



Lifelong Learning Programme

## The 3<sup>rd</sup> European Quality Assurance Forum

20-22 November 2008

hosted by Corvinus University of Budapest

with support from the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Commission

### List of papers

05.11.2008

*All the paper sessions are 45 min. and take place during the Working Group Sessions I and III.*

#### **Working Group Session Ia: Paper abstracts - Friday 21 November, 11.15 – 12.00**

##### **Ia.1 Concept of Complex Quality Management in the Higher Education Institution Strategy**

By: Jozsef Temesi and Andras Gabor, Corvinus University of Budapest (Hungary)

Room: 102 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Henrik Toft Jensen, Chair, Forum Steering Committee

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to describe a possible approach to the institutional task of developing an internal quality assurance system. Complex quality management can contribute to the development and maintenance of the organizational strategies at universities. Organizational strategies refer to the administrative systems, institutional policies and systems that make the integration of international, intercultural, and global dimensions of the primary functions of a university (teaching, research, and community services) possible.

The proposed solution is based on a set of innovation. The innovative technologies cover identity management and the related applications: e-learning, blended learning, mobile learning, adaptive testing, and advanced learning environment. Furthermore innovation goes beyond the traditional learning/teaching relations: technological challenges of a less bureaucratic administration, closed information flow (workflow), management information systems, executive information systems, strategy monitoring are also addressed.

##### **Ia.2 Review on the Quality of Teaching in Higher Education**

By: Fabrice Hénard, OECD

Room: 103 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Lee Harvey, Forum Steering Committee

Abstract: This paper reflects the early findings of a review been carried out by the OECD programme Institutional Management for Higher Education (IMHE), on the quality of teaching in higher education. That review aims at understanding why and how the institutions support,

implement and reward the quality of teaching. The paper focuses on the emergence of the institutional support to the quality of teaching, on the influence of QA on the quality of teaching, and on the evaluation of the quality of teaching by the institutions themselves. A conclusive part points out the importance of the institutional involvement to improve the quality of teaching.

Over 2008, IMHE worked with a group of 28 higher education institutions, which provided vignettes of their practices in the field of quality teaching.

Many institutions are in some way hesitant to support the quality of teaching because it might alter academic freedom. However, they now strongly believe that teaching can no longer be neglected at institutional level and be left to individuals; new challenges brought about an institutional interest in to quality of teaching. Institutions become keen on helping the academic community to improve the pedagogical skills and to gear teaching to the current requirements of a diverse audience of students and of the job-markets.

Institutions consider that QA national systems have had an impact on raising the consciousness of the quality teaching within the institution. However, some complain that QA can embrace the complexity of higher education of today (e.g. to appraise the quality of e-learning). Evaluation instruments to appraise the quality of pedagogy are indeed lacking. The evaluation of inputs prevails whereas the evaluation of learning outcomes remains utopia for many. But all institutions recognize the importance of defining what quality means for teachers prior to embarking institutional support.

### **Ia.3 The Actor's Lenses: On Understanding Prevailing Conditions for Introducing Quality Assurance Measures in an Institution**

By: Ingrid Maria Hanken, Norwegian Academy of Music (Norway)

Room: 104 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Martin Prchal, Chief Executive, AEC

Abstract: This paper discusses challenges that can confront higher education institutions when quality assurance measures such as student evaluation of teaching are introduced. It is based on a research study of how student evaluation of individual instrumental tuition is perceived, experienced and practiced by instrumental teachers and their students at a Norwegian music academy. The study takes institutional theory as its point of departure. This theory focuses on how norms, values, routines, and perceptions develop in an institution and result in a collective “logic of appropriateness”: taken-for-granted expectations as to how members of the institution “should” behave. The results indicate that there exists such a “logic of appropriateness” in the case institution, and that it represents several challenges to student evaluation of teaching. The results underline the importance of understanding the prevailing “logic of appropriateness” when introducing quality assurance measures such as student evaluation of teaching in higher education institutions.

### **Ia.4 Valuing the Student Voice. Evidence from the UK**

By: Ruth Williams, The Open University (United Kingdom)

Room: 105 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Bruno Carapinha, ESU, and Forum Steering Committee

Abstract: The role of students in institutional quality assurance and enhancement processes has a long tradition in UK higher education and elsewhere. In the UK students are invited to respond to institutional mechanisms for collecting their views about the learning experience, and to represent their peers on institutional education and quality governance committees. However, the increasing marketisation of higher education and continuing drives to greater public accountability have prompted renewed institutional efforts to ensure that student voices are listened to and acted upon. This paper draws on the findings of a study that is exploring institutions’ deliberate attempts to involve students in their internal quality assurance and enhancement processes, both formal and informal. While the study focuses on one particular country – England, the findings from this research are likely to be of interest to other countries in Europe and beyond that are grappling with similar issues.

### **Ia.5 How to Assess an E-Learning Institution: Methodology Design and Implementation**

By: Esther Huertas Hidalgo, Anna Prades Nebot and Sebastian Rodriguez, AQU Catalunya (Spain)

Room: 106 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Anne Mikkola, Vice-President, EQAR Executive Committee

Abstract: There are certain features in the assessment of distance learning in higher education that need to be particularly taken into account. A methodology adapted for an e-learning institution (Catalan Open University, UOC) was designed by the Catalan University Quality Assurance System (AQU Catalunya) with the institution's characteristics (student profile, teaching methodology, teaching staff, etc.) incorporated into the evaluation model. In addition to a distinction being made in the assessment methodology between institutional evaluation and programme evaluation, the specific aspects of e-learning also called for adaptations to be made to the evaluation process. Training for the external review panel and on-line access to the university's virtual campus were thus key aspects throughout the evaluation process. This paper also looks at the methodology's potentialities and limitations following two years of its use and the assessment of nine different degree programmes.

### **Ia.6 Towards Institutional Accreditation: The Swiss Experience in External Quality Assurance**

By: Rolf Heusser and Laura Beccari, OAQ (Switzerland)

Room: 107 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Bruno Curvale, President, ENQA, and Forum Steering Committee

Abstract: The Centre of Accreditation and Quality Assurance of the Swiss Universities (OAQ) was set up in 2001 with the task to ensure and promote the quality of teaching and research at Swiss universities. On behalf of the federal and cantonal authorities and in accordance with best international practices the OAQ carries out various quality assessments with autonomous responsibility for its operations.

The focus of the external quality assurance system in Switzerland is on institutional assessments. Periodic assessments of the internal quality assurance systems of the Swiss universities are mandatory and linked to the financing of the institutions. The OAQ has successfully carried out a first cycle of such audits in 2003-4 and has repeated it in 2007-8 on the basis of new national Directives for internal quality assurance (compatible with the European Standards and Guidelines in that domain). The institutional assessments are supplemented by selective and voluntary programme accreditations. A new Federal law regulating the whole Swiss higher education sector is under discussion and will enter into force in 2012. According to the new law – and based on the positive experience made with the two past audit-cycles, a new institutional accreditation model will be mandatory for all public higher education institutions in Switzerland.

### **Ia.7 Teaching Observation: Does it Develop Teaching? A Case Study from South East European University (SEEU)**

By: Heather Henshaw, Alajdin Abazi, Zamir Dika and Rufat Osmani, South Eastern European University (FYROM)

Room: 108 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Gerard Madill, Policy Adviser, Universities Scotland

Abstract: Governments, regional bodies and individual institutions, employers and students are now demanding a high quality student learning experience and in particular, an improvement in the

quality of learning and teaching, within the particular environment of higher education. This case study provides an active example of how a higher educational institution has created and implemented a teaching observation procedure based on critical reflection, individual support, institutional quality assurance and staff training and development, within a challenging, social, economic and political context. It has drawn on European and Bologna policies and guidelines as well as other national schemes in order to shape an effective system. It is intended to offer an individual model for discussion and generate wider debate about the correlation between layers of quality assurance, and about what methods actually create the conditions and environment for improvement.

### **Ia.8 Developing Internal QA Mechanisms - Towards an East African Quality Assurance Framework**

By: Stefan Bienefeld, HRK German Rectors' Conference (Germany)  
Mayunga H. H. Nkunya, Tanzania Commission for Universities (Tanzania)  
Christoph Hansert, DAAD (Germany)

Room: 109 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Emmi Helle, Secretary General, ENQA, and Forum Steering Committee

Abstract: The expansion of higher education in East Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda) while contributing to national, regional and global development goals has raised concerns over the issue of quality. To address this, the national regulatory agencies of Kenya (CHE, Tanzania (TCU) and Uganda (NCHE) in collaboration with the Inter-University Council for East Africa (IUCEA), the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), the German Rectors' Conference (HRK) and the University of Oldenburg have started a collaboration to develop and pilot an East African QA framework. To this end a handbook including a diagnostic model for internal QA and external assessment was prepared and piloted in 22 selected institutions in the region. Additionally, staff of those institutions was selected and underwent training as quality assurance officers. Preliminary results, successes and challenges are identified and discussed.

### **Ia.9 Enhancing Education Quality Assurance Using Data Mining. A Case Study of Arab International University systems**

By: Faek Diko, Arab International University (Syria)  
Mouhib Al-Noukari, Arab Academy for Banking and Financial Sciences (Syria)  
Zaidoun Al-Zoabi, Arab Academy for Banking and Financial Sciences (Syria)

Room: 325 – New Building, third floor

Chair: Natalia Paganelli, Director of Research and Evaluation, CRUI Foundation

Abstract: In this paper we introduce a comprehensive educational quality assurance system for a university. The system takes into consideration the three main pillars of the educational process: content, delivery, and assessment. We will demonstrate a comprehensive system that enables quality control and quality assurance using data mining combining data from Quality Assurance Automated System QAAS, the Academic System, HR System, and Financial System focusing on various performance indicators in the aforementioned three pillars. We will explain the system through a real-life case, where this system produced valuable information in a way that helped Arab International University (AIU)-Syria to make use of the vast data produced by its main four systems to uncover hidden trends, knowledge, and quality deficiencies making it easier to the decision maker to plan, assure and control quality.

## **Working Group Session Ib: Paper abstracts - Friday 21 November, 12.15 – 13.00**

### **Ib.1 Quality Management System – a Good Aid in Creating a New Joint Culture for Merging Universities**

By: Sirpa Suntioinen, University of Kuopio (Finland)  
Kirsi Karjalainen, University of Joensuu (Finland)

Room: 102 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Anton Pokrivcak, Vice-Rector, Constantine the Philosopher University

Abstract: The present study explores how a Quality Management System, a QMS, can be used as an aid in creating a joint quality culture for two Finnish universities currently undergoing a merger. Through the joint QMS, the new vision, mission, strategy, and the entire organizational culture are made concrete and visible for the staff and students. Regardless of the campus or faculty, it also gives them the important feeling of having equal opportunities to work and to participate in the development of the new university. The joint strategic indicators and annual management reviews offer good tools to monitor the fulfilment of the strategy and vision, and the merger process as a whole.

Our experiences show that creating a joint QMS with transparent process descriptions alongside with the merger process helps the staff and students to adopt the new organizational culture and the new joint practices.

### **Ib.2 Criteria Identification for Study Programme Quality Assessment and Ranking**

By: Dainis Dosbergs and Juris Borzovs, University of Latvia (Latvia)

Room: 103 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Ligia Deca, Chairperson, ESU

Abstract: The authors present different approaches for higher education institution (HEI) or HEI's study course quality evaluation as well as introduce a new solution for assessing and ranking study programs based on identification and evaluation of quality criteria.

The aim of this research is to define the set of criteria that can be used for study program quality evaluation and ranking. Later on these quality criteria are to be analysed by the group of experts. In the first section the authors review world's experience in creating rankings and also identify its strengths and weaknesses. In the second section the authors examine Latvian experience in creating rankings and quality evaluation activities using accreditation. In the third section the authors compare concepts of ranking and quality. In the final section the authors include criteria for ICT study program quality assessment that are presented to experts for detailed analysis as well as describe a method that can be used to identify quality extent of different ICT study programs.

### **Ib.3 Thematic Quality Review as a Supplement to Departmental Quality Reviews: A Case Study within the Irish University System**

By: Heinz Lechleiter, Dublin City University (Ireland)

Room: 104 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Wendy Davies, Professor Emeritus, UCL, and Consultant, UK HE Unit

Abstract: The Irish universities' quality assurance and improvement system is well established and successful since its introduction in the late 1990ies. It takes the form departmental reviews of both academic departments (Schools, Faculties and Research Centres) as well as administrative and

support units. The case study reports on the introduction of thematic reviews in Dublin City University with the intention of bridging the gaps that arise from a departmental approach to quality related matters. The theme of the first review of its kind in the Irish university sector was First year and Beginner Student Experience (to include transfer and international students). Characteristic features of thematic reviews, associated difficulties, and ways of coping with such difficulties are shown using the key areas of complexity, leadership, timing and originality of thematic reviews. A short summary of the results of the review and an overview of some of the main distinguishing features of thematic vs. departmental reviews conclude the case study.

#### **Ib.4 Training of Students as Experts for External Quality Assurance. The Swiss Experience**

By: Christian Schneijderberg, VVS-UNES-USU (Switzerland)  
Monika Risse, OAQ (Switzerland)

Room: 105 – New Building, first floor  
Chair: Martin Prchal, Chief Executive, AEC

Abstract: VSS-UNES-USU the National Union of Students of Switzerland and the Center of Accreditation and Quality Assurance of the Swiss Universities (OAQ) started with conceptualising, implementing and training of a pool of student experts for external quality assurance assessments in 2007.

Before the cooperation began several challenges had to be faced. One challenge was and still is the continuous organic growth of a culture of quality enhancement in the Swiss higher education system. The second challenge – due to the lack of tradition of student participation in Quality Assurance in the Swiss Higher Education System – was to set up a legal basis for the integration of students in external quality assurance. The Swiss experience may be of interest for all countries/QA agencies/student unions to see how such initiative can be realised. Also the role of students is of big importance when discussing about participation in internal and external quality assurance.

#### **Ib.5 E-xcellence+: European-wide Introduction of QA in E-Learning: A Benchmarking Approach**

By: George Ubachs, EADTU (Netherlands)

Room: 106 – New Building, first floor  
Chair: Anne Mikkola, Vice-President, EQAR Executive Committee

Abstract: Quality Assurance issues have become more important with the increased mobility of students, academic staff, as well as higher education providers resulting from the globalization of higher education. Quality assurance in e-learning is especially of interest as e-learning has become the main instrument for generating cross border higher education.

It is therefore of direct interest to ENQA and EADTU to define and determine the elements of quality in e-learning and develop strategies and processes of assessment and accreditation. ENQA and EADTU have therefore decided to start collaborating on the subject of quality assurance in e-learning and work towards models of e-learning quality assessment and accreditation across Europe. From 2008 on, EADTU and ENQA will further introduce and test the E-xcellence benchmarking instrument on quality assurance in e-learning throughout Europe. Approach and first results will be presented in the QA forum of Budapest.

#### **Ib.6 Four Years of Experience Using Quality Assurance Systems: Lessons Learned From Three Institutions**

By: Pål Bakken and Ove Edvard Hatlevik, NOKUT (Norway)

Room: 107 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Bruno Curvale, President, ENQA, and Forum Steering Committee

Abstract: A study was developed to explore the experiences with Quality Assurance Systems (QAS) in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). An important purpose of this study was to analyse and discuss how QAS is used by different groups at the HEIs; students, academic staff and administrative staff, as well as local and central management. Group interviews were carried out to collect lessons learned from using QAS and perceptions of the influence from QAS on management and the teaching-learning process. The interviews indicate that the use of QAS has contributed to changes in academic and administrative leadership, management and decision-making processes at HEIs. QAS is also related to the development of quantitative indicators of quality, to the use of external evaluations of study programme and has contributed to a more systematic approach to student evaluations. Students, staff and management have some joint recommendations about QAS. It seems important to develop a web-based system that is simple, easily accessible and usable for all relevant groups. The system has to be transparent with regard to the analysis, the decision-making processes and the measures made on the basis of information from the QAS.

### **Ib.7 Developments to Encourage Quality Enhancement: A Case Study**

By: Kath Hodgson, University of Leeds (United Kingdom)

Room: 108 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Gerd Koehler, Board Member, University of Frankfurt-am-Main

Abstract: How can an institution ensure that effective quality enhancement takes place in an environment where the rules and regulation of quality assurance are seen by many academic staff as discouraging such activity? The following provides a case study of the actions taken by one institution when trying to ensure that it provides an exceptional student experience whilst at the same time meeting appropriate quality requirements.

It is argued that whilst the restructuring of the central support teams to ensure co-ordinated support for academic staff and effective links between the outcomes of the quality assurance processes and developmental activity plays a part what really allows a significant step change to be taken is cultural change within an institution based on a clear shared vision.

### **Ib.8 The AUDIT programme: an Initiative to Promote Internal Quality Assurance Systems in Higher Education Institutions**

By: Eduardo Garcia and Jose Antonio Perez de la Calle, ANECA (Spain)

Caterina Cazalla and Miquel Vidal, AQU Catalunya (Spain)

Sebastian Rodrigue, ANECA and AQU Catalunya (Spain)

Julio Abalde, Paula Rios, Dolores Castro, ACSUG (Spain)

Room: 109 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Emmi Helle, Secretary General, ENQA, and Forum Steering Committee

Abstract: In accordance with the trust placed by society in the autonomous administration of the universities and the transparency called for within the framework of the EHEA, a number of higher education institutions in Spain are participating in the AUDIT programme, which involves the design, evaluation and future certification of their internal quality assurance systems (IQAS) to ensure the correct alignment of their activities and for goals associated with degree programmes to be achieved. To this end, there is a need for policies and processes that are formally laid down and publicly available.

The aim of the AUDIT programme, which is jointly promoted by the ANECA, AQU Catalunya, and ACSUG quality assurance agencies, is to guide and facilitate universities, in particular their institutes, faculties and colleges, in the process of defining these systems, and furthermore, to establish responsibility for external review processes and ensure that the goals of university quality are achieved.

## **Ib.9 QA Conclusions from Electronic Database and Parallel Evaluation of Doctoral Schools in Hungary**

By: György Bazsa, Hungarian Accreditation Committee (Hungary)

Room: 325 – New Building, third floor

Chair: Andy Gibbs, Director of International Development, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Care, Napier University

### Abstract:

Legal background:

- frame of doctoral training are the doctoral schools organised by disciplines (167 at present),
- conferring PhD degree is the right of university doctoral councils (25 at present).

Establishment of a nationally complete, open, bottom-up built electronic database [www.doktori.hu](http://www.doktori.hu) for public information and for quality and performance evaluation including

- personal, research and performance data of more than 6,000 teachers and
- detailed training, research and organisational information of 167 doctoral schools.

Evaluation of *eligibility* of 2,340 key scientist based on their

- university or research institute position,
- up to date scientific performance (publications, citations)
- preceding achievements in doctoral training.

Evaluation of compliance of 167 doctoral schools based on the requirements:

- minimum 7 *eligible* key scientists (tribesman) in the given discipline(s),
- a proper coherent training and research programme,
- quality assurance system and the homepage of the school.

A comprehensive pilot-evaluation took place in 2008; accreditation of all doctoral schools is scheduled for 2009. Details, results and conclusions of broader interest of the pilot-evaluation will be presented in details including demonstration of the database.

## **Working Group Session III: Paper abstracts – Saturday 22 November, 11.15 – 12.00**

### **III.1 Governance and Evaluation in the Italian University System: An Analysis of the Italian Experience**

By: Eliana Minelli and Gianfranco Rebori, University Carlo Cattaneo (Italy)  
Matteo Turri, University of Milan (Italy)

Room: 102 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Guido Langouche, Chairman of the Executive Board, The Coimbra Group

Abstract: Evaluation and quality assurance in higher education are closely linked to system governance. The paper proposes four possible patterns of university system governance, according to locus and focus of governance. This frame of reference takes into consideration the Italian university system over the past twenty years where great changes have taken place and evaluation has been introduced.

The paper pinpoints those characteristics that Italian university system governance has taken on over time which are in line with the external (locus), negotiation-based (focus) pattern. This model requires strong support by suitable evaluation systems geared to fully implement the ENQA guidelines.

### **III.2 Australia's Higher Education Quality Framework - Components and Current Challenges**

By: Mark Hay and Rudolf Lidl, AUQA (Australia)

Room: 103 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Ruth Williams, The Open University

Abstract: Australia's current approach to quality assurance in Higher Education (essentially universities and private providers of university-level programs) has evolved over the past ten years. The essential components are: the Australian Qualifications Framework, the National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes, State and Territory accreditation and registration, internal self-monitoring and review and external quality audits. In particular, this paper outlines both the contributions of the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA), and the challenges this body faces in contributing to the development of a quality assured system of Australian Higher Education.

### **III.3 Integrated Quality Management System at Tomsk Polytechnic University**

By: Alexandr Chuchalin and Alexandr Zamyatin, Tomsk Polytechnic University (Russia)

Room: 104 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Tia Loukkola, Senior Programme Manager, EUA

Abstract: For the time being, institutional quality management systems and systems for academic programme quality assurance are not appropriately integrated at the majority of Russian and European universities. As a result, the efficiency and effectiveness of institutional quality management systems are very much limited. The solution to the problem could be putting together all quality assurance tools applied by a university to a complex system aimed at achievement of a principal target – high quality of education and graduates' competitiveness on national and international labour markets by means of necessary competencies acquisition.

The suggested approach is being adapted at Tomsk Polytechnic University by means of the development of an integrated quality management system (QMS). The subsystems of the presented integrated QMS are a competency-based standard for academic programmes, evaluation

and accreditation criteria and procedures, HEI's processes management and strategic management of a university.

### **III.4 An Audit Process as a Tool for Quality Assurance and Enhancement at the University of Helsinki**

By: Aimo Virtanen and Helena Immonen, University of Helsinki (Finland)

Room: 105 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Lucien Bollaert, EURASHE, and Forum Steering Committee

Abstract: The University of Helsinki reorganised its quality assurance system between 2004 and 2007. The build-up process and some of the challenges are described in this paper.

The Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council (FINHEEC) will audit the quality assurance systems of all Finnish higher education institutions (HEIs) by the end of 2011. The quality assurance system of the University of Helsinki was audited in autumn 2007. The objective of FINHEEC audits is to ensure that HEIs have a quality assurance system that supports continuous improvement. Careful preparation for the audit process produced a positive result and the audit was certificated in February 2008.

### **III.5 Developing the Institutional Quality Management System: The Case of the Corvinus University of Budapest**

By: Ildiko Hrubos, Corvinus University of Budapest (Hungary)

Room: 106 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Ivan Ostrovsky, Former Vice-Rector, Comenius University in Bratislava

Abstract: From 2004 to 2007 period the Corvinus University of Budapest has developed and introduced a modern and consistent quality assurance system. The new model takes the concepts of the TQM and EFQM as its foundation. An essential part of the system is inquiry of the opinions of staff members, students, institutions and individuals with external relations, and regular feedback based on these results. In the 2007/2008 academic year the CUB participated in two external accreditation/evaluation programmes. The institutional accreditation by the Hungarian Accreditation Committee took place (conducted every 8 years), and in 2007 the CUB applied for an institutional evaluation by the European University Association. The aims, legal status and central points of the two evaluations are different from each other. The statements prepared through the two types of processes arrived to similar conclusions on several issues. The proposals complement each other and emphasise various viewpoints.

### **III.6 Future Directions for the Scottish Enhancement-led Approach to Quality**

By: Alan Davidson, Robert Gordon University (United Kingdom)

Room: 107 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Andreas Orphanides, Vice-President, ENQA, and Rector, European University Cyprus

Abstract: This paper considers the case of the national approach to quality in higher education (HE) in Scotland, at a time of transition between implementation cycles. The approach combines quality assurance and quality enhancement and is termed the 'Scottish Quality Enhancement Framework'. The first cycle extended from 2003 to 2007; there has been a year of review, reflection and development during 2007-2008, and the second cycle commences from the start of academic year 2008-09. The paper focuses on:

- evaluation and review of the first cycle, describing the approaches to review and the broad findings; and
- future directions and changes proposed for the second cycle; and

- key issues of work-in-progress, which will inform discussion at the conference workshop.

### **III.7 Selecting and Training Students for the External Review Panels: The Romanian Experience**

By: Traian Bruma and Violeta Caragea, University of Bucharest (Romania)

Room: 108 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Ligia Deca, Chairperson, ESU

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to share the first two years of the Romanian experience in selecting and training students for participating in external quality assurance review teams, lessons learned and questions left unanswered.

The first design of the selection and training process is presented including selection criteria and tools, training objectives and activities. The student participation in the external review panels in the pilot phase is described together with the evaluation of its impact that leads to the rethinking of the training and selection process. The 2008 improved training is also presented.

The paper wishes to continue the European conversation started at the First Quality Assurance Forum in 2006 on the practical aspects of involving students in external QA.

### **III.8 Quality Assurance on the Road. Finland and Austria in Comparison**

By: Andrea Bernhard, University of Graz (Austria)

Room: 109 – New Building, first floor

Chair: Helka Kekäläinen, Secretary General, FINHEEC

Abstract: The ongoing necessity of quality and quality assurance in the whole Bologna Process remains one of the main issues for European policy makers. The aim to create comparable systems to guarantee quality within higher education systems are the reasons for national developments and their eagerness to reform. The situation in two relatively small European countries, Austria and Finland, are in the centre of discussion and shall exemplify different ways to cope with international developments and the need to establish a comprehensive quality assurance system. How do these countries cope with the pressure to compete with the global higher education market? Is their system of quality assurance in line with the European mainstream to create a *European Higher Education Area*? The purpose of this paper is to give a broad view on the quality assurance systems of Finland and Austria and to deal with current issues in national policies.

### **III.9 Where are All the Students Gone? - Measuring the Output of Higher Education and Relating it to Student Feedback Measures**

By: Dennis Mocigemba and Johann Pixner, University of Freiburg (Germany)

Room: 201 – New Building, second floor

Chair: Wendy Davies, Professor Emeritus, UCL, and Consultant, UK HE Unit

Abstract: The University of Freiburg, Germany, has implemented a longitudinal data analysis procedure with the purpose of monitoring the retention and success rate of its students. The procedure is called the *Studienverlaufsanalyse* (SVA) and can be applied at different levels: university as a whole, schools, faculties, study fields, courses and majors. The SVA provides exact ratios of graduates, dropouts and still enrolled students. These rates can be regarded as basic output measures for higher education institutions and meet one of ENQA's standards for institutional information systems (ENQA, 2007). The SVA is based upon regular student administration data and constitutes an integral part of the University's data warehouse. This paper presents the concept and implementation as well as some applications of the SVA and discusses future advancements. An empirical example shows how the SVA can be integrated into the

University's system of Quality Assurance by relating dropout rates to student evaluations of academic satisfaction and teaching quality.

### **III.10 How to Implement a QA Model? A Concrete Example of a Policy for the Quality Work in the Educational Area at the University of Aarhus**

By: Steffen Skovfoged, University of Aarhus (Denmark)

Room: 202 – New Building, second floor

Chair: Anne Mikkola, Vice-President, EQAR Executive Committee

Abstract: This paper presents a new and reinforced policy in the making for the quality work (quality assurance and quality enhancement) in the educational area at the University of Aarhus, and touches briefly on the national, international and legislative context in which QA takes place. The main objective of the paper is to share and illustrate how a large and diversified university can actually implement and work with a quality assurance model in practise. A model that tries to take into accounts the many external demands and recommendations and at the same time pay attention to the internal voices of employees, students and other stakeholders.

### **III.11 Flexibility through Learning Outcomes: Implications for Quality**

By: Elpida Keravnou-Papailiou, KYSATS and University of Cyprus (Cyprus)

Room: 203 – New Building, second floor

Chair: Gerard Madill, Policy Adviser, Universities Scotland

Abstract: Flexibility in learning is an acknowledged necessity for a knowledge society. This flexibility has been developing in an incremental fashion (discrete cycles, credits, distance learning, learning outcomes). Full flexibility in learning means that horizontal and vertical traversals between different learning pathways (formal, non-formal, informal) are supported and recognized, and higher level qualifications can be obtained this way. It is widely believed that such a state of affairs can be clenched through the notion of learning outcomes. From this perspective, the viability of the proposition of full flexibility in learning depends critically on whether the same or at least comparable learning outcomes could be potentially achievable through vastly different learning pathways and whether the potential means for assessing such learning outcomes could credibly assure quality. This paper examines the viability of the proposition of full flexibility in learning with respect to quality, suggesting that there is an urgent need to agree on European standards and guidelines for quality assurance concerning the non-formal and informal learning pathways.

### **III.12 A Proposal for a Performance Indicator Model for the Spanish Higher Education System**

By: Anna Prades Nebot and Sebastian Rodriguez, AQU Catalunya

Room: 204 – New Building, second floor

Chair: Ailsa Crum, QAA Scotland

Abstract: This paper is the product of a study on drawing up a proposal for an indicator model of higher education for the Spanish university system. An analysis of existing indicator models was carried out for this, and a comparison made with the indicator system for the seven public universities in Catalonia that has been available since 2000. A second stage involved the study of the available performance indicators for Catalonia and how they have been affected by variables that are exogenous to the universities, the aim being to establish how to draw up the performance indicator reports. The first section of the paper gives a summary of the main conclusions of the documentary analysis; three indicators are used as examples in section two to show the interactions between performance indicators; and lastly, a proposal is made for an indicator model

for the HE system in Catalonia that is both feasible and more complete than the one currently used.

### **III.13 Intentional and Unintentional Consequences of Evaluation**

By: Henrik Toft Jensen, Roskilde University

Room: 205 – New Building, second floor

Chair: Liviu Matei, Academic Secretary, Central European University

Abstract: This paper analyses unintended consequences of evaluations, which must be avoided as much as possible. We argue that the EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme was created as a programme sensitive in relation to the university traditions and the national conditions of the universities in a country, therefore reducing the negative aspects of unintended consequences.

### **III.14 A Case Study between Hungarian and British institutions which Highlights Quality Issues Related to Recognition of Qualifications**

By: Andy Gibbs, Napier University (United Kingdom)

Laszlo Vizvari, National Institute of Primary Healthcare (Hungary)

Room: 206 – New Building, second floor

Chair: Eddie Gulc, Senior Adviser, Higher Education Academy UK

Abstract: This paper considers a co-operation between a UK University and a Hungarian national public institution. The partnership developed a study programme for nurses to study for a first cycle qualification and receive a UK degree. For many Hungarian qualified nurses it was not possible to study in this way in Hungary, or when possible it was for a greater length of time at higher cost than it would be in the UK. The paper considers European tools, directives and frameworks for mutual recognition of qualifications. It concludes that the separation of professional and academic qualifications create political divisions at national and EU level which undermine attempts to drive up quality in Higher Education and have other adverse effects on students and other EU citizens.

### **III.15 Perpetual Improvement of Quality in Higher Education Institutes**

By: Avner Halevy and Michel Daloya, University of Haifa (Israel)

Room: 207 – New Building, second floor

Chair: Antonio Ferrari, University of Aveiro

Abstract: Quality activities have become a normative practice in institutes of higher education (HEI's). However, these activities are motivated by different, sometimes contradictory, forces which might, if we are not vigilant and careful, tear the systems apart. We propose an outline for what we consider a competent and vigorous HEI quality system that may well serve as a role model for general quality management systems in industry.

### **III.16 Graz Quality Management Model for Universities. Theory and Practice: Four Years of Experience with Accountability**

By: Andreas Raggautz, University of Graz (Austria)

Gerard Gaberscik, Graz University of Technology (Austria)

Room: 208 – New Building, second floor

Chair: Oktem Vardar, Provost, Isik University

Abstract: Both previous experience in this field and the legal constraints placed on universities' work have made it clear that there is a need for a suitable quality management model for higher education institutions. The Graz Quality Management Model is one such way of using modern quality management expertise to meet the requirements of university life. Our experiences of implementing the system and also of its day-to-day functioning uncovered new aspects to this topic and led to the development of advanced tools for quality-related university management. Problems and challenges we encountered are also discussed, and there is a suggestion of which steps will best take the project forward. Our main goal here was to move from a "twentieth century" model of quality assurance towards state-of-the-art quality management which includes quality planning, quality control and quality improvement.

### **III.17 Au Audit Model in Croatia: A Study Based on a Pilot Project of three Higher Education Institutions**

By: Vesna Dodikovic-Jurkovic and Visnja Petrovic, AZVO (Croatia)

Room: 209 – New Building, second floor

Chair: Stephan Neetens, Bologna Expert, VVS

Abstract: By signing the Bologna Declaration in 2001 Croatia has started a process of serious transformation of its higher education system. Today, quality, quality assessment and enhancement of a quality culture are a major focus for the Croatian academic society, government and national economy. In the strategic document Education Sector Development Plan 2005-2010 set out by the Ministry of Science, Education and Sport (MSES), it was stated that:

- Quality assurance units in higher education system of the Republic of Croatia should be established by 2006.
- A binary system should be introduced by the beginning of the academic year 2010/2011.

The Agency for Science, Education and Sport (ASHE) developed a model of external audit of Quality Assurance Units in 2006/07 and tested it through a pilot project at the beginning of 2008. The pilot project was a part of the CARDS 2003 project «Furtherance of the Agency for Science and Higher Education in its Quality Assurance Role and Development of a Supporting Information System». The present study is based on the analysis of an audit model and outcomes of this Pilot project.