participants were invited to discuss the aspects of the standards which are unclear and explain how these aspects are understood in HEI’s practice. The data collected shall enrich qualitative research conducted as part of the online survey on Part 1 ESG&IQA carried out in March 2015.

1.2 Design and Approval of Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the most important/crucial part of given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by HEI?</th>
<th>What are the main obstacles in the implementation of given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of the standard 1.2 (Design and Approval of Programmes), the following issues were identified as most important/crucial parts of the standard having a potential impact on the quality/developing quality culture by the HEI:</td>
<td>The participants also identified certain obstacles in the implementation of the given standard:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All HEIs should adopt formal, written and published procedures for the design and approval of programmes.</td>
<td>• Focusing only on Poland: Over-regulation, frequent changes of the national legislation, too much bureaucracy and lack of autonomy of HEIs are regarded as the main obstacles by Polish HEIs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HEIs should adopt a strategic approach in terms of programme design:</td>
<td>• Difficulties in the definition and validation of the intended learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ 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. Concerning 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.</td>
<td>• Difficulties to involve external stakeholders (distance between HEIs and external stakeholders).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The issue of employability should be taken into account when adopting this kind of strategic approach.</td>
<td>• Random design of the Programmes without internal consistency between courses design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Definition and validation of intended learning outcomes represent a crucial part of the aforementioned 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.</td>
<td>• A mismatch between HEIs and the external stakeholders at different levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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).</td>
<td>▪ Aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The aspect of internationalisation should be considered as part of the standard (a missing topic).</td>
<td>▪ Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A crucial aspect of the standard is the involvement of external stakeholders in the process of the design and approval of programmes.</td>
<td>▪ They speak different languages...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A cyclical link should be established between standards 1.2 and 1.9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI and why?

The participants also provided the aspects of the given standard which would need further clarification:
• the need for appropriate »wording« as HEIs and external stakeholders »speak different languages«;
• effective communication between HEIs and all stakeholders should be enhanced;
• intended learning outcomes should encompass all three aspects – the knowledge, skills and competences obtained, and not merely focus on the competences achieved;
• the need to establish a cyclical link between the standards 1.2 and 1.9 (to obtain relevant feedback).

Do you identify any good practice in relation to a given standard?

The following activity was identified as an example of good practice:
• The Bulgarian national state-funded scheme for practical placements (involving 50,000 students).

1.9 On-going Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programmes

What is the most important/crucial part of given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by HEI?

In terms of the standard 1.9, the following issues were identified as most important/crucial parts of the standard having a potential impact on the quality/developing quality culture by the HEI:
• Evaluation must be linked to the intended learning outcomes.
• A combination of top-down and bottom-up approach should be used.
• We should raise the awareness of all stakeholders concerning the importance of their participation in the process.
• Effective communication and providing feedback to all stakeholders involved are crucial to ensure the successful closing of the »quality circle«.
• Formal and informal approaches should be used.

What are the main obstacles in the implementation of given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?

• Lack of funding affects the implementation of the standards, since the institutions are understaffed and lack financial resources.
• Low engagement and low motivation of students (in certain cases also of staff) is also perceived as an obstacle.
• Lack of understanding of the objectives.
What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI and why?

- 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 to them.
- In terms of providing on-going and regular monitoring and review of programmes, the diversity of various scientific disciplines covered by the programmes at a certain HEI should be taken into account.

Do you identify any good practice in relation to a given standard?

- The WSB’s School of Banking (Poland) has established a committee of quality, consisting of internal and external stakeholders, who are invited to propose changes and inform the HEI about what kind of skills are needed in the labour market.
- The University of Ecology and Management (Warsaw, Poland) has introduced meetings of small groups of teachers and students at which various issues concerning quality assurance. The groups meet two or three times per semester.
- At GGW – the University of Life Sciences (Warsaw, Poland) has developed software through which external stakeholders (employers of graduates) and students can propose changes for future improvement.

Report drawn up by: Madalena Fonseca and Veronika Piccinini
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### 1.3 Student centred learning, teaching and assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the most important/crucial part of given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by HEI?</th>
<th>What are the main obstacles in the implementation of given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students as key actors!</td>
<td>Obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased motivation of students and teachers</td>
<td>- Lack of definition on institutional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better developed competences of students for personal and professional life</td>
<td>- Lack of awareness both on institutional and personal level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A way to benefit from the students’ knowledge – engaging their capacity</td>
<td>- Lack of LO validation especially in case of soft skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting the management position on SCL</td>
<td>- How to monitor whether we are on the right track?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining organisational meaning of SCL</td>
<td>- Organisational culture – habits of teachers, students expect to be thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitting the programmes to their purpose</td>
<td>- In interactive classroom big differences between the level to which students are prepared in advance- how to work when some are fulfilling the prerequisites regarding the preparation and others not (go with the active group or adjust to the non-active one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in international exchange (in order to shift the paradigm)</td>
<td>- Lack of time and space, also other resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ In L&amp;T methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Formative (and on time) and summative assessment/feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ In fostering space for SCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ In tools, guidelines, manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Too regulated study programmes, especially in some subject areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHY is it so complicated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many levels, organisational and personal, but...it is about CREATING SPACE for SCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- At institutional level for teachers and students.... and also the conditions (IT support for blended learning, appropriate classrooms...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- At personal level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ by employing SCL methods by the teacher to create space for the SCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ by students participating in SCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a BIG PARADIGM SHIFT! How do we implement it????</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI and why?

**Need for clarification of ESG**
- Definition of SCL (a long process)
- What do pedagogical methods mean?
- How to work interactively with big groups
- How to adjust study process to different groups?
  - Does this mean separation of groups, different paths, or could we benefit from mixed groups?
- Different in terms of skills, merits, or learning styles?

**Needs for the implementation of the ESG 1.3**
- Enabling space for choosing study paths, guiding students on choosing study paths
- LLL needs to be emphasised
- Trainings on L&T and assessment methods
- Inspiration by good practices
- Involving students actively – so they prepare some topics
- Talking with students about L&T, feedback on what works
- Introduction of team work
- PL: if it is not in the law, it will not be followed – even if it is a very hard ESG to define

---

### 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

**What is the most important/crucial part of given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by HEI?**

Aspects of how relevant administrative activities are implemented in an IQA system, so that quality requirements for tertiary education are fulfilled, are highlighted. Four processes, admission, progression, recognition and certification, with unit operations, i.e. basic steps in the process, are called attention to.

HEIs are responsible for the academic regulatory framework (fit for purpose) for maintaining and disseminating rules and other guidance. The series of stages from the beginning of a students’ education career to his or her graduation are covered; all periods of the life span conform to the principles and legislation of equal opportunity, fairness and transparency of all administrative activities. In this regard, quality is assured by implementing predictable and repeatable practices.

---

**What are the main obstacles in the implementation of given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?**

Student admission is the initial stage. Systems through which students enter a HEI vary, an overriding guarantee of quality being the provision of equal access – prospective students are not segregated on the basis of social, racial/ethnic, physical, gender factors or schooling background or on any other basis. In this respect, the mechanism of numerous clauses may be used given that admission to degrees is not limited by prospective students’ circumstances, for example, ability to pay upfront. Officially, minimum requirements for right of entry are in place and instruments for selection such as entrance examinations are administered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI and why?</th>
<th>Do you identify any good practice in relation to a given standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL does not have a „One-Size-Fits-All” solution: Limitations of flexibility – learning outcomes should not be hindered. Different students’ needs, level of experience, interests, background etc. Assessment of implementation of SCL for certain field of study. Raising awareness and training of academic staff and students in SCL.</td>
<td>Since university admission is a process, it can be represented graphically as a dataflow diagram with components and connectors, e.g. student application form – decision making (acceptance/rejection) – registration – information – enrolment – fees – student induction, etc. Induction/student orientation is to be the first part of effective holding up of student progression. Student progression in a course of study is to be consistently planned and executed so that favourable conditions for learning are provided. General strategic planning and specific IQA standards, e.g. ESG 1.3, close the loop of curriculum and syllabus design, pedagogy, testing and assessment and reporting. Support for students (both academic and pastoral) ensures that they can progress satisfactorily through their programme and are informed about their progress. HEIs organise student progression effectively and efficiently, e.g. by the principle of expected learning outcomes. Student recognition guarantees the quality of student progression and mobility. Recognition includes areas such as higher education qualification, periods of study, prior learning, non-formal and informal learning, etc. Appropriate recognition procedures rely on institutional practice for recognition being in line with the principles with the Lisbon Recognition Convention (c.f. European Area of Recognition) and cooperation with other institutions, QA agencies and the national ENIC/NARIC centres. Student certification is the natural ending of a cycle in tertiary education as described in the Framework for Qualifications in the EHEA. A certificate of higher education, a diploma or any other tertiary education qualification attests the successful completion of a period of study in arts, humanities and/or sciences. HEIs regulate the issuing of an official document (or information object) which is retrievable (with which information can be found) and identifiable (fits in to the national qualifications framework) and usable (allows credit transfer). It records actual achievement and competence of a student and shows if graduation requirements have been met or if a degree has been awarded. Graduates in all the countries partaking in the Bologna Process have the right to receive a Diploma Supplement (part of the Europass framework transparency tools) automatically, free and in a major European language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 1.7 Information management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the most important/crucial part of given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by HEI?</th>
<th>What are the main obstacles in the implementation of given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information system is crucial from the point of view of making use of vast amount of information | Compatibility between changing and different systems  
Not very good habit of analysing and using the gathered information for the quality purposes  
The information sources are not always available i.e. alumni  
Interpretation of the separate data might be misleading without broader context |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI and why?</th>
<th>Do you identify any good practice in relation to a given standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Key performance indicators – what they might be in terms of education  
Good practice and examples of using cross-information | The interface of the IT system should be adjusted to the needs of each user groups (staff, students, alumni, etc.)  
IT system is used for the purposes of internal evaluation reports, supporting university management  
Top-10 rankings of teachers – the most popular, the most helpful, the most work-demanding; published information – the young or worse teachers are required to follow the best teachers classes  
KPI – Number of students going abroad – KPIs are very contextual and related to the quality policy  
Information system might provide some predictions about the future and offered additional support  
Some of the information can be used to modify study programmes (i.e. high drop-outs)  
Gather information about reasons of students resigning |
### 1.8 Public information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the most important/crucial part of given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by HEI?</th>
<th>What are the main obstacles in the implementation of given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publishing the information builds transparency and trust between the HEI and stakeholders and recognition of its attributes</td>
<td>Achieving objective and comparable information to publish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If HEI is to publish something it has to be positive for HEI</td>
<td>Intellectual property rights (i.e. course composition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI and why?</td>
<td>Reliability of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching, learning and assessment procedures Pass rates</td>
<td>Do you identify any good practice in relation to a given standard?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The information should be available also in foreign languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Branding survey – WSB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 1.5 Teaching staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the most important/crucial part of given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by HEI?</th>
<th>What are the main obstacles in the implementation of given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) innovative approach to teaching, taking into account diversified student population (including lifelong learners)  
 b) teaching staff assessment rules/criteria  
 c) professional development of teaching staff, taking into account diversified objectives and methods (diversified competencies needed) | a) insufficient knowledge/skills in innovative pedagogy/teaching  
 b) limited, if any, incentives – more frequently demotivation (e.g. no raise or even decrease in salary)  
 c) problems with teaching staff assessment rules/ criteria:  
   - difficulty in defining criteria for effectiveness/excellence in teaching  
   - focus on research – little recognition for excellence in teaching  
   - limited transparency  
   - uniformity (disciplines differ with regard to teaching styles) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI and why?</th>
<th>Do you identify any good practice in relation to a given standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| no needs have been identified | a) centre Ars Docenti – for professional development of teaching staff  
 b) awards for good teachers  
   - awards in three categories: most popular, most demanding, most useful for students  
   - “golden chalk” awarded by the students  
 c) peer-learning activities initiated by the HEI central administration  
 d) “strategic tours” – meeting of teaching staff outside of HEI to reflect on education - discuss problems and exchange ideas on teaching  
 e) sabbatical at industry (to get a new perspective and experience useful for teaching) |

Except for examples of good practice, the following ideas related to ESG 1.5 were presented:

- a) diversification of academic staff careers is desirable, including possibility to trade-off - to a large extent – involvement in different types of activity: teaching, research and organisation (possibility to substitute - in teacher assessment - deficient scores in one area by excellent scores in another area)  
- b) teaching staff competencies should be assessed in three categories: knowledge, skills and social competencies; the development of a sectoral qualifications framework for teaching staff can be considered  
- c) alternative ways to professional development of teaching staff can be considered:
- at the institutional level (advantage: can provide the institution with a competitive edge; can better suit the needs of a particular institution – its type, size etc.),
- at the national level – organised by the ministry, accreditation agency or rector’s conference (advantage: better exploitation of available human resources – trainers etc.)

\(d\) in the process of professional development of teaching staff both internal and external “trainers”/instructors should be involved

\(e\) professional development should be considered/seen by academic staff as an opportunity rather than punishment (however, some form of training should perhaps be obligatory for “bad” teachers)

\(f\) assessment of teaching competencies should be carried out also for “external” staff (visitors, practitioners, etc.); selection in the process recruitment of external teachers is needed

\(g\) an in-depth consideration/analysis aimed at the key question: “why teaching staff is reluctant to changes/ involvement quality assurance?” is recommended; such an analysis should not be restricted to “negative factors” (lack of incentives etc.), it should address teachers needs and possibly rely on a survey of teachers satisfaction.

**1.6 Learning resources and student support.**

The participants of both workshop groups agreed that the massification of study increases the demand for resources to support learning and students. 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 particular needs. The number of students with particular needs is perhaps also increasing as a result of growing individualism and awareness of student rights and possibilities. The demand for student and learning support is particularly increasing in the following areas:

- life-long learning and specific support for older students: the student body is becoming generationally diverse with various levels of self-awareness and personal development as well as with varying levels of cognitive capabilities, socialization and behavioural contexts – and all of them need to be accommodated;

- foreign students have particular language requirements. In order to engage in the study process at the higher education institution, they must overcome their linguistic barriers, otherwise they can perhaps only participate through individual consultations or lectures in foreign language. Linguistic adaptations pose extensive demands for human and financial resources and at the same time, internationalization is becoming ever more important. Whether it is translating the study content into foreign languages and teaching in foreign languages or whether foreign students attend language courses and slowly learn the domestic language, financial costs will need to be settled as well as there will be a need for additional engagement of teaching staff;

- students with special needs require costly spatial adaptations, equipment and personal support to overcome their physical impairment and to be able to study as equal and active students. There are study programmes that they simply cannot enroll because there will be no chance for them ever to enter the labour market as capable professionals. But in several disciplines of study, they do have a chance to enter the labour market provided that their education is properly supported. There are however some cost-effective solutions that higher education institutions should consider first prior to undertaking big investments. These range from granting extended rights, making simpler adaptations or personalizing the study process.

Based on this, the question is raised, how far should the higher education institutions extend their support to students in order to assure quality learning processes and active engagement of the entire student body. Usually it will be a matter of discussion with the students and of considering their requests and incentives. Costly improvements are not likely to occur on short notice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the most important/crucial part of given standard having the potential impact on the quality/or developing quality culture by HEI?</th>
<th>What are the main obstacles in the implementation of given standard and why? Are they derived from the content of the standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>resources to support learning and students</td>
<td>All types of support mentioned in the ESG 1.6 standard are relatively understandable. There are however national differences between different types of student support. For instance, in Poland, tutoring is hardly present, whereas in Slovenia, it is not only widespread for first cycle students but also for students with special needs of even for doctoral students in terms of offering help for accessing and searching in databases of scientific papers, journals, etc. In conclusion, student support in partner institutions is well developed and workshop participants were convinced that their higher education institutions meet the requirements of standard 1.6, but this support apparently takes on different forms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the needs for further interpretation of given standards? Which aspect of standards are unclear for HEI and why?</th>
<th>Do you identify any good practice in relation to a given standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The groups of workshop participants wished to expand the interpretation of this standard by referring its concept also to the support for teachers and teaching, as well as to other material conditions, such as lecture rooms. The latter addresses the extension of proper student support also to the teaching equipment and teaching facilities which should also be fit for purpose – for instance for the provision of particular courses.</td>
<td>Workshop participants expressed a few cases of good practice. One example was the acquisition of EU funds for the provision of technical learning support for distance learning and of related digital support. Another example was the support of business partners through internships and mentoring in the learning process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Sample procedures in the area of quality assurance,
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- ...
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EIQAS TRAINING EVENT 1.
WARSAW, POLAND, 26-30 JUNE 2015
– METHODOLOGY FOR THE IDENTIFICATION
OF IQA GOOD PRACTICE.

Author:
Todor Shopov, NEAA
presentation outline
process and/or product

**fit for purpose**: delivering more with less

**right the first time**: the “zero defect” strategy
standard and/or good practice

- nuts and bolts; matice i vijaki; śruby i nakrętki; porcas e parafusos; гайки и болтове
- plumbing; hydraulika; canalização; vodovod; водопровод
- etc.
“An ounce of practice is worth more than tons of preaching”

Gandhi
externalities: the spillover effect

Thank you for kind attention!

Prof. Dr. T. Shopov, todor.shopov@yahoo.com
NEAA, http://www.neaa.government.bg/
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Internal Quality Assurance System
commitment to quality

www.sgg.ipvc.pt

IPVC Schools and Services

The Social Services (SAS)
- Scholarships; Emergency relief
- Canteens and Bars;
- Health Office (Psychology; nursing and medical Support; Sport Centre;
- Cultural Office

Transversal Services
- Libraries;
- Academic Services
- International Office;
- OTIC- RDI
- Human Resources;
- IT; Infrastructures;
- Marketing/communication, IPVC-TV;
- Administrative and Financial
- Quality Office
QAS-IPVC Historical development

Certification 1st cycle (graduation); support services, project management

- ISO 9001:2000
  - December 2008

Transition to new version of ISO 9001:2008

- ISO 9001: 2008
  - December 2009

Extension Certification for 2nd cycle (Master)

- ISO 9001:2008
  - May 2010

Certification of Internal Quality Assurance System by Requirements ESG/A3ES

- First Polytechnic with QAS certified by A3ES
  - January 2013

Development: Extend scope to incorporate the level 5; New ESG and...

- ISO 9001:2015
1. Awareness and Training in Strategic and Quality Management; Workgroup formation
2. Structure Definition of Evaluation and Quality Office (see) (representability of Schools / Services and Activities)
3. Processes Definition System (see)
5. Training of Internal Auditors Team IPVC- ISO 19011 Training reinforcement in 2012- new version ISO 19011 and ESG (during 2015, adapt to new version)

The IPVC Quality Office - GAQ is a transversal structure responsible for ensuring the implementation and monitoring of IQAS-IPVC

with representatives in each school's and Services
Organizational Chart of IPVC’s Management and Quality Assurance System

Quality Office in each School: 1 or 2 QM+ 1 PM of each Process developed in the School
Group Coordinator of each PROCESS : PIM+ PM in each School/SAS/SC and FUNCTIONS
1. Awareness and Training in Strategic and Quality Management; Workgroup formation

2. Structure Definition of Evaluation and Quality Office (see) (representability of Schools / Services and Activities)

3. Processes Definition System (see)


5. Training of Internal Auditors Team IPVC- ISO 19011 Training reinforcement in 2012- new version ISO 19011 and ESG (during 2015, adapt to new version)
SEE

QMS documentation structure
design (QM)
and Information System Support

on.ipvc.pt

Moodle

• Criteria and requirements for IQAS-IPVC

Internal requirements
(Policies / Regulations / Manuals / Norms / Procedures)

ISO 9001 Standard

Criteria courses of accreditation bodies;
recognition of technical skills (World Tourism Organization- tourism; OTOC- accountancy; formation in Engineering ...)

2011
TARGET AREAS AND CRITERIA for Quality Assurance
Systems in Higher Education - Portugal (A3ES) and ESG

Legal / Regulatory Requirements
### SYNERGY / Interaction

#### A3ES – target area and criteria for internal quality assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 OMS General Requirements</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Documentation Requirements</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Management Commitment</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Customer Focus</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Quality Policy</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 OMS Planning</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 Responsibility_Authority and Communication</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1 Management Review</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Provision of Resources</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Human Resources</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.4 Infrastructure and Work Environment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Planning and Product Realization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Customer-Related Processes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Design and Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Purchasing Process</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1 Production and Service Provision</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2 Control of Monitoring and Measuring Equipment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3 Monitoring and measure Customer Satisfaction, Internal Audit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.4 Control of Nonconforming Product</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.5 Analysis of Data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.6 Continual Improvement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SYNERGY/Interaction

#### ESG - Part 1: Standards and guidelines for internal quality assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 OMS General Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Documentation Requirements</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Management Commitment</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Customer Focus</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Quality Policy</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 OMS Planning</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 Responsibility_Authority and Communication</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1 Management Review</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Provision of Resources</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Human Resources</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.4 Infrastructure and Work Environment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Planning and Product Realization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Customer-Related Processes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Design and Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Purchasing Process</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1 Production and Service Provision</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2 Control of Monitoring and Measuring Equipment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3 Monitoring and measure Customer Satisfaction, Internal Audit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.4 Control of Nonconforming Product</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.5 Analysis of Data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.6 Continual Improvement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document management</td>
<td>Reinforcement of information systems: avoid bureaucratization IQAS; language adaptation / terminology associated with HEI and teaching &amp; learning / students;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audits</td>
<td>More participative evaluation and more focused on teaching &amp; learning and student support (programs, providing resources and information); Mixed audit teams (from different schools, teachers, staff and students, guests from other HEI and other external-stakeholders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured methodologies for satisfaction evaluation /consultation on perceived quality-SURVEYS</td>
<td>Valuing shared reflection contexts: role of the academic bodies: scientific and pedagogical councils, Students Association, Student Ombudsman ... The information of informal character/confidences that arrives to teachers, other staff, among students- signaling the potentially critical situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures and records for occurrences tracking:</td>
<td>Reinforcing a more active role of stakeholders (partners, employers, students, ...) Reinforcing decision factors-creating/reviewing courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures to “product”-programmes/courses design, development, approval and revision</td>
<td>Reinforcement of Indicators associated with learning outcomes and teaching quality (academic success, mobility, employability, dropout; publications, own revenues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify key performance indicators for process / activity; apply PDCA-continues improvement cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Interligação entre **Critérios e Processos- Exemplo:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referencial</th>
<th>Sub-item</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 – Quality assurance of learning and of student support</td>
<td>- Dedica a devida atenção à conceção e conteúdos de cada curso e do respetivo currículo, promovendo, nomeadamente: - a definição dos objetivos de aprendizagem de cada unidade curricular do curso, bem como dos conceitos nucleares a adquirir; - dos materiais de trabalho disponíveis, das formas de avaliação das aprendizagens e da programação das atividades na lecionação da unidade curricular, - particular atenção esforço de trabalho do aluno</td>
<td>CRC, FOR, GEE, BIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Define as diretrizes e regulamentos respeitantes à organização do ensino e aos estudantes</td>
<td>CRC, FOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Define procedimentos para a seleção e recrutamento de estudantes</td>
<td>CRC, FOR, ACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Desenvolve mecanismos para promover o apoio social e acompanhamento psicológico dos estudantes, bem como ações de integração e de promoção do sucesso académico, e promove a avaliação periódica destes mecanismos</td>
<td>SAS, FOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promove atividades de investigação e inovação para os estudantes</td>
<td>FOR, GPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tem procedimentos para monitorizar, avaliar e melhorar os processos e resultados do ensino e aprendizagem, o envolvimento de estudantes, docentes e outras partes interessadas relevantes</td>
<td>CRC, FOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garante que a avaliação dos estudantes é eficaz de acordo com critérios, regulamentos e procedimentos previamente definidos e publicitados, e que são aplicados de forma consistente</td>
<td>FOR, ACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promove procedimentos para avaliar a integração e evolução profissional dos graduados</td>
<td>GMS, OBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define mecanismos para lidar com reclamações e sugestões</td>
<td>GMS, EAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The ISO 9001 is **compatible** with European and national standards for Quality Assurance in Higher Education

2. **Synergies** between standards enhance the Quality Assurance System of Higher Education

The IQAS should be:

1. **integrated and coordinated** with the corporate governance mechanisms (scientific council, Pedagogical council, financial management board)

2. **Generate information**, to ensure **analysis and dissemination.** Have procedures to taking actions for the **development and improvement of learning environment and processes**

3. **Evaluated internally and according to the needs**

4. **Motivator for everyone**
1. integrated and coordinated with the corporate governance mechanisms in successive levels

CU: Student & Teacher (registrations, schedules, CUP, Moodle information, Class attendance, Assessment, CUPreport, Survey)

study cycle: Course Committee (regular meetings, CUPreport analysis, Annual Course Report analysis, internships/teaching/RDI projects; Surveys; Course delegate and representatives of the Course in Pedagogical Council (report situations to colleagues and teachers and CourseCoord.)

School: Directions/Pedagógical C./Departments; regulation for student admission, progression/assessment, recognition, certification

IPVC:
- Council Geral (Strategic Plan, Policy and Quality Objectives; System Revision);
- Financial Council (budget; Needs Management, ...);
- Presidency; School Directions, Scientific Areas/departments, Scientific Council (the formative strategy, Resource Management; schoolar calendar, ...)

...A successive and participated Construction "sustainable building", with several levels of analysis and follow-up...

IQAS ANNUAL REVISION

Annual Review of each school/Process

ACR APR

Reports of Internal audits and External Evaluation (ISO, A3ES)
- IQAS and programmes/courses

RESULTS: Academic Information; Surveys; Internal and external Indicators; CU report programmes

STRATEGIC PLAN Annual Plan-IPVC AP-schools and Services; ANNUAL OBJECTIVES; Programmes
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### PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan (2015-2018)</td>
<td>Presidency/General Council</td>
<td>6 months after President took office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Plan Schools/Serv</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Plan IPVC (annual objectives and actions)</td>
<td>Presidency/General Council</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New CU Programmes published</td>
<td>Teacher/CC/Scientific Council</td>
<td>Up 15 days after beginning Semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reports Follow-Up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Quality Survey Report and CU Report (semester)</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Up to 2 months after CU end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report of the course</td>
<td>Course Coordinator</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report Schools/Serv</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 dez.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report IPVC (annual objectives and actions)</td>
<td>Presidency/CG</td>
<td>janeiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>GAQ/Presidência</td>
<td>março</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Examples of weaknesses in which we are working...**

- insufficient implementation of quality cycle in research and extension

- **Erasmus Process Mobility** needs to strengthen the connection with procedures and improvement quality of teaching & learning process

- In the **interinstitutional cooperation with community**  
  *systematic evaluation of the protocols is still a project in development*

- Headline indicators extension: need **focus on the essentials (key)** that allow informed decision making

- **Indicators collection and analysis systematically** and **not only in final reports** (early signaling Ex.: DROPOUT - Potential DROPOUT-1st Semester)  
  - FOCUS on **impact indicators** not only in “numeric results” (n.º of projects vs. patents)

- Auscultation / Benchmarking still with **not very robust methodologies**

- **Reduced participation of External stakeholders** in SWOT and improvement plans

- "Internal pressure" to create new courses / maintain courses that should close, even if there is evidence sustained that the risk is 'high'
1. Internal Audits with Students and other external-stakeholders

DO

PLAN

CHECK

RELATÓRIO DE AUDITORIA

ACT

2. you can follow online Suggestions, complaints,...
2. Surveys Results and communication

This questionnaire aims to evaluate the opinion of foreign students enrolled in mobility programs at IPVC.

Our intention is to address issues about IPVC quality of teaching, its services/resources and the profile of Viana do Castelo as hosting city.

Thank you for helping us, your contribution is essential to the improvement and development of our institution.

PROBLEMS?

1. welcome Integration
2. Support Services (SAC/BIB/SAS-Gab. Health/ Mobility,…)
3. Teaching&Learning - Course Revision - school schedules; Moodle… - Sucess / Dropout
4. Research Activities/ internships - Information; - Integration in learning process
5. Auscultation/participation in Surveys: (IASQC/Bibliot/Colaboradores/Serviços/Bolsas/Alojam/ Cantina/Bar) - Suggestions, complaints System
6. Representation / Participation in advisory or governance bodies
7. Comissão de Curso - funcionamento - Relatório Anual de Curso - Implementação de melhorias nas UC/PE…
8. Meios de Informação e Comunicação Interna - Plataformas - Portal… - Expediente/e-mail’s
9. Mobility - Erasmus, IACOBUS,…

OTHERS?
### Solutions are needed!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspecto relacionado com Serviço/Actividade/Sist. Informação/Orgão? (N.º-e descrição breve)</th>
<th>PROBLEMA ?</th>
<th>SOLUÇÕES !</th>
<th>Qual o nosso contributo para implementar a solução?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n.º........</td>
<td>- !!!!</td>
<td>- !!!!</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outro ........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TEAM Exercise!!!**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best regards,</th>
<th>Filename</th>
<th>Filesize</th>
<th>Download link</th>
<th>Valid until</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Legal Framework of the Bulgarian Higher Education Reform 1/2

The main legislative documents in operation are:

2. The Act for the Development of Academic staff.
3. Ordinance on the state requirements for the acquisition of higher education and educational qualification degrees.
5. Ordinance for the implementation of a system for credit accumulation and transfer within the higher education institutions.
Legal Framework of the Bulgarian Higher Education Reform 2/2

The Higher Education Act is adopted in 1995 and regulates the structure, functions, management and funding of higher education in Bulgaria.

– Introduced accreditation;

– Introduced 3 stages in Higher Education System – Bachelor (four years of education), Master (at least one year after a Bachelor’s degree) and Doctoral degrees (at least 3 years after a Master’s).

Quality Assurance

Major amendments to the Higher Education Act were adopted in 1999 and 2004.

The European Credit Transfer System has been adopted.

Important amendments were related to quality assurance – new regulation of the external assessment were adopted and Internal quality assurance systems were introduced.
External Evaluation and Accreditation

The external evaluation is a responsibility of the National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency. The Agency has been established in 1996 as the national body for evaluation, accreditation and monitoring of the quality in higher education institutions.

The National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency has also developed multiple activities intensifying its co-operation with other European agencies: it is a co-founder of the Central and Eastern Europe Agencies for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (CEEN) as well as a member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA).

The National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency

The National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency monitors the ability of institutions, their main units and branches to provide good quality of education and scientific research through their internal quality assurance systems.

The Agency helps to improve the quality of higher education by the periodic institutional and programme evaluation and accreditation of the higher education institutions in Bulgaria, and by evaluating the projects for opening new HEIs and basic units, as well as by post-accreditation monitoring and control.

The process of evaluation and accreditation has four steps: self-evaluation, peer review, report of the standing committee and decision-making.
NEAA’s Main Functions

The main functions of the National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency are:

- To evaluate and award accreditation to legally established higher education institutions – institutional accreditation;

The NEAA has also the right to propose changes in the legal status of institutions, following a negative accreditation assessment.

- To evaluate the higher education institutions’ study programmes – programme accreditation.

The NEAA has the right to withdraw state recognition for particular programmes that do not satisfy the requirements with respect to curricula, academic staff, physical infrastructure, etc.

Criteria List

The criteria are essentially compatible with the “Bergen descriptors” of quality and cover implicitly Part 1 of the *European Standards and Guidelines for Internal Quality Assurance in Higher Education Institutions*.

The National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency evaluates the four main activities carried out by the higher education institutions:

- educational activities;
- research;
- management of the institution and functioning of the internal system for quality assurance;
- competitiveness of the institution.

All four areas of activity are connected with IQA but it is specifically evaluated in the third group of criteria – management.
Some Problems with the Evaluation and Accreditation 1/2

There are still some problems with the evaluation and accreditation.

- A formal attitude by the expert teams;
- Poor inclusion of foreign experts in the expert teams;
- A ten grade system had to replace the former four grade system;
- Criteria;

The National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency developed new evaluation criteria, which include a new fourth group of criteria, concerning the competitiveness and adaptability of the institution.

Some Problems with the Evaluation and Accreditation 2/2

- The information required for institutional and programme accreditation is duplicated. In universities with many professional branches the same activities are repeatedly performed, many of which repeat the institutional accreditation. On the other hand the National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency is experiencing difficulties in securing the hundreds of experts needed. This makes it necessary to seek a more rational accreditation model by creating an integrated system of institutional and programme accreditation. For that purpose the necessary legislative changes should be made.
Paradigm Change 1/4

The focus of institutional accreditation shifted from conformity with the law to internal quality assurance and quality enhancement arrangements set by the institution. Before quality as such is assessed, evidence for the institution’s capacity to monitor, assess and improve quality itself is required.

In programme accreditation, the evaluation of student learning experience is in focus, rather than compliance with the uniform state requirements, designed in a prescriptive form of national curricula.

Responsibility for quality lies within the HEIs.

Paradigm Change 2/4

Higher Education Act

Art. 6. (4) The higher school shall provide the quality of education and scientific research through internal system of assessment and maintenance of the quality of education and of the academic staff, including also the student’s opinion pools at least once in an academic year.

(5) The objective of the system under para 4 is to control, maintain and manage the quality of education in the offered spheres of the higher education and professional sectors, as well as of the academic staff.
Paradigm Change 3/4

Chapter ten – Accreditation of the Higher Schools

Art. 77. (2) The assessment at the institutional accreditation shall be directed to check of the effectiveness of:

1. the internal system for assessment and maintenance of the quality of education;

2. the procedures for approval, monitoring and updating of the study plans and programmes;

Paradigm Change 4/4

Art. 78. (3) Subject of assessment at the programme accreditation shall be:

5. the quality management of the education;

Art. 11. (4) The National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency shall carry out post-accreditation monitoring and control over:

1. the ability of the institution and its main units and branches to provide a high quality of education and scientific research through an internal system of assessment and maintenance of the quality;
Internal Systems of Assessment and Maintenance of the Quality 1/2

The higher education institutions are obliged to provide the quality of education and scientific research through internal systems of assessment and maintenance of the quality of education.

Some HEIs established IQA systems before the adoption of the requirements in the Higher Education Act in 2004.

In 2004 IQA systems were introduced in national legislation and later in the evaluation criteria of the National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency.

In 2011 all universities had their IQA systems established and most of the higher schools have their own IQA Manual.

Internal Systems of Assessment and Maintenance of the Quality 2/2

In the Bulgarian educational institutions there are operating systems for:

a) assessing and maintaining the quality of training of students and doctoral students;

b) assessing and maintaining the quality of a department;

c) self-assessment as part of the requirements for external institutional and programme accreditation;

d) monitoring of the employment of graduates;

e) research, analysis and evaluation of students and post-graduate students’ views;

f) systems for credit transfer and distance learning.
Problems with the Internal Quality Assurance Systems

However, the internal quality assurance systems need further improvement. The following problems with the quality assurance systems have been outlined:

- There is still a certain degree of formality in the functioning of the internal quality systems, they are neither seen as an indicator of the actual condition of the educational process nor as a corrector of management decisions;
- IQA systems do not have enough efficiency and the managements of higher schools unreasonably ignore their results;
- Only a small part of the higher educational institutions have established a regular practice to carry out self-evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of their quality assurance systems;
- There is a lack of trained specialists with experience in the field,

General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.1: Policy for quality assurance

- SU has a policy for QA that is published and refers explicitly to the ESG;
- SU has developed an Internal Quality Assurance, Quality Control and Quality Monitoring system;
- SU has established a University Centre for Quality Management – a specially created unit for carrying out the strategy and policy of quality control at the University and to coordinate and carry out the development and support of the system for quality control.
General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.2: Design and approval of programmes

SU has a formal procedure for design and approval of programmes.

The programmes define:

- the expected learning outcomes;
- modes of delivery (e.g. full time, part-time, distance-learning);
- the student workload in terms of ECTS credits;
- teaching and learning methods;
- assessment methods;
- the specific qualifications in accordance with the National Qualifications Framework, to which the programme leads.

General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.3: Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

- Student assessment procedures, methods and criteria are published;
- Student performance is assessed by more than one examiner;
- Assessment is based on the achievement of the intended learning outcomes;
- Procedures for student appeals are adopted and published.
General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.4: Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

- Regulations on student admission and student progression are adopted and published;
- The award of diplomas and certificates is regulated by the Law.
- There are procedures for recognition of study periods completed at other institutions in the country and abroad and for recognition of qualifications (degrees) awarded by other institutions in the country and abroad;

These procedures are however slow and in some respects unclear;

- SU has not adopted regulations on the recognition of non-formal and informal learning (Regulations on national level are discussed).

General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.5: Teaching staff 1/3

- There is a transparent and fair recruitment process for teaching staff; Recruitment and acquisition of the Ph.D. and “Doctor of Science” degrees are regulated by the Rules of the Terms and Conditions for Acquisition of Scientific Degrees and Academic Positions, adopted by the Academic Council;
- SU provides professional development opportunities to the teaching staff;
- SU encourages professional development of the teaching staff and innovation in teaching;
- SU offers incentives to encourage the use of new technologies in teaching (e. g. development of distance learning courses and programmes)
General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.5: Teaching staff 2/3

- There are mechanisms for rewarding teaching achievements;
- Regular assessment of the performance of the teaching staff by the Attestation Commissions;

At the same time a monitoring of the teaching staff's satisfaction is not provided.

- Through mobility programmes, such as ERASMUS, CEEPUS, etc. the academic staff have the opportunity to learn from other Universities' experience and good practices.
- SU is financing short term trips and conference participation;
- The system of evaluation of the teaching staff on annual basis rewards development of new courses.

General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.5: Teaching staff 3/3

- Teachers participate in competitions organized by the University’s Research Fund by submitting project proposals which are evaluated and the best projects receive funding.
- A Center for Electronic and Distance Learning is established;
- A questionnaire for self-evaluation of the academic staff is developed.
- A Good Practice in Career Development of Teaching staff is a project financed by the Human Resources Development operational programme of EU – 2013-2015 – Development of a system of qualification and career growth of academic staff at Sofia University.
General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.6: Learning resources and student support 1/2

- SU provides financial and academic support to its students;
- Student Career Centres at a University level and in some of the Faculties are established;
- SU was the biggest participant in a EU-funded project giving opportunity to 5500 SU students to have a job training and practice in the state administrations and in the business sector;
- The satisfaction of students is measured by using regular surveys, collecting quantitative data about students’ satisfaction with the learning process;

General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.6: Learning resources and student support 2/2

- The satisfaction of students with the learning resources and the student support available is measured through specific questions for each teacher and each subject taught.

The data collected are analyzed by sociologists at Sofia University Centre for Quality Management and the reports compiled are given to the heads of faculties. The Faculty Boards discuss the results of the analyses and make a managerial decision about changes in work organization, curricula, or whatever else might be necessary.

These data are used for creating lecturers’ profiles which are necessary for the attestation of a given lecturer or for their carrier development.
General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.7: Information management 1/2

• The Ministry of Education and Science requires the HEI-s to provide data for several registries the Ministry maintains. Thus the Universities had to establish electronic data systems themselves and now they collect data periodically;
• Different data are collected on an annual basis from The Bulgarian University Ranking System, which forces the Universities to periodically gather information on different topics and to conduct surveys;

General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.7: Information management 2/2

SU developed and implemented an internal integrated information system that allows immediate access to established databases gathering information about registration, admission, enrollment and current student status throughout the period of study;

• The University library has a web-based electronic catalogue;
• Several University centers offer digital resources and digitalize new content;
• All systems are web-based and provide free access to the service for students and staff.
General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.8: Public information

- Provision of information is required by the law;
- SU offers full public information about programmes, admission criteria, curricula, syllabuses, learning outcomes, qualifications awarded and student assessment procedures.

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

- SU has adopted procedures for ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes as required by the Higher Education Act;
- It is expected from the teaching stuff to do annual reviews of teaching material and to improve it. The information collected through the programme monitoring is analyzed at meetings of the departments and faculties and if necessary changes are made. Subsequently they are approved by the Academic Council. Results from different reviews are the base for proposals for actualisation of the content of curriculum, for introducing new methods of teaching etc.
General description of SU’s IQA System in relation to Part 1 ESG

ESG 1.10: Cyclical external quality assurance

- External evaluation reviews and post-accreditation monitoring are conducted by the NEAA periodically at an institutional and programme level;
- Financial audits are conducted on a regular basis;
- Students participate in programme monitoring and review procedures as full members of expert groups or by filling in course evaluation surveys;
- External stakeholders are involved in programme reviews.

How is a good practice in IQA identified

- Who determines that an activity is a best practice?
- How do we evaluate what is a best practice?
- Distinctive feature of a good practice:
  - Effectiveness;
  - Universality, transferability;
  - Innovativeness;
  - Exemplariness – inspiration set off by the practice; contribution to quality culture.
How do we evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency, successfulness etc.

• measurable success;
• active commitment to quality;
• willingness to engage in critical self-evaluation;
• internal regulatory framework with clear and consistent procedures;
• explicit and clearly assigned responsibilities for quality control;
• drive to obtain feedback;
• prompt and appropriate managerial action;
• transparency and dialogue with stakeholders and society.

Examples of good practice in IQA

Standard 1.5: Teaching staff

System of qualification and career growth of academic staff at Sofia University is an R&D project, BG051PO-001-3.1.09-0005, under Human Resources Development operational programme of the EU, 2013-2015.

University administrators and academics created a new system of qualification development for university teachers through e-learning. The system constitutes a virtual career centre.

The operation relates in general to enhancement of quality culture and in detail to career development, appraisal, enhancement of teaching and research (adherence to the respective standards).
Examples of good practice in IQA

Open access is made available to all university teachers.

The virtual career centre registered 250 university teachers in its first round of admissions in 2014. Feedback on participants’ satisfaction is gathered by using special questionnaires. The information is applied in continuing curriculum development and working on e-courses’ orientation to the labour market.

Examples of good practice in IQA

Seven modules have been designed including 25 curricula, necessary and sufficient materials, and adequate teaching/learning procedures.

The teaching/learning modules for university teachers are as follows:

1. ICT,
2. Modern language learning (English, French, German, Russian, Spanish),
3. Academic writing,
4. Communication skills,
5. Methods of academic teaching,
6. Modern educational strategies and technologies,
Examples of good practice in IQA

Successfulness of operation

Effective production of an expected outcome "for the enhancing of quality culture" in HE is achieved by fulfilling the aims of the R&D project.

The outcomes ensure usefulness and effectiveness as evidenced by the characterization of this operation as a "positive action".

Examples of good practice in IQA

Innovation of operation

The use of novel approaches different from the current ones is substantiated by the new system of qualification development of university teachers through e-learning established at the institution.

It is linked to the existing e-learning platform of the University. This provides stability of the implementation of this operation in the process of modernization.
Examples of good practice in IQA

Transferability of operation

The passing on of the approach to other areas is effected by the universal nature of the operation. The practice is visible, communicable and shareable. In addition, it is applicable to systems and regulations at other HEIs.

The dissemination of operation is facilitated by its electronic form. The use of a native language in the practice is a drawback which is easy to overcome.

Examples of good practice in IQA

The next example is difficult to attribute to one specific ESG.

A Quality mark is bestowed on faculties, departments, centers that perform well in compliance with the quality management system throughout the year and to teams and individuals who have proven their contribution in increasing the quality of education at the University.

The mark is engraved on a plaque, it is a symbol.

The practice of awarding a Quality mark of the University of Sofia was established to motivate the lecturers and staff to observe the quality standards and achieve stability in the functioning of the interuniversity system for managing quality.
Examples of good practice in IQA

The Mark is awarded by the University Center for Quality Control based on the information gathered throughout the academic year, e.g. Faculty quality commissions whose plans and initiatives have created conditions for successful application of the standards; reports and documented proceedings by the Faculties, as well as by the Units and the governing body of the University. This information is gathered and processed by the Center for Quality Control for the whole University.

Examples of good practice in IQA

The criteria for awarding the Mark each respective year are as follows:

1. The systematic execution of the Quality Control rules by the Faculties and the Units.

2. Initiatives/acts for increasing the quality of education at the University (in particular, the learning process).

3. Achieved results (based on a comparative analysis of the gathered data).

4. Correspondence to the indicators of the quality of education.
Examples of good practice in IQA

The Mark is awarded once a year at an honorary ceremony during the celebration of the University’s patron saint (November 25th).

The Mark was awarded for the first time to the Faculty of Mathematics and IT. It was received extremely positively as a reward and an acknowledgement of the whole Faculty.

Successfulness of operation

The annual awarding of the Quality mark of the University of Sofia is very motivating and encouraging for the whole University community.

The Faculty Quality Commissions and teams strive for a better organisation of the proceedings and give publicity as to what is happening in the Departments due to the expectation of who is going to be awarded.

Teams and faculty communities often have good ideas and a specific internal organization of the processes of quality assuring, deserving to be popularized.
Examples of good practice in IQA

Successfulness of operation

This award allows us to discover such internal initiatives and to encourage them, as our colleagues are motivated to present them throughout the year, as well as to seek feedback for what was accomplished.

The award presents us with the chance to discuss the significance of standards and indicators of quality and to expound the components of the interuniversity system for quality.

It helps attract more adherents in our attempts to build an organizational culture for high quality of work.

Examples of good practice in IQA

Innovation of operation

We consider the idea of Quality mark to be innovative, as until this point in the long history of the University, no such attempt of internal quality assurance through commendation and public acknowledgement, rather than control, formal evaluation and sanctioning of those who do not live up to the quality standards, has been made.
Examples of good practice in IQA

Transferability of operation

The realization of this initiative does not require a large amount of funds and is not committed to financial stimuli or rewards. The plaque is a humble symbol, as well a recognition of achievement and a job well done.

Examples of good practice in IQA

There are other examples for good practice for IQA:

- Establishment of several doctoral schools;
- The development of new forms of learning – distance and e-learning;
- Establishment of libraries for digital resources etc.
Obstacles and Threats linked to its inappropriate use

In the literature, arguments against using good practice were raised:

- pointing out a good practice may discourage all those who use alternative courses of action;
- the recognition of a good practice may imply that there is only one way of getting a task done and therefore no alternatives are necessary or possible’;
- good practice may be viewed as the ”best method” of operation and therefore no improvement is possible.

Objective threats, risks and challenges

To the arguments above it may be answered that unlike a standard, a good practice has its alternatives suitable for diverse situations. A professional standard takes in a range of concrete good practices.

In the same time there are objective threats and weaknesses in the process of identifying a good practice.

Furthermore, sometimes we have examples which represent good and bad practice at the same time.

SU’s Student Career Centre – a good or a bad practice?
Objective threats, risks and challenges

Superficial quality perception;
Academia distrusting the added-value of evaluation;
Internal tolerance for low quality;
Inherent difficulty in quantifying the outputs of higher education for self-assessment purposes;
Measuring the administrative or the service functions is easier than measuring the quality of research or that of teaching and learning.

Examples of unsolved tasks

1. We need to develop and improve automatic systems for electronic data compiling and processing, and thereby, make the information related to the quality assurance system more visible.

2. We need to attract more stakeholders and make them more active in the process of external monitoring.

3. We need to motivate our students to be more active when they give their opinions about curricula and lecturers.

4. We need to establish the good practice of having the Faculty Board regularly publish information about decisions concerning the enhancement of quality assurance systems.
Thank you for your attention!
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UL quality system and ESG part 1

1. Policy for QA (strategy, QA manual (comprehensive),...)
2. Design and approval of programmes (guidelines, requirements, procedures, peer review)
3. Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment (SC L&T emphasised with the Bologna reform, needs more support and resources for L&T & assessment methods; assessment regulations are in place... )
4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification (various documents, procedures, DS...)
UL quality system and ESG part 1

5. Teaching staff (promotion of teachers (habilitation), trainings, use of IT)
6. Learning resources and student support (tutorship system, career centres...)
7. Information management (data, indicators, surveys..)
8. Public information (programme information...)
9. On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes (programme coordinators, more emphasis on self-evaluation...)
10. Cyclical external QA ( (re)accreditations, international evaluations and accreditations

A good insight into a quality system?

(Source: http://necsii.edu/figs/uga.htm)

UL: 23 faculties, 3 academies, more then 40.000 students, almost 6.000 employees
Quality System

**University level** (responsibility of the rector):
- Quality committee (pedagogical and non-pedagogical staff, a student)
- Vice-rector
- Quality unit (quality assurance, analyses and reporting)

**Faculties and academies** (responsibility of the dean):
- Quality committee (teachers and student representative, sometimes also staff)
- Vice-dean
- Seldom: QA unit or QA staff

Properties

- Comprehensive quality system
- Indicators covering all areas
- Planning, reporting and self-evaluation
- Procedures, tools and mechanisms at university level and faculty/academy level
- Qualitative & Quantitative methods
- Formal & semi-formal methods
Role of the central level QA&D:

- Defining common rules, procedures, indicators
  - e.g. QA manual, approval of study programmes
- Designing tools (obligatory and optional), preparing guidelines
  - e.g. employee satisfaction monitoring, tools for programme monitoring and enhancement
- Offering IT support to some tools (graduate survey, new student survey (in preparation))
- Data collection, integration, preparation of indicators
- Coordination of institutional re-accreditation (learning opportunity)

Central level (continued)

- DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITY CULTURE!
  Support, encouragement
  Consultations, trainings, conferences, workshops
  - And... yearly planning, reporting and self-evaluation...

Faculty/academy level QA&D

- Some additional rules, procedures, tools, guidelines
- Use of tools
- Use of results
- Yearly planning, reporting and self-evaluation
- ...
Recent dilemmas & changes

- More emphasis on standardisation, control?
- Need to establish internal evaluations - internal audits of faculties, programmes?
  
or
- More emphasis on **quality enhancement**?

- More emphasis on quality system or **quality culture**?

Source: http://www.businessesgrow.com/
Why Quality Culture?

- Very diverse university, different phases of IQA on different faculties (26 faculties/academies)
- Need for further development of the common QA framework, but not the unification of existing mechanisms on faculty level
- Need for more systematic approach and the transfer of knowledge
- Need for more professional support in QA&D
- Need for less multiplication of work-load
- Need for quality enhancement, appreciation of CONTEXT
- Momentum - a good past cooperation experience (2012)

OPPORTUNITY: Project QUL (2013/2015)

HOW?

- Involvement of faculties in designing new mechanisms and the redesign of old ones
- Introduction of participatory leadership (facilitation! (Art of Hosting))
  - Appreciative Inquiry (to activate the strengths of participants)
  - Use of powerful questions (open space for new possibilities)
  - Work in small groups to involve everybody present
  - Emphasis on the process (fitting the purpose)
- Building capacity for (self)reflection (purpose, needs, e.g. SER)
Example: enhancement-led visits to faculties (new mechanism)

- Involvement of faculties in the preparations (needs),
- Emphasis on coaching, learning from others, but taking in account specific context, needs and goals

*But how?*

- Participatory methods to reach goals and tackle the dilemmas
- Preparation of the faculty
  - short and reflective materials,
  - support during preparation,
  - selection of most topics to work on
- Mixed visit team (faculties, central level, student) - training

Enhancement mechanism (continued)

- 4-hour participatory workshop (3 stages, recomendations as a result, facilitation)
- Integration of the results in yearly planing and reporting
- Adoption of the enhancement mechanism in the quality system (2014 - QA manual, 2015 – principles and guidelines)
- Time-line:
  - 2014: Pilot phase, 3 faculties, 1 academy
  - End of 2014: evaluation
  - 2015: 2 faculties
  - 2016-2018: call open for next
Results (enhancement mechanism)

- Raised motivation and good feed-backs from the 6 faculties/academy that underwent the process
- Pool of 60 people that underwent the intense 3-day training
  - multiplication also in their own environment – units, possible transfer to L&T process
  - Large networking achievement (further possibility of involvement)
- Need for more trainings in participatory leadership (faculties would like to use these approaches)

Trainings (project QUL, central level)

- QD skills (communication, facilitation, group dynamics, process management, strategic planning...),
- Awareness and knowledge (organisational culture, quality concepts and approaches...)
- L&T (methods, e-learning, flipped learning)

Intense, in-depth (at least full-day), training of skills

Other:
- Conferences and seminars
  Awareness, reflection, inspiration by transfer of knowledge and experience
- Study visits (2) – affirmation of the taken course, new ideas...
General results of 2,5-year comprehensive project QUL

- Involvement of the faculties
- Involvement of the leadership in QA&D
- Step further in quality loops on central and faculty level (from check to plan/act)
- Changed perceived role of the central level (from demand, admin. burden to support, involvement),
- Networking between faculties, pedagogical and non-pedagogical staff, students;
- Raised identification/affiliation with the university
- Raised awareness about quality...
- Plan to continue the trainings (from the central level)

A jump in quality culture 😊
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The Portuguese Context for QA in HE

- New Law in 2007
  - Accreditation (ex ante and ex post) of all degree programmes by the National Agency for the Evaluation and Accreditation of Higher Education (A3ES)
  - Each HEI must develop its own IQAS
  - The A3ES set up
    - Reference points for IQAS (based on the ESG)
    - A voluntary process of institutional audit for the certification of IQAS
QA at UMinho - The early stages

- Coordination and management of teaching
  - Big emphasis from the beginning: degree programme ↔ educational project
  - Coordination structures
    - Degree Director
    - Degree Committee
    - Degrees Council / Pedagogic Council (scientific area / School level)
    - Academic Council / Standing Committee for Pedagogical Affairs (University level)
- Formal system for the evaluation of teaching established in 1991
  - Applying to all degree programmes
    - Student surveys / Student’s success rates / Internal reflection system

Main mechanisms and procedures

- Main mechanisms and procedures in place for QA
  - Internal feedback and external feedback
  - Internal reflection and action for improvement
  - External reviews
- Internal feedback
  - A wide set of semestral/annual surveys
  - Annual reports on students’ success data
QA at UMinho
Main mechanisms and procedures

- **External feedback**
  - Main source - the AlumniUM site [http://alumni.uminho.pt]:
    - On-line surveys to track the professional careers of the alumni
    - Surveys to employers (collect opinion on skills shown by graduates)
  - Formal consultation with external partners when a new programme is designed and developed
  - Reports from External Advisory Committees set up in connection with some Schools or Degree Programmes

- **Internal reflection and action for improvement**
  - Timely dissemination of relevant (worked out) descriptive and feedback data to the relevant actors
  - Production of annual reports and their discussion in the pedagogic bodies:
    - Issues needing correction are identified
    - Some measures are taken as a result of the assessment

- **External reviews**
  - Institutional level:
    - Follow-up by EUA in 2009
Moving to a new comprehensive IQAS (2009/2010)

Main previously missing elements to fully comply with the ESG:
- The definition of explicit quality standards (lack of tradition in Portugal)
- The organisation of the existing QA instruments as a system - to be well documented and applied in a consistent and holistic way
- The definition of procedures for the monitoring and improvement of the IQAS itself

Weak points in the quality cycle:
- A proper action plan was not consistently drawn up and approved by the relevant bodies → somewhat heterogenous results
- No comprehensive follow-up procedures were in place

A new explicit institutional quality policy
- Building upon the existing QA procedures and mechanisms, but addressing the questions above
- Underlying principle → a shared vision of UMinho mission and objectives, translated into:
  - a strategic institutional development plan
  - its furtherance throughout the whole University
- Result: a formal IQAS → the SIGAQ-UM
  - a comprehensive system, covering teaching and learning (T&L), research and development (R&D), Cultural Units and Support Services.
QA at UMinho – A new comprehensive IQAS

Key elements of SIGAQ-UM

- The Strategic Programme

- The Quality Plan

- The Quality Manual

The Quality Plan

- Translates the Strategic Programme into concrete action plans

- The action plans establish, for each action:
  - Strategies and methodologies
  - Performance indicators
  - Goals
  - Schedule
  - Levels of responsibility

The Quality Plan establishes the quality standards for UMinho
The Quality Manual

Documents the overall conception of SIGAQ-UM. Includes, namely:

- The strategy for quality
- The macro-organisation of SIGAQ-UM (scope, objectives, coordination structures, levels of responsibility)
- The methodologies for the monitoring, assessment and feedback action, discriminated for:
  - Research
  - Teaching and learning
  - Interaction with society
  - Human and material resources
  - Services
- The interface of SIGAQ-UM with the strategic management of UMinho
- The participation of internal and external stakeholders in QA
- The production and dissemination of information
- The meta-evaluation of SIGAQ-UM

QA supporting structures

- QA Follow-up Committee:
  - Coordination and advisory body, chaired by a Vice-Rector
  - Holds responsibility for the strategic coordination and the meta-evaluation of SIGAQ-UM
  - Integrates the Quality Manager and representatives from every School and from cultural units, services and students

- QA Office (SGAQ - Services for QA)
  - Logistics support centre for SIGAQ-UM
  - The Quality Manager acts as Head Officer

- SIGAQ-UM Information System
  - Integrated into the UMinho information system
  - Allows for on-line surveys, on-line preparation of reports and all data gathering and analysis
Strategy for monitoring/assessing/enhancing T&L

- Consists mainly in the preparation of annual self-evaluation reports (with predefined specifications and format)
- Develops at successive levels of intervention, gradually aggregated:
  - Course unit
  - Degree programme
  - Organic Unit (School)

Includes a flagging mechanism of “results to reflect upon”

Structure of self-assessment reports

- Background information
  - Imported from sources/databases in UMinho’s Information System
  - Automatically available upon opening the electronic form
  - Includes the aggregated appraisals from the previous levels of analysis
  - Allows easy surfing on (a high volume of) information through selective viewing interfaces

- Electronic form for the elaboration of the analytical report
  - Self-reflection on nuclear aspects of the organisation, functioning and results of teaching (at the corresponding level of analysis)
  - Identification of strengths and weaknesses (or SWOT)
  - Suggestion of improvement measures/action plans
Structure of self-assessment reports

Flagging mechanism
- Flags situations where results stray significantly from the set goals and therefore requiring a deeper examination
- Flagged situations at course unit level require a compulsory further examination, as well as a suggestion for an action plan for improvement
- Degree programme self-assessment reports shall explicitly include a proposal for an action plan aimed at the resolution of the problems encountered, or a proper rationalisation of why a formal action plan is not necessary
- The Pedagogical Council (at School level) analyses and validates the action plans for improvement proposed by the Degree Programme Directors

Analytical nature of self-assessment reports

- Reports are predominantly an analytic process, devoid of bureaucratic load and relatively light on the academic community
- But ensure the systematic identification and treatment of potential situations of poor quality through the flagging mechanism!

Follow-up on action plans

- There is a software application for the management of the action plans
- Self-assessment reports always require an appreciation of the answer given to the recommendations and improvement plans included in the previous assessment
Main constraints of SIGAQ-UM

- "Upstream constraints" - In the initial phases
  - Problems of pedagogical organisation and management (properly defined procedures not always in place)
  - Timely availability of reliable background information (problems of integration of autonomous information systems)
- Internal communication
  - Although a very participative process - Difficult to reach all intended recipients
  - Clarity of language and perception of concepts
    - E.g.: Negative perception of the flagging mechanism
    - Improvement: change "unsatisfactory results" → "results to reflect upon"
  - Vertical articulation liable to better exploiting

Participation in the experimental audit process of A3ES

- Contribution for the enhancement and consolidation of SIGAQ-UM
- Very positive assessment → strengthened motivation of all actors
  - "Existence of a well-defined and documented institutional policy for quality, which covers the different aspects of the institutional mission"
  - "The system has all the conditions to contribute to the continuous quality improvement of UMinho activities"
Some good practices

1. Good practices identified by the External Review Team (A3ES)
   - The deep involvement of University leadership in the SIGAQ-UM [ESG 1.1]
   - The periodical tracking of SIGAQ-UM to ensure its consistency [ESG 1.1]
   - The concern in progressive streamlining of the system, emphasising the practices of reflection among the different actors [ESG 1.1 and 1.9]
   - The process of quality improvement in education/learning in the 1st and 2nd cycles, with all procedures associated with the DUC (Course Unit portfolio at subject level) [ESG 1.9 and 1.4 (student progression)]
   - Good integration of the information system supporting the SIGAQ-UM, in the areas that are already implemented [ESG 1.7]

Compliance with ESG Part 1

1. Elements of compliance with ESG Part 1
   - 1.1 Policy for quality assurance
     - Comprehensive well-defined, documented and publicised institutional policy for quality, including explicit strategies covering the different aspects of the institutional mission.
     - Translation of QA policy into a comprehensive IQAS extensively involving internal and external stakeholders.
   - 1.2 Design and approval of programmes
     - Well-defined terms-of-reference and procedures for the approval of programmes, including formal approval at Department, School and University level.
     - Clear definition and communication of intended learning outcomes at programme and subject levels and of resulting qualifications.
Elements of compliance with ESG Part 1

1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment
- Teaching and learning methodologies are a central element in self-assessment reports.
- Fully student-centred teaching and learning processes in Medical Education, at the School of Health Sciences.

1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification
- The publication of formally adopted Academic Regulations defining precise rules for students admission, progression, recognition and certification, including special provisions for particular groups of students.

1.5 Teaching staff
- Formally adopted procedures for career admission and progression.
- Common reference points for academic staff assessment and career progression defined at institutional level and very detailed regulations for academic staff assessment at each School.

1.6 Learning resources and student support
- Comprehensive internal quality assurance mechanisms for support services.
- Includes regular surveys on users satisfaction.
Elements of compliance with ESG Part 1

1.7 Information management
- The design and implementation of a specific information system to support SIGAQ-UM, fully integrated into the UMinho Information System.
- The timely availability of data and indicators as background information for the elaboration of self-assessment reports.
- The elaboration of an Institutional Progress Chart as a 3-year times series of the most relevant performance indicators.

1.8 Public information
- Comprehensiveness and quality of public on-line information on each study programme.
- Detailed public annual report.

1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes
- Strategy and procedures for quality assurance of the teaching and learning processes - from subject level to institutional policies.
- Action plans for enhancement of teaching and learning, research and support services.

1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance
- External assessment/accreditation review of every study programmes every six years (A3ES).
- Auditing/certification of SIGAQ-UM (A3ES).
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Agenda:

- WSB
- IQAS in WSB Torun
- Good practices
WSB Schools of Banking
– largest group of business schools in Poland:

20 years of experience

present in 9 big cities

230,000 students and alumni

60,000 under- and postgraduate students

How to assure „quality of our alumni”?

- Programm – what and why we teach?
- Teaching – how we teach, how students learn?
- Teacher – who teaches?
Processes and standards

WSB Teaching and Evaluation Standards
WSB e-learning and e-service Standards
Internship Standards
Didactics planning
Promoting processes
Internship processs

Teacher recruitment
Teacher implementation
Teacher assessment
Teacher development
Motivation system

System management procedures

Internal Quality Audits and Management Reviews
Corrective and preventive actions

Advisory and Quality Boards Processes
Designing, Verifying and Approving Program
Verifying Learning Outcomes Process
Assessing the quality of diploma thesis

Enrolment, Teaching, and evaluation
Promotion
Learning outcomes validation
Assessing the quality of diploma thesis

Complaints and non-compliance service management
Corrective and preventive actions
Benchmark with ESG

1.1 Policy for quality assurance
1.2 Design and approval of programmes
1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment
1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification
1.5 Teaching Staff
1.6 Learning resources and student support
1.7 Information management
1.8 Public information
1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes
1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance
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Good practices:

- Advisory board and Quality Commissions
- Program Managers
- Annual research - all stakeholders feedback (BAM)
Quality Commissions:

- Assemblies
  - Employers
  - Alumni
  - Students
  - Academic Teachers
  - Teaching Methodology Advisor
  - Library Advisor
  - New Technology in Teaching Center
  - Program Managers

Quality Commissions

- Consulting
- Designing and verifying programs
- Evaluating
- Participating in teaching
Program Advisory Board:
- Assemblies
  - Quality Comissions
  - School Management Board

Program Manager
Accountable for the students in the program
- responsible for the offer and its communication
- responsible for enrolment
- responsible for the program
  - including quality comission process
- responsible for the teaching
- responsible for „brand attributes”
Program Managers and Teams

Annual research since 2009 - all stakeholders feedback (BAM)

P²

WSB brand attributes:
- friendliness
- Practicality

PRZYJAZNOŚĆ
PRAKTYCZNOŚĆ

WYŻSZA SZKOŁA BANKOWA
Annual research - all stakeholders feedback (BAM)

The „brand process”: continuous improvement

- set goals
- do
- measure
- correct and motivate
- share good practices

Research every year; last research: 01.04-09.06.2015

Feedback

**Number of survey forms**

- Bachelor students: 9219
- Master students: 2498
- Postgraduate: 2557
- MBA: 283
- Postgraduate alumni: 430
- MBA alumni: 22
- Master and bachelor alumni: 850
- Employment "not engaged": 702
- Academics: 703
- Students other univ.: 1090
- Students other univ.: 1090

18354...
5.9.

Presentation 16

THE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF COIMBRA

Author:
Madelana Alarcao, University of Coimbra/ CRUP
Quality assurance has been a central concern at the University of Coimbra (UC) for some years. At the present it is considered to be a priority for the performance of its activities.

Since 2011 the UC adopted a global vision of Quality Assurance, cutting across all the pillars of its mission (research, education, university extension) and resources (people, economic and financial, infrastructures)

Given the need to monitor a system of this dimension, a Quality Committee (CQ) was set up in 2013. The CQ approved the quality policy and ensures the strategic coordination of the SG.

Since 2011 the SG.UC is connect with the UC Strategic Action Plan (PEA)
The management system of the University of Coimbra [SG UC]

2003
ISO 9001 certification in the UC Administration departments

2008
Implementation of the Educational Quality Management Assessment

2011
First Strategic Plan and extension of the SG.UC to all missions of the UC

2013
Set up of the Quality Committee

2014
Institutional evaluation by A3ES

2015
ISO 9001 certification for the UC Administration

SG.UC organization chart

Quality Committee (16 elements)

Rector/rectoral team

Directors of the Organizational Units

UC Administrator

SAS Administrator

Pedagogical Council

Scientific Council

Course coordinator

Research unit coordinator

Process managers

Internal auditors

Students

Professors

Researchers

Workers

External stakeholders
Quality Policy of the University of Coimbra

It represents a commitment to continuous improvement in all aspects of the institution’s performance.

1 | Encouraging the involvement of the whole academic community, particularly students, ensuring the effectiveness of the Quality Management System
2 | Making the UC into a top-class European university, where knowledge and innovation are constructed in an alliance oriented towards new challenges
3 | Ensuring quality and continuous improvement of teaching, aligning the skills of students with the requirements of advanced training and the job market
4 | Reinforcing the Teaching - Research – Knowledge Transfer connection, promoting collaboration between the University and the economic, social and cultural environment
5 | Providing the UC with the most advanced forms of specialized services to the community
6 | Fostering the workers’ commitment with the organization, promoting participative internal communication and reinforcing individual skills
7 | Encouraging the sustainable management of resources, well-being of people and social responsibility of the organization

The management system of the University of Coimbra [SG UC]

The SG.UC includes the set of all documents, procedures, information systems and other tools to support planning, implementation, monitoring and continuous improvement in the UC mission areas - research, teaching, university extension and support services.

It aims to promote a culture of quality, for the overall satisfaction of the different stakeholders and the excellence of the institution.
Education

- **PLAN**: Each year evaluation procedures of pedagogical quality assessment are scheduled and implemented improvement actions are disclosed.
- **DO**: In the polling process, which includes pedagogical surveys, the teaching staff and students are asked to analyse some aspects considered important for the pedagogical quality. Self-assessments reports are prepared for each course at the end of the academic year. The coordinator is responsible for preparing the final report, though it is recommended that this exercise involves the participation of students, professors and other bodies related to the course (e.g., trainee host bodies, professional associations, research units). On the level of the faculties, the assessment cycle involves the preparation of a report which also includes a SOWT analysis about research, teaching, internationalization, human resources, students integration and school success, employability, partnerships, scientific productivity. In the light of this self assessment, the faculties reassess their Action Plan, introducing the adjustments they considerer relevant.
• **CHECK**: The Evaluation and Continuous Improvement Division (DAMC) analyses all the results (quantitative and qualitative ones) for each faculty and for the global of the university and points out the critical results that should lead to improvement actions

• **ACT**: The assessment closes with a discussion of the main results in each faculty, with monitoring of the less favourable results and subsequent actions. A pedagogical quality management report is prepared each year on the level of the university and made available to the public on the webpage

• The assessment cycle described provides a lot of information that can be used by faculties and the university to define the courses on offer, pedagogical regulations, support measures for students, pedagogical training for professors

---

**Research**

• **PLAN**: Having identified the need for improvement in the processes and results 2 administrative structures were set up (DAPI + DPA)

• **DO**: DAPI responsibilities include prospecting and divulging funding programmes available and providing specialized support for the preparation of applications. DPA supports the researcher upon the administrative activities

• **CHECK**: A collaborative web platform is currently being developed to offer an integrated overview of the research competence and technological capacities available. The research units are assessed by the FCT.

• **ACT**: The university rankings are viewed as an opportunity to optimize internal monitoring mechanisms and results are used to define new forms of I&D activities promotion.
Support Services

- **PLAN**: In most of the support services, the SG.UC was implemented in accordance with ISO 9001
- **DO**: For each service macro-processes were defined that identify the activities that must be carried out and how they should be made. For human resources, we have procedures for staff recruitment, performance assessment and training and development. Teaching and non-teaching staff assessment is dematerialized. The academic department ensures students support from admission to certification and transition to the job market. It also supports the creation of courses and alteration of study plans among other activities
- **CHECK**: Every year, each service evaluates critical points from the registered complaints and the results of stakeholders satisfaction surveys
- **ACT**: Improvement actions are identified to implement the following year

Information management

- The TIC infrastructures and services are strategic as they support the UC activity – pedagogical, research, cultural and administrative. A strategic management model is being developed that integrates various indicators for different decision levels (course coordinators, faculties directors, services directors, UC administrator, team rector and Rector)
- Two informatic systems subsystems should be highlighted
  - Nóonio: we manage the courses, course units, students registers, applications/enrolments, issuing documents, teaching support tools; we send notifications, etc. This platform also permits various lists in real time and supports polling procedures;
  - Trouble ticket system: includes rows for the management of user requests and needs in the different services, including a specific aspect for the suggestion/complaint management
Management, maintenance and improvement

- In the SG.UC monitoring, assessment and continuous improvement are particularly important; they are integrated into the following tools:
  - Internal quality audits, carried out by non-teaching staff and students/alumni with special training
  - Monitoring, including PEA
  - Self-assessment of courses and faculties
  - External assessment of courses and institutional (A3ES), I&D units (FCT) and Administration services (APCER)
  - SIM@UC: information platform that enables the recording, management and monitoring of suggestions, complaints and improvement opportunities.

- The information from these tools is integrated into the SG review process which takes place on 2 broad levels
  - Administrative: quality balance by administrative departments directors and quality promoters
  - Strategic reflection: appreciation of the development of the SG and the SWOT analysis by the Quality Committee
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INTERNAL SYSTEM QUALITY ASSURANCE
(IN IMPLEMENTATION)

• Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG);

• A3ES Auditing Process;

• ISO 9001, 2008 - Services.
INTERNAL SYSTEM QUALITY ASSURANCE (IN IMPLEMENTATION)

• It was created an internal team with a responsible and an employee of each service, of each college and of the Pedagogic Council;

• Another team of 5 people with the task of implementing the internal system quality assurance was created, which in turn promotes and coordinates workshops for process analysis;

• It is supported by two experts in quality of the Regional Government of Madeira (RAM)

OFFICE 365 - TOOL FOR IMPLEMENTATION THE DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Objectives:
• Dematerialization of documents;
• Organization of documents taking into account user satisfaction;
• Using Sharepoint;
• Document management;
• Efficiency in information transmission
DEMATERIALIZATION OF DOCUMENTS

- Internal accreditation of courses (1.2 of ESG);
- Registration, renewal, training crediting (1.4 of ESG);
- Admission procedures for recruitment teaching staff (1.5 of ESG);

DEMATERIALIZATION OF DOCUMENTS

- Mobility of Students (1.6 of ESG);
- Profile of the student population (1.7 of ESG);
- Student progression, success and drop-out rates (1.7 of ESG);
DEMATериALIZATION OF DOCUMENTS

• Students’ satisfaction with their courses and programmes (1.7 of ESG);

• Publish information about their activities, including programmes (1.8 of ESG);

• Quality assurance (1.1, 1.10 of ESG).

ORGANIZATION OF DOCUMENTS TAKING INTO ACCOUNT USER SATISFACTION

• Improvement Bulletin Disclosure throughout the community (1.1 of ESG);

• Satisfaction Survey Disclosure throughout the community (1.1 of ESG);

• Internal Accreditation of subjects (1.2 of ESG);
ORGANIZATION OF DOCUMENTS TAKING INTO ACCOUNT
USER SATISFACTION

• Publish information about their activities, including programmes (1.8 of ESG);

• Contribution for quality assurance (1.10 of ESG).

USAGE OF SHAREPOINT

• Improvement Bulletin Disclosure throughout the community (1.1 of ESG);

• Satisfaction Survey Disclosure throughout the community (1.1 of ESG);

• Information sharing and joint production of documents by teachers of the same course of study and / or by teachers of the same scientific area (1.2 of ESG);
USAGE OF SHAREPOINT

- Sharing documents by the members of collegial bodies (1.2 of ESG);
- On the analysis of requests for academic credits (1.4 of ESG);
- In teacher assessment in two evaluation periods (1.7 of ESG);

USAGE OF SHAREPOINT

- Sharing of internal regulations (1.7 of ESG);
- Information management about programmes and other activities (1.7 of ESG);
- Creating better conditions for monitoring and review of programmes (1.9 of ESG).
DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

- Internal Accreditation of subjects (1.2 of ESG).

OTHER TASKS DEVELOPED

- Development of the general map of goals;

- Training the teams on the ISO 9001-2008;

- Organizing awareness sessions on alternative schedules in order to stimulate participation;

- Provision of opinion surveys on the functioning of services;
TASKS IN DEVELOPMENT

• Prepared monthly activities map;

• Quality Manual (Management Manual) - in preparation;

• Built Improvement Suggestion Bulletin, released and placed in an accessible site to the entire academic community;

OTHER TASKS IN DEVELOPMENT

• Meetings with some services for guidance and monitoring of its processes;

• Extension of quality improvement activities, gradually, to all units;

• Weekly meetings of the quality team.
EVIDENCE OF IMPORTANCE OF INTERNAL SYSTEM OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

• Although they are still to go the first steps, it is evident that:

• the availability and enthusiasm of a significant percentage of the institution's employees willing to participate actively;

• Analysis of the processes and meetings of the Quality Team with the services immediately motivated improvement proposals which in some cases were implemented immediately;

• More dialogue and cooperation between the various units that make up the University;

• Increased user satisfaction of internal and external services already analyzed.
INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM
MADEIRA UNIVERSITY (UMa), PORTUGAL

Thank You for your attention
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Presentation plan

- Internal Quality Assurance Systems in University of Social Sciences,
- Quality Assurance Department,
- Sample procedures in the area of quality assurance,
- Good practices in University of Social Sciences,
- the procedure of monitoring IQA systems effectiveness,
Quality Assurance in University of Social Sciences

Key players are:
- The Rector (responsible for QA according to Polish law),
- The Rector’s Plenipotentiary for Quality Assurance,
- Quality Assurance Committees,
- Faculty Deans,
- Quality Assurance Department.

All of them have strictly defined tasks in the area of QA.

Quality Assurance Department

- established in 2009,
- interfaculty unit,
- subordinates directly to Rector’s Plenipotentiary for Quality Assurance,
- mainly in charge of efficient functioning of IQA systems in University of Social Sciences,
Quality Assurance Department

- presents interdisciplinary approach to quality,
- cooperates with all participants of education process (students, academic staff, administrative staff, graduates, employers, etc.),
- in charge of tasks strictly defined in the IQA systems.

Quality Assurance Department, duties and responsibilities

- providing various departments and management board with information concerning quality of education and quality enhancement,
- IQA systems coordination,
- developing, planning and implementing procedures in the area of quality assurance,
- supporting different units with all activities aiming to implement procedures in the field of quality enhancement (administrative assistance),
Quality Assurance Department, duties and responsibilities

- planning and conducting evaluation researches aiming to measure and monitor quality of education + popularizing their results,
- developing tools to measure quality of education,
- providing management board with the results of evaluation researches + recommendations aiming to enhance quality,
- completing other tasks set by the Rector or his Plenipotentiary for Quality Assurance.

Quality Assurance Systems in University of Social Sciences

two complementary systems:

- university-wide system of quality assurance,
- faculty system of quality assurance.
University-wide Quality Assurance System

- common for all faculties and all fields of studies,
- very general,
- leaving „freedom” and „independence” for each and every field of study and taking into account their uniquity,

University-wide Quality Assurance System

- defining university-wide quality standards,
- strictly defining duties and responsibilities of all players and units involved in quality assurance,
- updated regularly.
Faculty System of Quality Assurance

- consistent with and complementary to University-wide Quality Assurance System,
- much more detailed than University-wide Quality Assurance System (can be treated as a "guidebook"),
- including sample tools to measure quality of education,
- flexible and easy to modify (if necessary).

Faculty System of Quality Assurance

- including 17 procedures to follow,
- giving simple and precise instructions to follow,
- including the procedure of its modification and verification,
- updated regularly.
Sample procedures (Faculty System of Quality Assurance)

- academic staff assessment procedure,
- administrative staff assessment procedure,
- monitoring and evaluation of teaching process organization,
- enrolment procedure,
- procedure of lodging complaints by students,
- procedure of lodging complaints by employees,

Sample procedures (Faculty System of Quality Assurance)

- procedure of learning outcomes verification,
- procedure of monitoring graduates’ careers,
- procedure of student internships realization,
- procedure of study programmes building and modification, etc.
Good Practices in University of Social Sciences

- Didactic Conference taking place regularly at the end of every academic year,
- **the procedure of monitoring IQA systems effectiveness,**
- Minerva platform.

Criteria to be fulfilled by the Good Practice

**GOOD PRACTICE is:**

- **effective** – it results in gaining information essential to develop recommendations and plan corrective actions in the area of increasing IQA systems effectiveness,
- **universal** – it is relatively easy to implement in any HEI,
- **innovative** – it involves all internal and external stakeholders of educational process,
- **a standard** – it can be a benchmark for other HEIs,
- **ethical,**
- **sustainable.**
Regulations putting the Good Practice into force

- university-wide Quality Assurance System,
- Faculty Quality Assurance System,
- Regulation Nr. 19 of the Rector of University of Social Sciences dated 8 December 2013 on the monitoring of IQA systems effectiveness,
- Regulation Nr. 28A of the Rector of University of Social Sciences dated 4 October 2012 on the IQA systems verification and improvement.

Purpose of the Good Practice

- improving IQA systems implemented in the University of Social Sciences,
- making IQA systems compliant with relevant regulations and trends in the area of quality enhancement,
- making IQA systems compliant with the needs and expectations of internal and external stakeholders of educational process,
- increasing internal and external stakeholders of educational process involvement in the actions taken in the area IQA systems,
- raising quality culture in University of Social Sciences.
Description of the Good Practice

- regulates monitoring of IQA systems effectiveness,
- research conducted every 2 years,
- research conducted among different groups of internal and external stakeholders of educational process (faculty management, students, teachers, administrative staff, external stakeholders – e.g. employers),

Description of the Good Practice

- conducted by Quality Assurance Department,
- individualised questionnaire for every group of respondents,
- on-line and paper-version questionnaire,
- gaining information concerning different views and therefore giving the full picture of IQA systems effectiveness.
Description of the Good Practice

- presenting research outcomes during Faculty Council and Quality Assurance Committees meetings, as well as during annual Didactic Conference,
- discussion,
- developing recommendations and corrective actions for each Faculty,
- conducting corrective actions,
- modifications in IQA systems introduced at the beginning of the next academic year.

The benefits derived from applying the Good Practice

- popularizing informations concerning IQA systems implemented in University of Social Sciences,
- involving different groups of internal and external stakeholders in corrective actions,
- getting to know different points of view (students, teachers, external stakeholders, etc.),
- meeting different groups of stakeholders needs and expectations.
Difficulties linked to the implementation of the Good Practice

- time-consuming (e.g. due to using paper-version questionnaire, many groups taking part in the research, etc.),
- respondents’ reluctance to taking part in the research,
- getting reliable data from respondents (many open questions).

Sample corrective actions as a result of the Good Practice implementation

- implementing Minerva platform for didactic process management,
- appointing Rector's Plenipotentiary for External Stakeholders,
- increasing external stakeholders involvement in Programme Committees works,
- increasing students involvement in Programme Committees works.
Thank you for your attention

any questions?
contact us:
djk@spoleczna.pl
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University of Nova Gorica

- Small, non-state, research-based, internationally oriented
- 7 schools, 6 research laboratories, 6 research centres
- 2014/15: 548, 181 & 100+
- 1:<5
IQA system of University of Nova Gorica

- Central management – flexibility
- UNG bodies: Rector (legal rep.) UNG Senate, Governing Board, Stud. Council, 2 Vice-Rectors, International Council (advisory body)
- Bologna reform of all study programmes completed in 2007
- 2013-2015: EU & national funds for the project Modernization of the quality assurance system and reform of programmes at UNG

---

IQA system of University of Nova Gorica

- Revision of programmes (inv. all stakeholders)
- Student-centered learning promoted
- Course syllabi revised, student survey questionnaires and certain rules updated
- Practical placements, tutorship system introduced
- E-learning learning opportunities enhanced, online information system upgraded

ESG
IQA system

• Self-evaluation is the primary mechanism for IQA and the development of quality culture

• 2013: Quality Manual
  (former Methodology of monitoring and assurance of quality of pedagogical and research work at UNG)

• IQA procedures in compliance with the national legislation (Higher Education Act, acts adopted by SQAA – institutional and programme accreditation) and ESG; ESG explicitly referred to in the Quality Manual

• Formally adopted, published

• Quality management at UNG is incorporated in the management of the university; the responsibility borne by the Rector of UNG, Vice-Rectors, Deans of schools, and by Heads of UNG research units.

Quality Assurance Committee

• Responsible (at UNG level) for the implementation of QA activities, for presenting the proposals and initiatives for the development of quality culture and the updating of procedures and strategies, as well as for constant improvements of quality

• President, 1 representative per school, student representative (weak point: no member of support staff)

• Rules of Procedure, regular meetings

• Responsible for UNG self-evaluation report (adopted by the UNG Senate) – analytical report including guidelines for improvement and checklist of annual progress
At school level: Quality Coordinator

- Also member of UNG QAC
- Monitors self-evaluation elements throughout the year
- Gathering information: e-surveys, School’s Senate sessions, UNG Strategic Panels, regular meetings with the Dean, support services, in contact with staff and students, external stakeholders
- Proposes improvements to QAC/Dean of school
- Involved in the procedures for the design and approval of programmes

- Progress monitored, actions taken documented (Reports to QAC (2/year)
- Together with the Dean, the Coordinator analyses the students’ questionnaires at the end of each academic year. (Newly adopted change: all findings should be published also in a manner to be understood by the students – adapted versions of findings of questionnaires shall be sent to students via the online information system (the latter cannot fully interpret the results)
- Responsible for producing the School’s annual self-evaluation report, together with other stakeholders) – annual monitoring of progress + contributes to UNG self-evaluation report
- Reports published, feedback communicated to all stakeholders within UNG circle of quality
Explicit reference to ESG – Chapter 2 of QA Manual

1. Introduction
2. Quality assurance strategies
3. Methodology of monitoring and assurance of quality of UNG study programmes
   3.1 Structure of self-evaluation reports
   3.2 Procedures for monitoring and assurance of quality, quality circle
4. Monitoring and assurance of quality of research work
5. Involvement of students in the process of monitoring and quality assurance
6. Credit system ECTS (recognition of the students’ knowledge obtained elsewhere)
Strengths of UNG IQA system

• UNG’s small size is seen as an advantage
• Specific internal structure of UNG, centralised management, unified strategies and procedures for QA
• Specific orientation – specific areas of research and teaching: 3rd-cycle study programme Karstology (QA procedures reflected on a global scale)
• Strong international orientation and at the same time strong links with the local community, contributing to the development of the local economy, creating a pool of highly trained experts in specific fields – karstology, viticulture and enology etc.)

Compliance with the standards of Part 1 of ESG

• 1.1 Policy for quality assurance
• 1.2 Design and approval of programmes
• 1.3 Student-centered learning, teaching and assessment
• 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification
• 1.5 Teaching staff
• 1.6 Learning resources and student support
• 1.7 Information management
• 1.8 Public information
• 1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes
• 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance
Good practices in current activities

• SWOT 2014; strength: high employability of graduates (enhanced cooperation with local companies and organisations – introduction of practical placement, student projects; survey aimed at employers to evaluate graduates’ competences – feedback) 1.2 – Design and approval of programmes, practival placements
• SWOT 2014; strength: adaptability, fast response to changes (possible due to small size of UNG, weekly sessions of management bodies), personalised approach towards internal stakeholders and regular meetings with external stakeholders
1.1 Policy for quality assurance

Provision of unique study programmes in specialised areas, related to the local environment – doctoral programme Karstology (effect on enrolment rate, no. of international students) (1.2 – Design and approval of programmes)
• “Double-monitoring” of students’ satisfaction – 2 parallel (formal and informal) ways of gathering feedback; lecturers’ own initiatives (recognised as good practice by EUA Evaluation Committee) (1.9 – On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes)
• Introducing the concept of Partner schools
• Students: system of Tutorship (teacher-student), a unique tailored scheme of studies for students-athletes (1.6 – Learning resources and student support)
Short-term plan:

• The newly-established centralised system of professional development opportunities for staff should be enhanced) (In line with the revised ESG – esp. amendments of standard 1.5)

How do you identify good practices in IQA? What is the scope of good practice?

Definition of the word “scope”:
1. The extent of the area or subject matter that something deals with
2. The opportunity or possibility to do or deal with something
   The scope for major change ...
   (Source: Online Oxford Dictionary)
How do you evaluate the effectiveness of good practices?

– Obstacles: diversity of activities, long-term process, time needed to obtain relevant/measurable results, lack of guidelines for evaluating the effectiveness

– **Self-evaluation processes** (Formal: analysis of findings in self-evaluation reports, analysis of results of questionnaires, UNG SWOT analysis, observations noted in the reports of Quality Coordinators; informal gathering of information from stakeholders)

– **External evaluation processes** (SQAA – maximum accreditation periods awarded to UNG and its programmes, institutional EUA (European University Association) evaluation in 2014/15, Thomson-Reuters profile, U-Multirank Performance Profile – excellence especially in the fields of research and international orientation)
Do you find any obstacles or threats linked to its inappropriate use/or further development?

- Funding: State funds for concessions and research activities have been scarce since, preventing a favourable development of pedagogical and research activities. Funding of UNG in 2013: 61.3% - research funds, of which over 50% obtained from international projects – lack of permanently employed staff (affecting the implementation of several ESG standards)
- In certain cases the national legislation impedes the development of the IQAs (due to the limitations prescribed by the national legislation in terms of language of instruction certain new study programmes cannot be introduced, the no. of international students and staff cannot increase to the level desired (affecting esp. the implementation of standards 1.2, 1.4)
What is the value added for your university?

• IQA procedures designed in the manner helping the institution to accomplish its vision and achieve the set goals
• Beneficial effect on UNG graduates’ employability rates
• Enhancement of the quality culture in the broadest sense
• Contribution to the development of the local/national economy and the selected scientific disciplines

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

www.ung.si

veronika.piccinini@ung.si
5.13.
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Summary

1. University of Beira Interior

2. Quality Office

3. Internal Quality Assurance System

4. Conclusions
1. UBI in a nutshell

- Portuguese public higher education institution
- Five faculties: Science, Engineering, Social and Human Sciences, Arts and Letters, Health Sciences
- 1st cycle, Integrated Master, 2nd cycle, 3rd cycle and lifelong learning programmes
- ca. 7000 students and 698 teaching staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Polytechnic Institute of Covilhã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>University Institute of Covilhã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>University of Beira Interior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Quality Assurance at UBI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>ETI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachering Staff</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>434.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>327.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>350</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Human Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Human Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building Quality Assurance at UBI

2. Quality Office

- Created in 2009
- Central structure reporting to the rectoral team
- Committed with:
  - Institutional evaluation
  - Accreditation of programmes
  - Quality of teaching and learning
  - Internal quality assurance system

Building Quality Assurance at UBI

3. Internal Quality Assurance System

- Prior to 2009
  - Some compliance with ESG (Part 1)
  - Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) by the European University Association (EUA) in 2007/08
  - Compliance of (some) services with ISO 9001:2000
3. Internal Quality Assurance System

• After 2009
  - Significant compliance with ESG (Part 1)
  - Creation of the Quality Office
  - A more clear design of IQAS evolving Scientific Councils, Pedagogical Councils, Faculties Quality Commissions, Course Commissions, ...
  - IEP Follow-up Report in 2011/12
  - Assessment/accreditation of programmes by the Portuguese Agency for Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education – A3ES)
  - Compliance of (nearly all) services with ISO 9001:2008

• Current status
  - Implementing full compliance with the ESG (Part 1)
    - e.g. good practice “Public Information about Programmes” - Providing all relevant information on one page - the one-stop-shop
  - Reviewing the information system
  - Assessment/accreditation of programmes by A3ES
  - Rethinking ISO 9001:2008 compliance
3. Internal Quality Assurance System

- Short-time prospects
  - Streamlining the information system
  - Accreditation of the Internal Quality Assurance System by A3ES

4. Conclusions

- Final remarks
  - Have the ESG been embedded in our quality assurance practices?
  - Have the ESG been given the required visibility in our quality assurance system?
Thank you!
PART I

PRESENTATION ON THE REFERENCE FRAMEWORK FOR COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF AGENCIES’ IQA ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES FOLLOWED BY AGENCIES’ PRESENTATIONS ON IQA ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES
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Purpose of this presentation

- A general word about methodology
- Common grounds that enable our comparative analysis
- Outline of QA methodology
- Indicators for assessing IQA
- Follow-up and system-wide analyses
- Open questions
Methodology

- … is in our case a set of methods for external evaluation and assurance of quality at HEIs

- **Methods**: tools, procedures, approaches, steps for checking facts against quality standards, (inter-)national contexts, policies and trends

Focus

- WG3 shifts the focus from all-ranging EQA to external assessment of IQA systems at HEIs

- Our framework thus focuses mostly on specific topics of the ESG Part 1 which relate to self-evaluation on the institutional and programme level, stakeholder involvement, internal QA policies, quality culture, quality loops

- **Requirements for comparative analysis**: „certain“ comparability of quality standards and QA methodology among partner agencies and HEIs in the field of IQA
Common background for assessment

- All national quality standards of partner agencies are in accordance with the ESG
- All partner HEIs follow the ESG and undergo periodic EQA reviews by reviewers
- Reviewers evaluate whether a HEI meets the quality criteria and so do the HEIs themselves carry out internal (self-)evaluations by using related methods
- Any evaluation tries to check compliance with standards and assess quality by regarding common relevant stakeholders (students, teachers, HEI management, employers, graduates …)

Common methodology

- Common methods possible for EQA and IQA:
  - (1) studying documentation and collecting evidence
  - (2) analysing gathered information and establishing the state of affairs (by checking documented results against stakeholder opinions)
  - (3) linking the state of affairs to quality standards
  - (4) passing opinion and grading compliance with standards and the state of affairs (qualitative / quantitative)
  - (5) upgrading the opinion by benchmarking and referencing (also based on follow-up and system-wide analyses)
  - (6) counselling – establishing advantages and recommendations (examples of good / poor practice)
  - (7) we try to follow-up on these recommendations – check their realization
Common procedural differences in methodology

- **Assessing the state of affairs in initial accreditation:**
  - Checking plans, promises, letters of intent …
  - Possibly no results or collected stakeholder opinions yet

- **Assessing the state of affairs in re-accreditation:**
  - Strict checking of documented results against stakeholder opinions and testimonies
  - Plans and intentions can hardly be regarded as evidence
  - However, the reviewers do check the realization of past action plans against improvement

Levels of assessment in EQA

- **Level 1 (for everyone):** Checking for compliance with minimum quality standards
  - Importance of hard evidence and measurable standards in legal proceedings vs. importance of peer counselling and encouragement?
  - Forensic inspection vs. peer review?

- **Level 2 (case specific):** Elaborating an assessment of quality that exceeds compliance with minimum standards:
  - What is the actual level of quality at the HEI?
  - Benchmarking with other HEIs (strengthening the credibility of reviewer opinion)
  - Referring to system analyses, national studies, scientific papers (strengthening the credibility of reviewer opinion)
  - Case specific elaboration of advantages (good practice) and recommendations (poor practice)
Quality indicators for EQA assessment of IQA – PART 1

- **Quality assurance policy and strategy**: IQA should have a policy, it should be transparent, realistic, promising, it should develop with time

- **Quality culture**: Are the stakeholders aware of benefits and disadvantages of IQA and do they enhance quality through this awareness

- **Transparency of IQA rules**: Quality manual and other rules should be readily accessible to all stakeholders and adopted in advance

- **Considering stakeholder opinions and incentives**: Regularly collecting stakeholder opinions, publishing evaluation results, stakeholder participation in IQA management

Quality indicators for EQA assessment of IQA – PART 2

- **Design, approval and review of study programmes**: There should be an internal mechanism of quality development of study programmes

- **Proper stakeholder participation in IQA**: Stakeholders should pass opinion and participate in IQA processes

- **Topics that IQA should cover**: IQA in its assessment processes should cover all areas of assessment that are also part of EQA

- **Closure of quality loop**: IQA itself should apply steps (see slide 6), add to them an action plan for improvement, as well as checking the realization of previous action plans and recommendations from IQA/EQA (follow-up)
Follow-up and System-wide analyses (SWA)

- EQA should be accompanied by follow-up: More regular checking for implementation of EQA recommendations and progress of HEIs

- Findings from follow-up are to be evaluated in the upcoming external periodic reviews or may lead to prompt external evaluations in case of serious shortcomings

- SWA: Findings of EQA or IQA should be analysed and evaluated all together in meta-analyses for the purpose of national studies, policy making and benchmarking

- SWA should thus serve both reviewers as well as governments, researchers and HEIs

Open questions

- Do IQA and EQA assessment methods enable proper development of HEIs?

- What and which methods proved to work best for the development of HEIs?

- How much does our methodology overlap?

- When is the right time for the agencies to leave compliance with minimum standards to HEIs themselves and focus just on counselling and peer quality assessment without possible legal consequences?
Thanky You!

mag. Jernej Širok
jernej.sirok@nakvis.si
Madalena Fonseca, A3ES

Maria João Rosa, A3ES
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Legal framework
Are quality standards/criteria defined by law, by agency’s regulation (executive act) or non-binding guidelines or all together?

- The Minister for HE announces the general criteria
- PKA develops detailed criteria and evaluation procedures

Are there any legally binding standards/criteria referring directly to the internal quality assurance issues?

IQAS refers to the whole process of education, in particular:
1) Methods of verification of intended learning outcomes throughout the process of education
2) the use of feedback provided by students
3) assessment of achievement of intended learning outcomes
4) the conclusions from the analysis of the results of graduate careers monitoring,
5) prevention and detection of plagiarism.
What happens if a standard/criterion is not defined by law and accreditation is revoked on account of non-compliance with such a standard?

- The status / legal reference of particular criteria are usually not questioned

What are the legal consequences of agency’s decisions (negative and positive)?

- Negative
  - No new recruitment
  - Immediate cancelling of the licence for the programme
- Positive
  - Programme assessment – re-accreditation after 6 years
  - Institutional evaluation – no programme assessments for 6 years
- Conditional
  - Re-accreditation after 1 year
Are external quality assessment methods defined by law/regulation/quality manual/guide for reviewers/all?

• No legal regulations
• Procedures are regulated according to internal PKA procedures

Do some standards lack legal grounds (which and how)?

• No direct answer – the assessment criteria are related to the legal regulations
Are some standards poorly defined (which and how)?

- PKA aims to define criteria more general (qualitative) rather than strict (quantitative)

Procedural framework
What evidence primarily counts for initial accreditation procedures?

- Internal HEI’s legal acts (curriculum approval)
- Curriculum (including the list of programme aims and ILOs)
- Staff CVs and allocation
- Resources description
- Letters of intent (where applicable)
- Internal analysis (relevance with the labour market, international benchmarks)
- Description of ILOs verification methods
- IQAS description

What documentation does your agency require for initial accreditation from applicants when assessing an IQA system in the making – plans or evidence of any results or both?

- Every HEI is legally obliged to have IQAS already implemented
What evidence primarily counts for re-accreditation and related procedures?

• Procedure for re-accreditation is basically the same as any other ex ante accreditation
• More focus on realisation of the suggestions and recommendations from the previous procedure

What documentation does your agency require from HEIs when assessing an already functioning IQA system

• Every relevant confirmation of the operations of the IQAS
How would you describe the nature of your quality procedures with regard to the type of procedure

- Programme – peer review evaluation
- Institutional – peer review audit

How do you compose/select the panel of experts? Are there any compulsory trainings for experts and do these trainings also focus on the assessment of IQA systems?

- 800 subject-specific experts
- 40 IQAS experts
  - 20 for institutional procedure
- 50 student experts
- 15 Ph.D. Students experts
- 50 professional field experts
- 30 international experts
- 90 PKA members
In which quality assessment procedures are site visits compulsory and in which not?

- Ex ante – not compulsory
- Ex post – compulsory
  - In some re-accreditation cases the site visit might be skipped

What if site visit is not enough and evaluation does not clear the matter entirely – do you repeat it or proceed to adopting a decision?

- This is impossible 😊
- Usually the procedures ends with the decisions
  - Innocent until proven otherwise
Do you supplement review procedures with any other procedures (oral hearings, calls to applicants for submitting additional evidence, etc.)?

- No

How hard must the evidence be when you connect it to a particular standard? Can you use only evidence and regulations for the case at hand or can you also refer to findings and legal interpretations within other previous or pending procedures (please state for evidence and interpretation / use of legal provision separately)?

- Rock solid 😊
- Usually triangulated
- Gathered only during the site-visit
Can HEIs respond to all reviewers’ written assessments (i.e. evaluation reports)?

- HEI response is one of the procedure steps
- HEI responses only to the final report

Can HEIs appeal to agency decisions?

- Yes it can
How many appeals to unfavourable decisions do you receive on average?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Total in 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex ante</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94 negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme ex post</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ex post</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 conditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the main grounds for disputing agency decisions?

- Using the opportunity for changing the assessment
- General disagreement with the assessments
- Interpretation of the legal requirements
If HEIs perform internal evaluations, are findings and recommendations of internal evaluations subject to external assessments?

- Yes they are – when evaluating IQAS
- Performance of internal evaluations is usually positively assessed by the panels

Methods of assessment and their applicability
Are methods of assessment layered?

- Ex ante – minimum standards and legal compliance
- Programme – focused on minimum standards
  - Including HEIs mission
  - Institutional – focused on the HEI strategy and IQAS

Do quality assessments include grades?

- Ex ante – yes/no
- Ex post:
  - Negative
  - Conditional
  - Positive
  - Outstanding
Do reviewers propose final decisions or state how the agency should decide?

- Indirect
  - PKA uses predefined algorithm for determining the final outcomes, based on the evaluation of the criteria

How does the decision making process looks like?

- Panel – assessment of the criteria
- PKA’s section – acceptance of the panel’s assessment and final assessment proposition
- Presidium of PKA – final decision based on the panel’s and section’s opinion
What steps do the agency and reviewers take in collecting and checking documentation for assessment and evidence?

- Ex ante – documents based assessment
  - No additional requests
- Ex post – triangulation principle
  - PKA tries to limit the number of documentation requested during the procedure

Who are relevant interviewees/reviewers for assessing the functioning and effectiveness of IQA systems

- IQA related questions are formulated during every interview
  - In every panel there is an IQAS expert
How do reviewers conduct interviews and orally gather information (questions are known in advance, free discussion, cross-examination)?

- Usually the panel agrees upon the questions asked
- There is usually the meeting leader
- Panels usually try to save some time for free discussion

What steps do the agency and reviewers take in analysing and interpreting the gathered information

- Ex ante – take as is
- Ex post – verify during the interviews
What steps do the agency and reviewers take in evaluating and grading the established state of affairs

- Triangulation
  - Starting from the SER

How does the agency assure that all quality assessments are comparable and treat HEIs equally?

- Decision-making process
- Secretary general – checking all the reports
Do the quality assessment methods applied at HEIs create the basis to sufficiently transfer incentives from top down?

- Development of IQAS in HEIs
- Slow process

Do agency’s accountability procedures based on quality assessment methods enable for incentives to be transferred from bottom up?

- Encourage HEIs for internal good practice sharing
- Support for involvement of internal stakeholders into the policy making processes and strategic decisions
Does your agency apply sufficient and effective methods so that external quality assessment assures proper counselling and support to HEIs?

- Quality Forum
- Suggestions and recommendations formulated in the reports

Do the methods applied lead to establishing the actual state of affairs and provide undisputable or valid evidence and findings?

- Is it really possible to answer?
Quality indicators for IQA

Do you assess accountability related policies (transparency, realism of plans and policies, their implementation, evaluation and improvement)?

- In general yes – by evaluating the efficiency of implemented HEI’s IQAS
Do you consider the background of accountability policies?

- Yes – the evaluation of IQAS is contextual and closely related with the HEI’s strategic intents

Do you assess quality culture?

- Indirectly – PKA panels try to identify informal practices having positive impact on quality
- PKA criteria indicate the importance of raising the quality culture
Do you assess the transparency and applicability of internal quality assurance regulations? Also, are they predefined, adopted and developed by proper bodies at the HEI?

- Development of the IQAS is fully autonomous
- PKA evaluates the inclusion of all the relevant stakeholders in development / realisation of the IQAS

Do you assess whether stakeholder opinions and incentives are regularly collected, analysed, evaluated and taken into account when adopting measures for improvement/enhancement? Also, are the corresponding results and measures made public?

- This is one of the main principles of every IQAS
- Publication of the outcomes of the IQAS procedures is always case sensitive
Do you assess whether internal quality assessments treat stakeholders equally and provide proper impartiality, anonymization and security?

- In principle – yes
  - Depending on the feedback procedures and methods used

Do you assess the amount of inclusion and structure of stakeholders? How actively do they participate – passing opinions, planning and evaluating measures within managerial structures? Is this assessment general or does it fall within specific quality indicators?

- Yes
  - The panels also looks for the HEI’s incentives and efforts for the stakeholders inclusion
Do you assess the results of IQA commissions and bodies at HEIs and their interaction with relevant stakeholders?

- Yes, but it is rather methodological then factual check

• Do you assess mechanisms for approval and periodic review of study programmes?
  Yes

• Do you assess transparency, efficiency and results of these procedures, participation of relevant stakeholders therein, publication of results and measures taken?
  Yes

• What is your main focus thereby (learning outcomes, students, employability, keeping touch with the developing disciplines and knowledge ...)?
  There is no clear focus, always contextual
Do you assess the extent of topics and content covered in IQA (does IQA (especially self-evaluations) cover all areas of assessment and quality standards as do external assessments)?

- Yes – listed in the PKA criteria for IQAS evaluation

Do you assess the quality loop and whether the scope of methods applied in IQA is complete (documenting, analysing, assessing, proposing measures, evaluating the implementation of measures, publishing)?

- Yes – focusing on IQAS impact on the quality
Do you also consider attempts and results at quality enhancement through other QA mechanisms that HEIs apply (EFQM, ISO), and how do you go about it?

- Yes, as an additional confirmation of the HEI’s dedication to the quality assurance
- They do not replace the standard procedure

Follow-up and system-wide analyses
Follow-up procedures

• Re-accreditation procedure after the conditional assessment – based only on the diagnosed weaknesses
• Standard re-accreditation procedure – refers to the recommendation from the previous evaluation
• Follow-up reports – based on the recommendation with strict deadline

System-wide analysis

• Yearly activity reports – including main findings and overall conclusions from the ex ante and ex post procedures’ outcomes
Conclusion

Good practices

- Increasing focus on professional experts training and development
- Contextualization of the evaluations
- HEI’s ultimate responsibility for its quality
- Inclusion of IQAS evaluation into every type of assessment (ex post and ex ante)
Bad practices / obstacles

- IQA follows EQA standards / requirements
- Generally low IQAS knowledge and awareness among HEIs
- Language barrier – hinders full internationalisation of the assessment procedures
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MEET NEAA. QUALITY ASSURANCE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN BULGARIA

Author:
Todor Shopov, NEAA
Meet NEAA

Quality Assurance for Higher Education in Bulgaria

Click on a tab to get to know NEAA.

Mission and Management

The National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency (NEAA) is an independent statutory body for evaluation, accreditation and monitoring of the quality in higher education institutions and scientific organizations aiming at the enhancement of their teaching and research, as well as of their development as scientific, cultural, and innovative organizations.

**Our mission:** encourage higher education institutions in assuring and enhancing the quality of education they offer by sustaining high academic standards and good education traditions in Bulgaria.

**Two main levels of management:**
- First level: Accreditation Council (elected and appointed by the Prime Minister)
- Second level: eight Standing Committees on study fields (elected and appointed by the Accreditation Council)
Structure of NEAA

NEAA QA Activities

- Responsible for carrying out institutional and program evaluation and accreditation of all HEIs in BG
- Tasks to establish a quality culture in the HE system by information, consultation and active participation of stakeholders
- Regular participation on ENQA events (eg. General Assembly)
- International cooperation (incl. bilateral agreements with ARACIS (Romania) and PKA (Poland))
Methodology used

- Experts are selected and trained in an objective and transparent process (maintained pool of experts)
- Expert groups are composed of different types of stakeholders (academics, students, employers, international experts)
- Experts use reference list of evaluation criteria and indicators
- Final decisions on program accreditation are taken by the Standing Committees
- Final decisions on institutional accreditation are taken by the Accreditation Council
- Post-Accreditation Monitoring and Control (PAMC)

Higher Education in Bulgaria

282 734 Students (PB, BA, MA, PhD), incl.:
- 69% full-time (face-to-face)
- 26% part-time (face-to-face)
- 5% distance learning (mostly MA).

51 HEIs (universities and colleges in 23 locations):
- 37 public (242 977 students)
- 14 private (37 757 students)

18249 faculty (acad. staff, full and part-time)

86 Professional fields
The Changing Higher Education Ecosystem

- Growing Competition for Students
- Lack of Funding (public HEIs)
- Students drop out rate increase
- Decreasing demand (demographically reasons, study abroad)
- Low barriers/requirements for Enrollment
Strengths and weaknesses regarding the assessment of IQAS

Internal

**STRENGTHS**
- Developing better KPI for HDIs performance measuring?
- The universities could be a lot more efficient and active by quality improvement (not only formal)
- Faculty resistance
- Hire marginally qualified academic staff
- Enrollment marginally qualified students

**OPPORTUNITIES**
- Faculty assessments (periodically)
- Critical external quality assurance

**WEAKNESSES**
- Lack of performance-driven compensation of faculty and staff
- Insufficient participation, influence and involvement of employers by design and approval of programmes
- Insufficient outgoing students and staff mobility
- Alumni networks still in emerging phase

**THREATS**
- Unfair and formally meet the criteria

External

- BI deployment for processes improvement
- Public information
- Cyclical external quality assurance

- University tracking student satisfaction with higher education services
- Tracking employer satisfaction of graduates
- Faculty assessments (periodically)

- Developing better KPI for HDIs performance measuring?
- The universities could be a lot more efficient and active by quality improvement (not only formal)
- Faculty resistance
- Hire marginally qualified academic staff
- Enrollment marginally qualified students

- Faculty members overloaded
- Reduce number of programs (new official register needed???)
- Lack of Funding (public HEIs)
- Students dropping out of the Universities
- Decreasing demand (demographically reasons, study abroad)
- Low barriers/requirements for Enrollment

What Impact Will IQA Have?

**Mildly Optimistic**
- Convince more faculty to try teaching better
- Refocus faculty and Universities on pedagogy

**Techno- Utopians**
- Dramatically increase success through BI and monitoring
- Improve instructional and research quality

**Doomsayers**
- Public Information
- Replace faculty with administrators and KPIs

**High Impact**
- Learning resources and student support
- Put most traditional HEIs out of business

**Low Impact**
- Must have but fade out quickly
- Never find viable model

- Distract from true academic tasks

Positive Consequences

Negative Consequences

- Low barriers/requirements for Enrollment
- Decreasing demand (demographically reasons, study abroad)
- Lack of Funding (public HEIs)
- Students dropping out of the Universities
- Faculty members overloaded
- Reduce number of programs (new official register needed???)
- Insufficient participation, influence and involvement of employers by design and approval of programmes
- Insufficient outgoing students and staff mobility
- Alumni networks still in emerging phase

- Not only formal
- Critical external quality assurance
- Lack of performance-driven compensation of faculty and staff
- Insufficient participation, influence and involvement of employers by design and approval of programmes
- Insufficient outgoing students and staff mobility
- Alumni networks still in emerging phase
- Unfair and formally meet the criteria

- Developing better KPI for HDIs performance measuring?
- The universities could be a lot more efficient and active by quality improvement (not only formal)
- Faculty resistance
- Hire marginally qualified academic staff
- Enrollment marginally qualified students
- Faculty members overloaded
- Reduce number of programs (new official register needed???)
- Lack of Funding (public HEIs)
- Students dropping out of the Universities
- Decreasing demand (demographically reasons, study abroad)
- Low barriers/requirements for Enrollment

- Not only formal
- Critical external quality assurance
- Lack of performance-driven compensation of faculty and staff
- Insufficient participation, influence and involvement of employers by design and approval of programmes
- Insufficient outgoing students and staff mobility
- Alumni networks still in emerging phase
- Unfair and formally meet the criteria

- Developing better KPI for HDIs performance measuring?
- The universities could be a lot more efficient and active by quality improvement (not only formal)
- Faculty resistance
- Hire marginally qualified academic staff
- Enrollment marginally qualified students
- Faculty members overloaded
- Reduce number of programs (new official register needed???)
- Lack of Funding (public HEIs)
- Students dropping out of the Universities
- Decreasing demand (demographically reasons, study abroad)
- Low barriers/requirements for Enrollment

- Not only formal
- Critical external quality assurance
- Lack of performance-driven compensation of faculty and staff
- Insufficient participation, influence and involvement of employers by design and approval of programmes
- Insufficient outgoing students and staff mobility
- Alumni networks still in emerging phase
- Unfair and formally meet the criteria

- Developing better KPI for HDIs performance measuring?
- The universities could be a lot more efficient and active by quality improvement (not only formal)
- Faculty resistance
- Hire marginally qualified academic staff
- Enrollment marginally qualified students
- Faculty members overloaded
- Reduce number of programs (new official register needed???)
- Lack of Funding (public HEIs)
- Students dropping out of the Universities
- Decreasing demand (demographically reasons, study abroad)
- Low barriers/requirements for Enrollment

- Not only formal
- Critical external quality assurance
- Lack of performance-driven compensation of faculty and staff
- Insufficient participation, influence and involvement of employers by design and approval of programmes
- Insufficient outgoing students and staff mobility
- Alumni networks still in emerging phase
- Unfair and formally meet the criteria
Establishment NEAA (BG)
Membership in NQUA
Full membership reconfirmed 2015
NEXT STEPS?
Internationalization ...
Benchmarking

1996 2008 2015 2020 2030
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SQAA PRESENTATION OF IQA ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Author:
Jernej Sirok, SQAA
Legal framework

- QA standards are defined by law and SQAA regulations
- SQAA criteria for accreditation specifically cover also IQA (requirement for an effective IQA with a closed quality loop)
- If a standard is not defined by law and accreditation is revoked, the HEI may appeal and win in legal dispute
- Legal consequences of SQAA decisions: granting or not-granting accreditation for 7 years or less (= basic right and obligation of a HEI > precondition for state approval)
- Assessment methods are partially defined by law and regulations, and supplemented by the Manual for Experts and Protocol for Site Visits
- Standards that lack legal grounds: None do directly, but some do partially because of soft/open definitions: human resources, scientific & research work, learning outcomes
- Problems in upholding SQAA decisions: Yes, almost in any legal dispute
Procedural framework – Part 1

- **Evidence in initial accreditations (IA):** plans (HR, finances), strategies, letters of intent, agreements, curricula, syllabuses, outline of IQA system
- **Evidence in re-accreditations (R-A):** testimonies of stakeholders, SEPs, reports on the realization of action plans, survey results, internal regulations
- **Nature of SQAA QA procedures:** Combination of peer review and inspection
- **Selecting experts:** pool of trained experts, depending on the procedure
- **Compulsory site visits:** in all R-A, institutional IA, optionally in programme IA if there are special spatial requirements for study programmes
- **If site visits are not enough:** SQAA council can decide on calls for supplementations, oral hearings

Procedural framework – Part 2

- **How hard must the evidence be?:** no referencing to previous procedures, all facts must be found and linked to standards, otherwise an appeal will succeed
- **HEIs can respond to all evidence:** (reviewer reports, additional expert opinions, council opinions)
- **HEIs can appeal to SQAA decisions**
- **The majority of HEIs appeal** when SQAA decisions are negative
- **Appeal success:** at least 90 % (an estimation)
- **Main grounds for appeals:** inappropriate interpretation of the state of affairs, incomplete findings, inappropriate use of legislation, procedural mistakes, arbitrary decisions
- **SQAA external evaluations include identification of good and bad practice**
Methods of Assessment and their Applicability – Part 1

- **Assessment methods are layered**: checking compliance with minimum standards, assessing quality above the minimum, identifying strengths and recommendations for improvement
- **Reviewers do not propose complete solutions** but just approaches to possible improvements
- **SQAA reviewers do not grade compliance** with standards
- **Do reviewers propose final decisions?** Sometimes, but final decision is made exclusively by the SQAA council
- **Reviewer steps for collecting evidence**: they receive the application with enclosures, they may ask for any additional information, they conduct interviews
- **Relevant interviewees**: management, teachers, students, graduates, employers, support staff …

Methods of Assessment and their Applicability – Part 2

- **Interviewing**: Questions may be pre-planned but not known in advance to interviewees, free discussion, cross examination …
- **Analytic methodology of reviewers**: deciding on relevance, analysing, interpreting, comparing, evaluating, counselling
- **How does SQAA assure comparability of external assessments**: through training of experts and by publishing reports
- **Do the methods of quality assessment assure transfer of incentives and enhancement of quality?** It could be better, but this does not depend so much on methodology as it does on stakeholders
- **Does SQAA manage to assure compliance with standards for all HEIs?** Mostly yes, but some HEIs may win legal battles without proving quality
- **Methods theoretically enable to establish the actual state of affairs** but it eventually comes down to diligence of reviewers
Quality Indicators for IQA – Part 1

- **Assessing IQA policies:** SQAA according to regulations checks for transparency, implementation of policy, but not for its improvement and realism
- **Background of IQA policies:** We do not mind that systematically. Some individual council members protect the academia, others protect students
- **Assessing quality culture:** Yes, we have a specific article in our accreditation criteria for this purpose
- **Assessing HEI regulations on IQA:** Yes.
- **Assessing the inclusion of stakeholders:** Yes, for their structure, passing opinions, participating in management activities and proposing improvements

Quality Indicators for IQA – Part 2

- **Assessing IQA results:** Yes, based on HEI reports
- **Assessing mechanisms for approval and periodic review of study programmes:** Yes – transparency, efficiency, participation of stakeholders
- **Topics that IQA should cover:** Yes, SQAA checks whether IQA covers all areas of assessment and closes the quality loop for all of them
- **Quality loop:** Yes, accreditation criteria require this from us
- **Considering other QA mechanisms (ISO, EFQM):** No, we do not consider these mechanisms nor their results
Follow-up and System-wide analyses (SQA)

- **Does SQAA apply follow-up?** No, SQAA has no formal procedures and no legal basis for follow-up. Informally, we ask HEIs to draft action plans.
- SQAA has the possibility of extraordinary evaluations if serious deviation from quality standards reported by stakeholders.
- SQAA has so far made 3 meta-analyses covering: HEIs, their IQA, study programmes, as well as higher vocational colleges.
- SQAA is lacking clear methodology for system-wide analyses in its quality manual.
- **Sources used for meta-analyses:** reviewer reports, SQAA decisions.
- **Dissemination of SWA results:** publication on the website.
- **Inclusion of SWA results in reviewer reports:** No.

Conclusion – good and poor practices

- **Good practice:**
  - Good support and training for reviewers (manual, rigorous training, annual meetings)
  - Quality standards for students with special needs
  - Carefully minding the counselling role of external reviews

- **Poor practice:**
  - Poor quality standards for assessing scientific research and HR
  - Hardly any SQAA council decisions withstand legal disputes
  - Lack of reference to findings of SWA and lack of benchmarking in EQA
  - No formalized follow-up procedures yet, but we are on our way.
Thanky You!

mag. Jernej Širok
jernej.sirok@nakvis.si
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A3ES CONTRIBUTION TO REFERENCE FRAMEWORK FOR COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF AGENCIES’ IQA ASSESSMENT

Author:
Madalena Fonseca, A3ES
A3ES – Portugal

Contribution to
Reference framework for comparative analysis of Agencies' IQA assessment methodologies

(EIQAS Project WG3)

(Based on the template for presentations)

Warshaw – PKA, 29th June 2015

Legal framework:

Are quality standards/criteria defined by law, by agency's regulation (executive act) or non-binding guidelines or all together?

- The Portuguese Agency is a private foundation with legal autonomy. All decisions are public and refer to the guidelines and criteria of the Agency. Those guidelines and criteria are aligned with the law but the law does not go so deep in the details of defining a standard. On the other hand the Agency must be aligned with the European regulations and being a member of ENQA must take into account the implementation of ESG by the HEIs and by the Agency itself.

- It is the Agency that defines external quality assessment methods for reviewers, taking into account the general rules defined by law.
Comparing with NAKVIS

- More flexible legal framework
- 1 example (next slide)

CRITERIA FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF STUDY PROGRAMMES – QUALIFICATION OF TEACHING STAFF –

Table 1 – Minimum percentages (composition) for the academic staff (university education)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic staff</th>
<th>1st Cycle</th>
<th>Integrated Master</th>
<th>2nd Cycle</th>
<th>3rd Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full time staff – “own teaching staff” (ECDU)</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full time PhDs (GADES and A3ES-3rd Cycle)</strong></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PhDs FTE (GADES – article 57, &amp; 2, e A3ES-3rd Cycle)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All percentages are calculated in relation to the whole academic staff and all values are considered in FTE.
Procedural framework:
What evidence primarily counts for initial accreditation procedures (plans, strategies, organization of HEI, curricula and syllabuses, existing material, HR and financial conditions)?

The Frame of Reference for internal quality assurance systems in Portuguese higher education institutions includes 10 References or standards (ESG +3):

Reference 1 – Definition of a quality policy and objectives
Reference 2 – Definition and quality assurance of educational offer
Reference 3 – Quality assurance of learning and of student support
Reference 4 – Research and development
Reference 5 – External relations
Reference 6 – Human resources
Reference 7 – Material resources and services
Reference 8 – Information systems
Reference 9 – Public Information
Reference 10 – Internationalisation

Methods of assessment and their applicability:

Are methods of assessment layered (are reviewers supposed only to check compliance with minimum standards or must they also evaluate aspects of quality exceeding the minimum threshold; must they propose recommendations for improvement, establish good and bad practices, engage in benchmarking, etc.)?

Do quality assessments include grades (no grades / simple binary grade in terms of compliant or non-compliant / multiple grades)?

a 4 level scale:

1 – Insufficient development;
2 – Partial development;
3 – Substantial development;
4 – Very advanced.
**ASIGQ areas of analysis**

1. The institutional policy for quality (objectives, functions, actors and levels of responsibility within the internal quality assurance system) and how it is documented.
2. The scope and effectiveness of the procedures and structures for quality assurance related to each of the core aspects of the institutional mission:
   2.1 teaching and learning;
   2.2 research and development (targeted research and high level professional development in the case of polytechnic institutions);
   2.3 interaction with society;
   2.4 policies for staff management;
   2.5 support services;
   2.6 internationalisation.
3. The relationship between the quality assurance system and the governance and management bodies of the institution.
4. The participation of internal and external stakeholders in the quality assurance processes.
5. The information system (mechanisms for the collection, analysis and internal dissemination of information; scope and relevance of gathered information).
6. The publication of information relevant to external stakeholders.
7. The monitoring, evaluation and continuous improvement of the internal quality assurance system.
8. The internal quality assurance system, taken as a whole

---

**Quality indicators for IQA:**

*Do you assess accountability related policies (transparency, realism of plans and policies, their implementation, evaluation and improvement)?*

*YES*

*Do you consider the background of accountability policies (do they apart from assuring quality focus on: protecting academia, students, economy of the HEI, its internationalization or its output – learning outcomes, competencies, employability, scientific achievements)?*
Follow-up and system-wide analyses:

*Do you apply any kind of follow-up – what kind (a sort of external evaluation, assessing HEI reports)?*

---

**Conclusion:**

*Can you state some good practices in quality assessment for your agency?*

- In what concerns IQAS accreditation, the model developed by the Portuguese agency is very innovative in that it includes 3 extra standards beyond ESG.
  - research and development
  - internationalisation
  - relations with external stakeholders
- Research and development department of the Agency
- Transparency and consistency
  - Independence
  - Public Information
  - Bilinguism
- Training
Conclusion:

Can you state some bad practices or obstacles for quality assessment for your agency?

“Limitations” better than bad practices: there is room for improvement in what concerns the link between programme and IQAS quality assurance.
PART VII

PRESENTATION ON EUROPEAN STANDARD AND GUIDELINES / ESG PART 1
INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE – INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS’ VIEW (TEACHING STAFF)
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ESG AND IQA FROM PORTUGUESE ACADEMICS’

Author:
Maria Joáo Rosa, University of Porto/ A3ES
Warsaw, 29\textsuperscript{th} June 2015

ESG and IQA
from Portuguese Academics’ Perspective

Maria João Rosa

EIQAS – Enhancing Internal Quality Assurance Systems
Erasmus Plus Project
Training Event 1

Topics to Cover

• Context
  ✓ The rise and development of IQA
  ✓ Academics and QA: resistance and support

• The A3ES standards for IQAS implementation

• Portuguese academics perceptions on the A3ES standards
  ✓ Their importance and degree of implementation
  ✓ Are perceptions different for different academics’ groups?

• Concluding remarks
• Concerns with quality in HEIs have always existed (internal vision – improvement)
• Until the 80s this intrinsic dimension was dominant.
• 80s: the emergence of an extrinsic dimension as a new form of public concern.
• Change of approach due to the emergence of some new issues:
  - HE massification
  - change in the relationship between governments and HEIs
  - increasing role of the market
  - lost of trust in HEIs

• Movement from QA with the main goal of improving quality to QA with the main goal of external accountability

• In the last three decades Europe has been paying more attention to the extrinsic quality of HE, developing quality models and systems that allow HEIs to demonstrate to society their relevance
• More recently... developments towards the idea that HEIs should be responsible for assuring their own quality – *Quality Enhancement*, with an emphasis on IQAS

• **ESG** development as a reference model providing guidance and assistance to HEIs in their efforts to **implement IQAS** and to **agencies** in their **external quality evaluations** (Prikulis, Rauhvargers, & Rusakova, 2011).

• The ESG establish the **areas that should be covered** by institutional QA arrangements, specifically in teaching and learning, but **do not define how these arrangements should be implemented** (Loukkola & Zhang, 2010: 40).

• Existing research has found **no evidence of an effective implementation of the ESG** in HEIs

---

Still a relatively **underdeveloped subject** in the research devoted to QA

**Different degrees** of acceptance/resistance, support and adaptation to the QA idea, policies and implementation procedures

**Translating** (Newton 2002):

• ‘intransigency’ (involvement in a minimum degree)
• ‘colonisation’ (involvement as a routine)
• ‘conversion’ (conversion rather than mere compliance)
• ‘rational’ adaptation (engagement while trying to gain from it)
• ‘pragmatic’ scepticism (scepticism but adaptation)
• ‘sinking’ (confusion but resignation)
• ‘coping’ (dealing well with it although there is a sense of burden)
• ‘reconstructing’ (assumption of an active role)
Assessment as an **imposition** and **prescription, clashing** with the values characterising **academic culture** (academic freedom, self and collegial accountability and self-improvement)

**Concerns regarding QA implementation**
- bureaucratic, time consuming, administrative and cost burden
- not aligned with the ‘academic endeavour’ and diverting attention from teaching and research
- academics ‘distance’: less positive idea of its purposes

**Perceived impact** on the HE system
- unintended consequences upon personal and organisational behaviour
- stimulus to inspection, regulation and standardisation
- mainly related to monitoring and control and less to enhancement, transformation or even excellence

**Grasping the ‘academic world’** through the **language and ideology of managerialism** and its business ethos
- new orthodoxy (business values, accomplishment of aims and goals)
- altering the traditional relations between academics (‘managers’ and ‘managed’)
- instrumental and ritual strategies: ‘system running’ rather than truly engagement

**Dissatisfaction** with assessment **procedures and results**
- not entirely reliable and incapable of grasping the ‘essence’ of the educational process
- not inducing improvements in academics working environment
- results not entirely truthful and artificially influencing organic units or HEIs performance (elitist bias within the HE system?)
**Higher adhesion** when assessment processes and procedures are more directed at **institutions as a whole**

**Agreement** with **accreditation** - an opportunity for HEIs to **reflect** on their mission and purpose, as well as to ‘join an elite club’

QA contributing to **increase** decision making processes **transparency**, developing **teaching** and benefiting **students**

---

**The A3ES Standards for Portuguese HEIs**

**European Developments**
- **Bologna Process** and the consequent development of the **ESG** for QA in the European area of HE

**In Portugal**
- **A3ES Standards** for the certification of HEIs internal QA systems

**In Portuguese HEIs**
- **IQAS development**
  - more or less systematics
  - more or less broad in terms of scope
  - degrees of consolidation significantly different
  - the goal is to assure the quality of their processes, namely teaching & learning
The A3ES Standards = ESG Part 1 + 3 Additional Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Definition of a quality policy and objectives (ESG 1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Definition and quality assurance of educational offer (ESG 1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Quality assurance of learning and student support (ESG 1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Research and development/target research and high level professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>External relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Human resources (ESG 1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>Material resources and services (ESG 1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>Information systems (ESG 1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>Public information (ESG 1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Internationalisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Importance and Degree of Implementation of A3ES standards for Portuguese HEIs

Understanding the importance of the A3ES standards as a framework for IQAS implementation in HEIs

Assessing the degree of implementation of A3ES standards in Portuguese HEIs

Are different academics’ characteristics relevant for these analysis (e.g. disciplinary affiliation, sex, age, type of institution, with or without management functions and degree of involvement in QA activities)?
The Importance and Degree of Implementation of A3ES standards for Portuguese HEIs

Empirical data collected with an online questionnaire – academics’ perceptions on the importance and degree of implementation of A3ES standards

Set of sentences for which a degree of agreement was asked from respondents, in a scale from 1-Totally Disagree to 7-Totally Agree. Three groups:

- Awareness of the ESG and A3ES standards
- Importance of the A3ES standards for IQAS implementation
- Degree of implementation of the A3ES standards in the respondent institution

Final sample of 2099 academics, representative of the population in terms of sex, type of HEI and scientific area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of academics</th>
<th>% of academics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public university</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public polytechnic</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private university</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private polytechnic</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and technology</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and health sciences</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;46</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=46</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance of management roles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement in QM activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low involvement</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium involvement</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Importance and Degree of Implementation of A3ES standards for Portuguese HEIs

**Portuguese Academics**

Awareness about the ESG and A3ES standards is not very high (medians of 4 and 5, respectively)

A3ES standards are considered as important or very important (medians of 6 and 7), which represents a favourable environment to the implementation of IQAS in HEIs – more important than the explicit knowledge about the standards is their implicit acceptance

The degree of implementation of the A3ES standards, despite being lower than the importance given to them, is nevertheless quite significant (medians around 6)

---

**Portuguese Academics**

QA practices less implemented in HEIs are related to issues such as (medians of 4 and 5):
- QA of human resources
- listening and taking into account external stakeholders perspectives
- adequate policies for the QA of research and development
- development of an information system sufficiently broad and capable of driving a truly institutional self-assessment

The subsystem to which academics belong, their age, sex, scientific affiliation, the fact of performing or not a management role, as well as their degree of involvement in quality management activities are relevant both for the importance they give to the different standards and for the standards degree of implementation they consider to exist in their institutions
Sex determines differences between responses on the awareness, importance and degree of implementation of A3ES standards – female academics tend to show a higher agreement position

- Quality connected with caring?
- Appropriation of quality as a way to enhance their rights and power?
- The idea of QA as a process promoting fairer, more equitable institutions?

Differences emerge between academics belonging to different types of institutions – more positive positions are assumed by academics from private institutions (especially polytechnics)

- A way to achieve recognition, credibility and reputation? (which public universities already have...)

Disciplinary affiliation also determines differences in academics perceptions – in the majority of cases academics from Medical and Health Sciences are those presenting a higher agreement level

- The discipline, rather than the institution, may indeed be the dominant force in the working lives of academics (Clark, 1983)

More awareness, importance and degree of implementation were found in the answers of academics with a management role and that consider themselves as being highly involved in QM activities

- Experience in management, namely in QM seems to matter, contributing to more optimistic views of it
Regarding age, while younger academics tend to agree more with the standards implementation in their institutions, in the case of the awareness about the standards and their importance, older academics are the ones presenting a more positive opinion.

These differences point to some work that needs to be done with different groups of academics in order to involve them more in quality management activities, because those more involved are also the ones that better know the standards, give them more importance and have a higher perception of their implementation.

Concluding Remarks

- Increasing number of national QA systems based on accreditation
- Move to ranking systems
- Move towards Quality Enhancement as a way to reinstate trust in HEIs
- IQAS implementation in HEIs
- The available literature indicates academics’ preferences towards Quality Enhancement...
- Our results show that Portuguese academics positively “welcomed” the A3ES standards. In general they think:
  o the standards are important for both HE and their institutions;
  o and believe they are implemented to a certain extent in their institutions
- Nevertheless there are gaps between what academics perceive as important for QA and what is actually being implemented in their institutions

Academics’ support is essential for QA systems adequate implementation...

So... governments, QA agencies and HEIs need to think about:
• How to get academics support?
• How to go from academics as mere “passive recipients” of QA to academics as engaged and effective participants in QA?
• Which standards need more effort in order to improve their degree of implementation?
• Is it necessary to work more closely with specific groups of academics?
Thank You!
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Training Event 1

The European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) are considered the most important milestone in the recent development of quality assurance systems. Launched in 2005, they cover internal and external quality assurance and quality assurance 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. However, after so many years they still remain an issue for quality assurance providers and higher education institutions.

Training Event 1 (Seminar on IQA and ESG), led by representatives of European networks, quality assurance agencies and higher education institutions, drew on the expertise and experiences of represented organizations to provide participants with a rich theoretical and practical training in some of the key aspects of ESG and IQA, illustrated by case studies and lessons learned. The training provided participants with detailed knowledge on ESG. Besides training provided opportunity to improve capacity in the design and development of internal quality assurance systems by sharing good practices and views.

Training Event 1 comprised several key sessions, it included an introductory session to ESG Part 1; overview session of EIQAS project’s survey findings on ESG&IQA; discussion workshops on the interpretation of ESG Part 1 standards 1.1-1.10; presentation on the methodology for the identification of good practice example in IQA followed by presentations on IQA systems and good practice examples; session on the reference framework for comparative analysis of agencies IQA assessment methodologies followed by agencies presentations on IQA assessment methodologies.

PRESENTATIONS ON EUROPEAN STANDARD AND GUIDELINES / ESG PART 1 INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE – presentations was given by way of introduction to workshops on IQA and Part 1 of the ESG at Training Event 1. The session was led by Tove Blytt Holmen (ENQA) and Blazhe Todorovski (ESU) representatives of leading European association of quality assurance agencies and students. Presentations discussed in greater detail each standard of Part 1 ESG. Through guidelines and discussion, it helped improve understanding of ESG dimensions and the very considerable gains that locally designed IQA systems can bring as a whole. On the other hand it brought stakeholders perspective on understanding of ESG and underlined the most important values such as setting the common framework for quality assurance systems for learning and teaching at European, national and institutional level; enabling the assurance and improvement of higher education in the European Higher Education Area; providing transparent information on the quality; supporting mutual trust thus facilitating recognition and mobility within and across national borders.

PRESENTATIONS ON SURVEY FINDINGS ON ESG&IQA AMONG HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS – the introductory part to ESG was followed by presentations on the results of the survey findings on ESG and IQA that was held at the beginning of 2015 and reflected the stage of development of national/ institutional arrangements for IQA and on IQA systems in the context of Part
1 of the ESG for each country represented in the project’s partnership (Bulgaria, Poland, Portugal and Slovenia). As concerns the revised ESG 2015, the results of the EIQAS survey on ESG Part 1 showed that further clarifications of individual standards and their popularisation is highly needed, as the majority of respondents still identify internal and external obstacles in applying revised ESG. That session helped to lay the foundation for an informative, accessible resource that could greatly strengthen the capacity of European, national and institutional providers to apply ESG and international good practices to their own systems. Besides the session strengthen the awareness of shortcomings and further challenges in micro- and macro quality assurance systems.

WORKSHOPS ON THE INTERPRETATION OF ESG PART 1 IQA STANDARDS 1.1 -1.10. – the Training Event 1 included several workshops encouraging people to engage in discussion and share their views on Part 1 ESG. Each workshop gathered 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. Each round of each workshop had a rapporteur, selected among the participants belonging to the partners of the project. One of the main goals of the workshops was to develop the capacity of intercultural understanding of ESG Part 1 and enhance the ability of participants to use standards in practice. The other goal was 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. Besides going through the ESG standards 1.1-1.10, one by one, the perceptions gathered on the intercultural workshops of the training events of the project were analyzed 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 workshops:

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?

The results of workshops were presented during the plenary session and put under the discussion. It showed that there are needs and expectations towards further clarification of ESG. On the other hand, there are a lot of examples of good practice related to a given standards that need to be shared.

PRESENTATION ON THE METHODOLOGY FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF IQA GOOD PRACTICE FOLLOWED BY PRESENTATIONS ON IQA SYSTEMS AND GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES – the session aimed to the introduce the methodology for the identification of good practice in IQA that was developed in the course of EIQAS project. It was based on a definition of good practice adopted or developed after an analysis of available definitions collected by the EIQAS project’s partnership. It was defined as a set of criteria for good practice covering, among other things, required characteristics (e.g. standard compliant, innovative, repeatable, sustainable, etc.) on the one hand and benefits identified and proven value on the other hand. The methodology was put under thorough discussion and received a positive feedback from the participants/representatives of stakeholders. It was followed by the presentations on IQA good practice that were delivered by the representatives of higher education institutions from four project’s countries. Each speaker encouraged audience to discuss the lesson learned and confront it with personal experience from internal quality assurance management. To sum up the session provided participants with the knowledge and opportunity to hone capacity in the design and development of internal quality assurance systems that align to ESG Part 1. Besides it
provided the necessary tool to measure and identify good practice in internal quality assurance by using objective indicators.

PRESENTATION ON THE REFERENCE FRAMEWORK FOR COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF AGENCIES’ IQA ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES FOLLOWED BY AGENCIES’ PRESENTATIONS ON IQA ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES – the idea of reference framework was to define an approach to comparative analysis of methodologies that the participating agencies use in assessing IQA systems at their higher education institutions. Methodology in this framework was regarded as a set of methods applied in processes of external assessment of higher education institutions’ internal quality assurance systems. The framework provided a basis for an in-depth discussion of the agencies’ methodologies at Training Event 1, with conclusions that would be presented in a comparative report. Each of the four participating agencies made a more detailed presentation of their methodology for assessing IQA systems at HEIs during Training Event 1. To ensure their consistent format, presentations were based on the reference framework developed in advance (legal framework, procedural framework, methods of assessment and their applicability, quality indicators for IQA, follow-up and system-wide analysis; good practice identification). The session showed that external quality assurance is very context specific and might have been influenced strongly by national solutions (legal framework, culture, etc.), however, as yet ESG have given a solid framework and many similarities among agencies activities might have been identified. Besides many examples of good practices and challenges were brought up by participants. While some agencies may have considered these practices good, others perhaps couldn’t have even imagined incorporating them or applying only their positive aspects in their system of conduct and regulations because of systemic differences and strong national context influence.

PRESENTATION ON EUROPEAN STANDARD AND GUIDELINES / ESG PART 1 INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE – INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS’ VIEW (TEACHING STAFF) – the aim of this session was to present the results of the research on views of internal stakeholders (teaching staff) on the ESG Part 1. The EIQAS survey showed that resistance and reluctance of academic staff towards quality assurance systems is a key internal obstacle for quality assurance managers in higher education institutions. Presentation delivered by Maria Joao Rosa responded to that issue directly. According to the research made in Portugal on the issue “academics’ support is essential for QA systems adequate implementation. So …governments, QA agencies and higher education institutions should think about how to get academic support? How to engage academics as active participants of quality assurance processes? Which standards need more effort in order to improve their degree of implementation?”.

To conclude Training Event 1, designed around ESG Part 1 and IQA related issues, provided participants with thorough understanding of standards and how they can be applied in order to design or enhance internal quality assurance systems. Besides by involving a broad range of experts and drawing on various international perspectives, offered an extensive 5-day interactive training on how to understand and apply ESG Part 1 to international/national/local contexts and how to use EIQAS project’s results in order to enhance quality assurance processes. In addition, it provided examples of good practices from selected higher education institution and quality assurance agencies from four countries and demonstrated how lessons learned could be transferred effectively. At the same time, by improving knowledge on the complexity of challenges and their local dimensions, enhanced the capacity of participants to tailor their systems accordingly to strengthen their effectiveness. Finally, ideas and suggestions collected during Training Event 1 provided the most significant input to the Guide to IQA promoting the ESG.
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