Work in Progress – Writing SER and Handbooks QA

Yerevan/The Hague, 11 April 2012

Meeting 12COM03
Visit 4 – NVAO, 21 – 23 March 2012
Report 12REP03
Report on visit and training, March 2012
Subproject 12SUB03
Training HEI on IQA, 22 March 2012 (day 2/3)
Subproject 12SUB04
Workshop HEI on Handbook IQA, 23 March 2012
Subproject 12SUB05
Workshop ANQA on Professionalization, 22 & 23 March 2012
Subproject 12SUB06
Workshop ANQA on Handbook QA, 23 March 2012

LINE 1 – IQA / LINE 3 – ANQA

Subproject 12SUB01
Project Website

ALL LINES

Amendment 12AME03
Amendment 3, April 2012

Observations

Preliminary observations
ANQA puts a lot of effort in managing various projects funded by third parties. All projects are obviously related to the further development of internal and external quality assurance of both HEI and ANQA as a QA agency. It appears, however, that ANQA hardly finds the time to manage daily work at the office that is not specifically related to projects. Given the ambition of ANQA to become a fully operative and financially independent quality organisation priorities need to shift from project management towards office management. Of course, there should be room for projects but not as the main activity.

Another general observation concerns the rather high ambitions of the Armenian Ministry of Education and therefore of ANQA. One should take into consideration that a quality assurance system cannot be established overnight. Creating a quality culture involving all relevant stakeholders needs time. And time is hardly given to both HEI and ANQA. NVAO will address this issue in a confidential letter to ANQA (copy to PIU).

IQA workshops HEI on IQA,writing SER and on Handbook IQA (12SUB03 en 12 SUB04)
Workshops on IQA, writing SER (12SUB03)
The workshops aiming to develop an internal quality assessment system in HEI have shown that these institutes are only at the beginning of this process. The aims of the Armenian government and of ANQA are very ambitious. The Armenian government has defined a national qualification framework with high standards for learning outcomes at both bachelor's and master's level. ANQA has set up an accreditation framework that reflects the European Standard and Guidelines (ESG). Armenia strives to fulfil the ESG at the end of this project.

The workshops showed that institutes invested substantially in developing internal quality assessment but they are still far away of the set targets. The documents worked out for the self-evaluation reports (SER) are encouraging and demonstrate the will of the HEI to succeed but they still have a long way to go. Institutes will have to work hard to fulfil the ambitions set by the Armenian government and ANQA.

It seems ineffective to focus already on self evaluation reports at a moment that no institute has an actual system of internal quality assurance (IQA). The present activities have clearly demonstrated that the focus of the activities in the near future should lie in the development of such a IQA system, which should be in line with the ANQA accreditation framework.

HEI did not write a full text per criterium but only a summary. Writing a summary was not according to the 'Assignment Writing SER'. Apparently, the institutions did not have enough time to write a full text, and so in consultation with ANQA they decided to write a summary per criterium. Furthermore some HEI did not write a SER for all three criteria (criteria 2, 3 and 10). So although HEI involved in the pilot are more than willing to work hard and thorough, they seem to lack the time to complete the work. This in combination with previous observations confirms that it will be hard, if not impossible, for HEI to fulfil the ambitions set by the Armenian government and ANQA.

Despite the fact that the SER were written in the form of summaries, the documents provided enough information for the trainers to give feedback in a more general way. Feedback in detail was less obvious given the limited amount of text available. See also Annex 6: Observations and recommendations on assignment SER criterion 1, 3 and 10.

Feedback was given by the trainers in sessions with two HEI at the same time. The institutions were selected on basis of the SER, and the aim was to learn from each other. For three groups of HEI it was a successful approach; for one group the result of working together was less productive. During the sessions the trainers not only gave feedback on the SER but they also provided good practices from their own institution.

In retrospect, the number of institutes involved in the workshop on IQA, writing SER was too large for the number of training experts. A small number of institutes would have been more effective as was the

original plan (3 instead of 8 HEI). Other institutes had to work independently during the feedback sessions, which proved to be inefficient and ineffective.

Workshops on Handbook IQA (12SUB04)
The workshops have been helpful to introduce the concepts of IQA within institutes. The workshops have given insight in existing IQA good practices in HEI in the Netherlands. Guidelines for quality handbooks were presented and some evaluation tools on student appreciation and personnel satisfaction were discussed. These are the major evaluation tools for assessing programmes and IQA. Institutes seemed to be satisfied with the outcomes of this workshop.

Workshops ANQA professionalization (12SUB05 and 12SUB06)
The workshops on ANQA professionalization (12SUB05) and development of a IQA handbook (12SUB06) have been a successful introduction to these subjects. The leading document obviously was the ANQA accreditation framework. In these workshops an overview has been presented of best practices on both topics, and several assignments have been worked on by two teams of ANQA policy advisors. These assignments focused on intellectual training (analysis of assessment criteria on the basis of well selected assessment reports) and tools for assessing achieved learning outcomes based on the criteria in the Armenian National Qualifications Framework.

A second focus has been procedural. Workshops covered subjects such as documenting the processes of institutional accreditation, development of outlines for a quality handbook and evaluation matrices. The workshops aimed at gaining insight in the subjects involved and assignments on quality protocols, evaluation schemes and flowcharts for institutional accreditation.

ANQA staff regarded the workshops as very useful, especially because of the large number of practical exercises. They liked the approach of the workshops, the clear answers to remaining questions, the summaries after each session and the tangible outcomes. ANQA staff also appreciated the involvement of the training experts. Finally ANQA staff was pleased with working in separate groups, and with the discussions of the outcomes gained by each group.

The training experts have found a very motivated group of policy advisors, who have already gained a lot of insight in the accreditation framework. The groups consisted of both senior policy advisors and younger staff. This mix worked well during the assignments, especially since the staff is rather heterogeneous in terms of analytical skills and knowledge of the English language. The presence of the ANQA management during the workshops has improved the team working and team building.

Due to the lack of knowledge of the English language of some of the policy advisors, the workshops required a lot of translation. These translations were performed by ANQA staff members, who got a better insight in the subjects due to this activity. However, it has been a very intensive activity for them. Even so, this approach is very useful for the further professionalization of the ANQA staff.

At the end of each day of the workshops an evaluation session has been foreseen. These closing sessions have proved to be very successful.

Targets have been set on specific issues to be further developed for the next workshop sessions in June: a first draft of a quality handbook, quality protocols for the primary processes. The training experts are convinced that a lot of material is already available, but an overall approach is still missing. The ambitions of ANQA on both internal and external QA are very high. They demand substantial acceleration of the efforts set up by ANQA so far in the project, in order to reach the set targets in due time.

The training experts are aware that a lot of different topics have been discussed in the two-day workshops. It is important that each of these topics will be further developed in the near future by small groups in which all policy advisors can play a particular role. If not, most of the gained knowledge will remain superficial, if not lost.

Short survey of activities within the workshops
Workshop ANQA on professionalization, Thursday 22 March 2012:
Presentation, assignment and discussion on the guidelines for assessing thesis was based on the learning outcomes as defined in the Armenian National Qualification Framework for master level. This proved to be a successful analytical exercise for ANQA staff.
Introduction to internal quality assurance with focus on principles of evaluation matrices. Assignment dealt with evaluation checklists for institutional accreditation.

Workshop ANQA on Handbook, Friday 23 March 2012:
Presentation and assignment regarding the flowchart of processes within institutional accreditation. Introduction to a handbook ANQA on internal quality assurance. A overview of necessary topics in a handbook was presented. The outlines of a quality handbook were related to the existing ANQA Accreditation Manual. Mission statement, PDCA cycle with Quality Protocols and Improvement Schemes were dealt with. An example of a Protocol for quality assurance of ANQA has been presented and discussed. It dealt with strategic goals, targets, indicators, description of main activities, evaluation procedures, responsibilities and improvement targets. Relevant quality areas were investigated. ANQA internal quality assurance should be developed on these lines and made fit for purpose according to the Armenian quality culture.

Finally all participants (HEI, ANQA and trainers) agree that it was a good initiative to organise the workshops at two HEI: Polytechnic University and Medical University. It not only helped to limit the costs for logistics but it also led to a relaxed and motivating atmosphere.

Recommendations

HEI activities
The workshops have demonstrated that the main target for the institutes is to develop an internal quality system at a short time. This internal quality system should focus on the ANQA standards and criteria for institutional and programme accreditation. The ultimate goal should be that programmes at HEI are in line with the ambitious level of the Armenian qualification framework. This framework sets the standards at a high European level.

Institutes should further work on the preparation of self evaluation reports, but perhaps more importantly, should especially increase their activities in further developing an internal quality assessment system.

Short term objectives:
- Development of a quality strategic plan for institutional and programme accreditation;
- Elaboration of quality protocols for all relevant quality areas, according to the standards of ANQA accreditation framework;
- Development of an appropriate evaluation matrix and evaluation tools;
- Design and implementation SER project.

Midterm objectives:
- Finalisation of the internal quality assessment system;
- Finalisation of SER project;
- Development of activities for EQA (ESG and ANQA accreditation framework).

ANQA activities
The training experts recommend to continue the approach of the present workshops on ANQA staff professionalization: separate group assignments, practical exercises, intermediate group discussions and group evaluations, setting targets on specific products. They also recommend that all ANQA staff – management, junior and senior policy advisors, lawyer, IT-coordinator, pr-officer – remain involved in future workshops, and that products continue to be developed.

As stated before, ANQA has laid down very high ambitions that have to be fulfilled in a very short period of time. Therefore, ANQA needs to intensify its activities in developing its own QA system. It is essential that policy advisors are made responsible for the set targets (draft of a quality handbook and quality protocols, documentation on the operational plans etc.) and start their respective activities without any further delay, in order to obtain preliminary products for the next June sessions. One agreed item is a checklist for acceptance of accreditation applications. Quality handbooks, targets, evaluation matrices, improvement schemes have to be finished before self evaluation reports can be developed. A self evaluation is indeed only useful when an internal and external ANQA quality assurance system is fully operational. It is therefore crucial to give absolute priority to these activities.

Unfortunately the eight SER were only written as summaries. This made detailed feedback on the SER difficult. The SER for the June workshop therefore should be complete (on 3 criteria) and in English for the panel of experts to be able to assess the documents.

Part of material for the ANQA workshop was not translated, also because some of it was only available at a very late stage. This did not lead to serious constraints, but it did retard the discussions.

Workshops with HEI will be organized preferably in HEI in Yerevan.

Finally the ARQATA website needs to be updated on a continuous basis. As soon as new material becomes available it should be posted on the website. All documentation available during events should be published on the site immediately after the events. Also future events need to be announced far ahead. In order to reach this goal one ANQA staff member should be made responsible for the project website.

Short time objectives:
- Updating the ARQATA website;
- Development of a strategic plan on QA;
- Elaboration of quality protocols for all relevant quality areas;
- Development of an appropriate evaluation matrix;
- Further development of quality handbook.

Medium term objectives:
- Finalisation of the quality handbook;
- Design and implementation SER project.

ANNEX 1 – Brief reports on the meetings (12COM03)

1 Meeting ANQA – NVAO
Yerevan, 21 March 2012

As is the standard procedure, ANQA and NVAO meet at the occasion of every event (12COM03). Purpose:
a) to evaluate the training and the seminar (1-3 March 2012);
b) to agree on steps to be taken for development handbooks;
c) to prepare the next event (June 2012);
d) to discuss the June visit to Europe (June 2012);
e) to discuss the national conference (October 2012);
f) to discuss the project website;
g) to take stock of needs regarding the ANQA information system (IT) and discuss further actions (*during dinner*)

A point of discussion remains the extension of the number of institutes involved in the pilots. There is a strong wish of the Armenian government that three universities will be involved in these pilots, but an agreement on the financial aspects still has to be found. Also ANQA is in favour of enlarging the number of universities from two to three.

Ad a
Overall the seminar of 1-3 March 2012 was very well organised. Participants were highly motivated. The seminar proved to be a good start on developing a quality assurance system in HEI. However, ANQA management missed a written feedback on the products developed. It also considered the feedback of the training experts during the seminar too positive, given the state of the work of the Armenian universities. As an example can be mentioned that the mission statements of universities were rather general and missed measurable targets. However, feedback on detailed level was not foreseen during this first day of the three-day training. The aim of the first training was to get the HEI acquainted with the process of writing SER. Feedback on the SER was planned for day two of the three-day training on writing SER. Participants lacked an overall evaluation at the end of the workshops and concluding summaries. They prefer to get training material more in advance.

The online evaluation showed very positive results. On a scale of 1 to 5, an average of 4/5 was reached, which is more than satisfactory. The participants were less positive (3,5/5) on the quality of the English language of the training material and on the QA glossary. They were positive on the QA knowledge of the training experts. The text of the open questions was written in Armenian. The translation (by World Bank) of the text will be delivered at a later moment

ANQA managed to design and develop the project website in less than three weeks. This is a impressive achievement. It is essential, though, to keep this website up to date at all times. ANQA should provide evaluation results in sufficient time, in order to incorporate recommendations in the next workshop.

Clearly the language issue has been underestimated. A larger number of Armenian participants have no knowledge of the English language. It is agreed that a translator will be hired for 2 days of the second March session with HEI. The translation during the workshops with ANQA participants will be done by ANQA policy advisors due to a lack of funds.

Ad b
NVAO will provide the framework and some tools for handbook on IQA and EQA. ANQA and the HEI should make them fit for purpose, taking into account the Armenian context.

Ad c
ANQA agrees on the outlines of the June workshops in Yerevan (annex 3). Feedback will be provided on the SER by a group of experienced quality experts from both Dutch and Flemish universities. The

roundtable conference on SER should be limited to **20 participants** in total and a maximum of 4 participants per HEI. The conference does not allow a larger number of participants to be effective.

Regarding the selection of students and ANQA observers for the training of students at the ANQA facilities, the number of participants should be limited to **15 max**. Students are bachelor's and master's students (not PhD), and should have a good knowledge of the English language. Translation will be provided by the translator of the March sessions, only if need be.

ANQA considers the training of analytical skills of its staff as very important and absolutely necessary. The training of the (**15 max**) in the June session will therefore focus on this aspect. More specifically the training will deal with writing assessment reports. Participants will be ANQA secretaries i.e. policy advisors/coordinators as well as external secretaries. As ANQA staff cannot cope with all the work related to writing assessment reports, a number of external secretaries need to be trained as well. External secretaries can be QA experts from HEI but not necessarily so.

Ad d
The June programme is approved (annex 4). Six persons from Armenian HE and ANQA will participate in the programme: 2 ANQA policy advisors, two participants from the ministry of HE, one QA coordinator from HEI (preferably from one of the HEI involved in the pilots) and a student. All should have a good understanding of English as there will be no translation.
NVAO will cover the costs for the Armenian student as participation of students in all QA activities is essential and no additional funds are available from the Armenian side.
Names of the 6 participants should be provided as soon as possible. Tickets can be booked in Armenia but only after approval by NVAO of an offer from an Armenian travel agency.
The possibility of shadowing will be looked into. If possible, one or more participants can be present as observer at an assessment procedure (programme level) in the Netherlands or Flanders. Procedures in English, however, are rather scarce.
The visit to University of Utrecht should preferably focus on the advanced training of educational competences of professors (Basic and Extended Learning Qualification). Another interesting topic could be the governance structure of a Dutch HEI. The visit to the Dutch and Flemish government should focus on the role of the different participants to QA in higher education and especially the role of the government.

Ad e
ANQA is pleased that the chairman of NVAO and the vice-rector of TUDelft will participate in the October National Conference. The draft programme is approved. The EQA and IQA sessions with HEI should be limited to a maximum of **15 participants** in order to keep the sessions efficient and productive, considering the number of training experts. The participants of the E-train workshop should be limited to 12, including ANQA management. The tow-day workshop focuses on 'train the trainer' and envisages Armenian QA experts with a good knowledge of English. Two international experts involved in the E-train project will be part of the NVAO training team.

Ad f
The ARQATA website is launched successfully. It gives a good overview of the state of the art in QA in Armenia as well as the outcomes of the project up to now. However, the website needs regular updating in order to be relevant to its visitors. Outcomes of the first March session being posted one day prior to the second March meeting is not very informative.

Ad g
It is clear that a substantial effort has been paid to the IT-environment. A workflow tool is presently implemented. An expert review is needed on the effectiveness. NVAO will offer advice on possible improvements of the IT-information tool. This can be done during the June visit of NVAO.

2   Meeting CfEP PIU – ANQA – NVAO
Yerevan, 23 March 2012

Outcomes: NVAO, PIU, ANQA agree on the adaptations of the remaining programme. The smaller changes in the documents are discussed and approved. A final draft will be worked out on the basis of further suggestions of PIU, ANQA and NVAO. Suggestions will be finalized in the week of 27 March.

No agreement has been obtained regarding the additional budget for the extension of the pilots with a third HEI. It is clear that the Ministry of Education is very much in favour of a pilot with three HEI. The justification of the budget and especially the overhead based on a fixed percentage of the total costs is unclear to both PIU and ANQA. NVAO will provide a more detailed justification.

NVAO states that within the present project it will take some costs on its own expense, such as the costs for the student involved in the visit to Flanders and the Netherlands in June. Also there has been an underestimation of the language issue. Professional translation is absolutely necessary, since a large part of the participants have insufficient knowledge of the English language. This involves extra costs to be dealt with by PIU and ANQA.

Other issues raised: the attendance of the Madrid E-train meeting. ANQA and PIU are in favour of attending the E-train meeting in June. It is expected that four or five representatives will attend this conference. All costs for attending this conference are to be covered by PIU and ANQA. Within the present project, no budget is allocated for attending this event. ANQA, PIU and NVAO are convinced that this conference could be beneficial for ANQA representatives.

PIU agrees that the midterm report scheduled for August will be delivered in September 2012.

ANNEX 1 – Programme Training HEI on IQA (12SUB03) and Handbook (12SUB04)

WORK IN PROGRESS – WRITING SER & HANDBOOK QA

1 Training HEI on IQA – Self-Evaluation Report
NVAO: Irma Franssen
University of Applied Science, Groningen: Hiltje Burgler-Feenstra & Yvonne Eppink

Thursday 22 March 2012

Subproject	Training HEI on IQA, day 2/3, Feedback on SER assignment and further elaboration
Participants	8 HEI – 3 to 4 members of the SER writing team (24 to 32 pp) *(on invitation only)*
Observers	2 ANQA – 1 junior and 1 senior ANQA coordinators
Translator	1
Trainers	Hiltje Burgler-Feenstra & Yvonne Eppink

End of March 2012, day 2 of the 3-day training session with HEI on all aspects of IQA (12SUB03) takes place. During this session, HEI get feedback on their first assignment, and continue working on writing a self-evaluation report. This training also deals with the requirements regarding the actual content of the report, and include another session on the glossary. By the end of this day's training, HEI should be able to write a SER on 3 criteria (I, III and X) to be finished by 15 May 2012. ANQA staff members attend this training as observers to continue their further professionalization.

HEI should be able to write a SER on 3 criteria (I, III and X) to be finished by 15 May 2012. ANQA staff members attend this training as observers to continue their further professionalization.

Programme

9 – 9.30	General feedback on self-evaluation reports – session 1
9.30 – 10.00	Discussion and assignment on criterion 2 (*Irma Franssen*)
10.00 – 11.00	Concurrent sessions
	− Feedback HEI 1 & 2 on SER
	− Other 6 HEI work on assignment
11.00 – 11.30	Morning break
11.30 – 12.30	Concurrent sessions
	− Feedback HEI 3 & 4 on SER
	− Other 6 HEI work on assignment
12.30 – 13.00	Discussion on assignment – preliminary outcomes and issues raised
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch break
14.00 – 15.00	Concurrent sessions
	− Feedback HEI 5 & 6 on SER
	− Other 6 HEI work on assignment
15.00 – 16.00	Concurrent sessions
	− Feedback HEI 7 & 8 on SER
	− Other 6 HEI work on assignment
16.00 – 16.30	Afternoon break
16.30 – 17.00	Reports HEI on assignment
17.00 – 17.30	General feedback on self-evaluation reports – session 2
17.30 – 17.45	Assignment writing SER by 15 May 2012 (*Irma Franssen*)

2 Workshop HEI on IQA – Handbook

NVAO: Irma Franssen
University of Applied Science, Groningen: Hiltje Burgler-Feenstra & Yvonne Eppink

Friday 23 March 2012

Subproject	Workshop HEI on Handbook QA (12SUB04)
	Introduction and general outline handbook & workshop on tools
Participants	8 HEI – 2 to 3 quality assurance coordinators (16 to 24 pp) *(on invitation only)*
Observers	2 ANQA – 1 junior and 1 senior ANQA coordinators
Translator	1
Trainers	Hiltje Burgler-Feenstra & Yvonne Eppink (tools) & Irma Franssen (introduction)

The workshop with HEI focuses on the development of a handbook (12SUB04) to be used by HEI as a guide for setting up and monitoring IQA. The seminar on IQA (12SUB02) and both training sessions on writing a SER (12SUB03) should provide the basic material for working on the outlines for a handbook. Again ANQA staff members attend the workshop as observers.

After an introduction and a general outline of a handbook on QA – both IQA and EQA – external experts present and discuss various tools as good practice. By the end of the day, HEI should be able to start composing their own handbook taking into consideration (1) tools already used, (2) tools elaborated on during the workshop and previous training sessions, and (3) tools to be developed in due course. It goes without saying that both the handbook and the tools should be fit for purpose. Composing and updating a handbook on QA is an ongoing process.

Programme

9 – 9.30	Introduction and general outline handbook QA – part 1 IQA
9.30 – 11.00	Tool 1 – Evaluation matrix
11.00 – 11.30	Morning break
11.30 – 13.00	Tool 2 – IQA measurements (session 1)
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch break
14.00 – 15.00	Tool 2 – IQA measurements (session 2)
15.00 – 16.00	Tool 3 – Quality characteristics
16.00 – 16.30	Afternoon break
16.30 – 17.30	Composing a handbook

Essential components of both the training and the workshop: evaluation (on line), glossary, and elements of quality culture made explicit. Also good practice from the other ongoing pilot projects will be included where relevant.

ANNEX 2 – Programme Professionalization ANQA (12SUB05) and Workshop on Handbook (12SUB06)

NVAO: Rudy Derdelinckx and Irma Franssen

Participants   8 ANQA – management (2) and (assistant-)coordinators (5) and legal advisor
Translator   1
Trainers   Rudy Derdelinckx & Irma Franssen

The further development of the professionalising of ANQA is the main goal of the workshop with ANQA management and staff (12SUB05). To this purpose, different sessions are organised to identify the needs and concerns, and to define a shared approach for professionalization. By the end of the workshop, the outlines should be clear for the action plan on professionalization including the design of a handbook (12SUB06) and the development of training material for ANQA staff.

Thursday 22 March 2012

9.00-9.30   Introduction and discussion about (possible) subjects for training ANQA

9.30-11.00   Guideline assessment theses by the panel – part 1

11.00-11.30   Morning break

11.30-13.00   Guideline assessment theses by the panel – part 2

13.00-14.00   Lunch break

14.00-16.00   IQA ANQA – part 1
               Evaluation matrix: processes

16.00-16.30   Afternoon break

16.30-17.45   IQA ANQA – part 2
               Evaluation matrix: business operations

Friday 23 March 2012

9.00-9.30   Introduction (Rudy)

9.30-11.00   Process of initial accreditation – part 1

11.00-11.30   Morning break

11.30-13.00   Process of initial accreditation – part 2

13.00-14.00   Lunch break

14.00-15.30   Handbook ANQA – part 1

15.30-16.00   Afternoon break

16.00-17.30   Handbook ANQA – part 2

17.30-17.45   Evaluation

ANNEX 3 – Draft Programme Visit 5 (June 2012)

Subproject 12SUB03
Training HEI on IQA, June/July 2012 (day 3/3)
Subproject 12SUB05
Training ANQA staff, June/July 2012 (2 days)
Meeting 12COM04
Visit 5 – NVAO, June/July 2012
Report 12REP04
Report on visit and training, July 2012

LINE 1 – IQA / LINE 3 – ANQA

NVAO: Irma Franssen and Frank Wamelink

Monday 25 June 2012
<departure IF and FW>

Tuesday 26 June 2012
Afternoon in concurrent sessions:
- Meeting ANQA (IF)
- Training students (FW)

Wednesday 27 June 2012
Training HEI on IQA
Roundtable conference on SER with max 5 people per HEI (x 8) participating (20 in total).

Thursday 28 June 2012
Training ANQA staff
Training session for ANQA secretaries on writing assessment reports

Friday 29 June 2012
<return flight IF and FW>

ANNEX 4 – Draft Programme International Visit (June 2012)

Outline programme – group June 2012

1. Sunday 3 June: travel to Amsterdam-The Hague

2. Monday 4 June NVAO office
   a. Preparing participants for visits and for individual assignment
   b. General introduction NVAO
   c. Workshop on various topics: Institutional Audit, Learning Outcomes, Panel compositions (Confirmed)
   d. Meeting / Dinner with stakeholders (The Netherlands Association of Universities of Applied Sciences (HBO-Raad) and Association of Universities in The Netherlands (VSNU) to be invited)

3. Tuesday 5 June Utrecht
   a. HEI – Utrecht University-UU (Confirmed)
   b. Assessment Agency – Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities-QANU (Confirmed)
   c. Meeting / Dinner with stakeholders (Dutch National Union of Students (LSVB), QANU and UU to be invited)

4. Wednesday 6 June Leiden
   a. HEI – Leiden University (Confirmed)
   b. Travel to Brussels
   c. Free afternoon in Brussels
   d. Meeting / Dinner with stakeholders (Flemish Student Association (VVS) to be invited)

5. Thursday 7 June Brussels
   a. HEI- University College/University of Brussels (HUB) (Confirmed)
   b. Flemish Council of Universities and University Colleges (VLUHR) (To be confirmed)
   c. Flemish Ministry of Education (Confirmed)
   d. Meeting / Dinner with stakeholders (Representatives from HEIs and Ministry to be invited)
   e. Travel to The Hague

6. Friday 8 June The Hague
   a. HEI – Leidse Onderwijs Instellingen, Leiden, Institution for Distance Education (Confirmed)
   b. Dutch Ministry of Education (Confirmed)
   c. NVAO – Workshop on Initial Accreditation
   d. NVAO - Evaluation
   e. Farewell dinner with NVAO

7. Saturday: travel to Yerevan

WHERE POSSIBLE SHADOWING ACTIVITIES WILL BE INTEGRATED…

ANNEX 5 – Draft Programme Visit 6 (October 2012)

Subproject 12SUB09
National Stakeholders' Conference, 8-13 October 2012
Subproject 12SUB10
Training HEI in IQA Implementation, 8-13 October 2012
Subproject 12SUB11
Training HEI and ANQA on EQA, 8-13 October 2012
Subproject 12SUB12
Train the Trainer (E-train project), 8-13 October 2012 (2 days)
Meeting 12COM05
Visit 6 – NVAO, 8-13 October 2012
Report 12REP06
Report on visit and conference, October/November 2012

ALL LINES

Monday 8 October 2012
National Stakeholders' Conference
− morning
  − speech K. Dittrich, chair NVAO
  − speech P. Rullman, board member and vice-president for education, Delft University of Technology
− afternoon: conference (Armenia) and visit Yerevan (NVAO-team free afternoon)

Tuesday 9 October 2012
National Stakeholders' Conference
− morning
  − presentation outcomes pilot SER (NVAO & HEI)
  − Training HEI in IQA Implementation, in concurrent sessions
    o with students (I. Franssen)
    o with faculty (K. Dittrich)
    o with management (P. Rullman)
    o with QA coordinators (J. Brakels)
− afternoon: visit Yerevan State University & possibly other HEI (NVAO-team study tour)

Wednesday 10 October 2012
Training HEI in IQA Implementation – programme accreditation
(J. Brakels and I. Franssen)

Thursday 11 October 2012
Training HEI and ANQA on EQA (1/2) – organisation of an institutional audit
(J. Brakels and M. Wera)

Thursday 11 October 2012
E-train (1/2)
(M. Frederiks, I. Franssen, and NN and NN)

Friday 12 October 2012
Training HEI and ANQA on EQA (2/2) – ESG
(M. Frederiks)

Friday 12 October 2012
E-train (2/2)
(M. Frederiks, NN and NN)

Annex 6 – Observations and Recommendations on Assignment SER (criteria 1, 3 and 10) (12SUB03)

1 On the assignment

HEI were asked to deliver a SER on criteria 1, 2 and 10, in text or in an English summary. All HEI delivered summaries. Some HEI managed to deliver a text in full but these SER were very brief; other SER were incomplete but contained more detailed information. HEI pointed out more than once that the SER was only a summary and that the full text obviously would contain more information.

2 Working with the formats provided

The **formats** were used and therefore a systematic approach was clearly visible. The recommended **sequence** – first de document analyses and then the description of the standards – was scarcely followed. As a result, the documents were named but rarely cited in de descriptions of the standard.

Ambitions were not always formulated: one should do so to give direction to the facts and findings. There was some discussion about how ambitious or realistic ambitions should be formulated.

Facts and findings were in general very brief with more facts than findings. It essential to address this matter properly. Indeed, this is the start for the later mentioned strong and weak points. The real thing about self-evaluation is to be clear about your own observations and to state qualifications on your own achievements.

The **SWOT** was often critical but more often not very systematic in approach. It is recommended to prioritise and to address the things that can be altered or improved.

The **documents** were listed properly, most of them with a short summary. It was clear that some were important (key-documents), others less but that was not always shown in the listing. It is advised to do so. Especially in cases of documents that are vital, mandatory or dictated by government rules the status of these documents should be absolutely clear.
There was some discussion whether the same documents should be repeatedly named with the different standards. It is advised to give the summary only once, and to simply refer to it when dealing with other aspects.
It was clearly visible, but only in a few cases, that documents were used as input for the description of the standard. This method is certainly good practice.

3 In general

There seems to be a general understanding of the criteria and standards although it is more difficult for the smaller HEI to make a clear distinction between institutional and programme level. This is quite understandable when, in some cases, the level is almost identical especially for HEI which are mono-disciplinary. In general, the institutional standards are more fitting to the larger universities.
It is recommended to add a chapter in the introduction to explain the actual situation of the HEI, and add specific background information so that the information provided in the criteria can be fully understood. Another recommendation is to add overviews, schedules, pictures and examples for further quick orientation, and to highlight special achievements.

4 Criteria

Criterion 1

When describing criterion 1, it is rather problematical to start with the HEI's ambition. Usually a mission statement includes this ambition. It is therefore recommended to start with a summary of the content of the mission, and to illustrate and elaborate on this in the facts and findings concerning the three standards. For the reader of the self-evaluation report it is very important to know from the beginning what the institution really aims at, really stands for. Also information about basic facts should be provided. When have the mission and the strategic plan last been reviewed ? What is the scope in years?

Criterion 3
In criterion 3 the ambition is very important. Education (and research) is the core business of each HEI. Important statements about the quality of education were already mentioned in the mission (criterion 1). Of course there must be a connection between criterion 1 and 3, but in criterion 3 the ambition concerning education should be further specified and elaborated.

And of course, it is difficult to distinguish between the institutional level and the programme level. One should stay close to general guidelines and procedures, but be also specific about them. A statement such as "programmes are in line with national regulations" are clear but not specific enough for a self-evaluation. So content needs to be added, and more detailed explicitation. One should not too easily assume that the reader – the assessor – will understand. This criterion is all about content. So take this chance and make the reader understand just what you want him to understand about education in your HEI. Some typical illustrations or good practices of general guidelines taken from the programme level, can be very helpful.

Criterion 10
Most HEI have several aspects of a QA system in place. However, a complete structure with fixed elements is often missing, and not working throughout all the levels of the organisation. Some HEI set up a QA department, and started assigning tasks and responsibilities. Other HEI started with the paper work and made books with rules and regulations. All are in the midst of developing a quality culture. The crucial question is: how to get the relevant stakeholders really involved? And yes, building a quality culture is an ongoing process.