



## Q-week

*Yerevan/The Hague, 14 November 2012*

### **Subproject 12SUB09**

National Stakeholders' Conference, 8 & 9 October 2012

### **Subproject 12SUB10**

Training HEI on IQA Implementation, 10 & 11 October 2012 (2 days)

### **Subproject 12SUB11**

Training HEI and ANQA on EQA, 11 & 12 October 2012 (days 1-2/3)

### **Subproject 12SUB12**

Train the Trainer (E-train project), 11 & 12 October 2012 (2 days)

### **Meeting 12COM05**

Visit 6 – NVAO, 8-12 October 2012

### **Report 12REP06**

Report on visit and conference, October 2012

**ALL LINES**

### **Subproject 12SUB01**

Project Website

**ALL LINES**

### **Amendment 12AME04**

Amendment 4, November 2012

After more than five years of designing and developing a quality assurance system incorporating and adjusting European models, Armenian higher education is ready to move beyond this pioneering stage and to take matters into its own hands. This is the most important conclusion following the National Stakeholders' Conference and the various training sessions involving representatives of most Armenian universities and numerous international experts. During Q-week four major concerns have become apparent.

1. Higher education in Armenia is putting a lot of effort in preparing itself for the European Higher Education Area. But as already referred to in the ARQATA interim report (September 2012): the **ambitions and expectations** are high if not unrealistic within the foreseen time frame. It is therefore essential to prioritize in consultation with the politicians and the rector's conference. Too many, too far-reaching goals might lead to disappointments which can easily be avoided by setting attainable targets. Although this is not on the present list of priorities, it might be worthwhile to consider the evaluations of the programmes, for instance in the sciences. These assessments require less effort and have immediate results in terms of quality enhancement at programme level. It would also allow HEIs to demonstrate the quality of their educational programmes while building on more substantial quality improvements at institutional level.

2. In discussions with representatives of different universities it remains unclear in how far 'academic leaders' fully support the development of internal quality assurance (IQA) and external quality assurance (EQA). The 'sense of urgency' within the **academic leadership** seems rather modest. The quality assurance staff of the universities, however, are well motivated and eager to take the necessary steps towards quality enhancement. The apparent lack of academic leadership and ownership of quality assurance within universities is a threat to the implementation of quality assurance systems in Armenian higher education. The actual support and commitment of the academic leaders –rector, vice rectors, deans and deans – are prerequisites for the acceptance and the success of these systems. Without their explicit engagement and open support there is a considerable risk for failure despite all efforts and good intentions of quality assurance staff involved in the various international projects. It is essential for universities to seriously contemplate this issue and to take appropriate actions. ANQA could be helpful in initiating the dialogue but in the end the responsibility for adapting a true quality culture lies with the universities.
3. ANQA relies heavily on **international projects and experts** for implementing quality assurance in Armenia. As such, ANQA's major preoccupation is with managing these projects rather than managing its own processes. So many projects, so many different inputs, so many different opinions and visions can be confusing instead of being helpful. Once clear and well-founded choices have been made by Armenian higher education i.e. ANQA and HEI, processes and procedures have to be made fit-for-purpose. Only then the actual implementation of quality assurance can be successful. In this process, ANQA can take the initiative, and to put into practice what it has been learning in years past. These activities might include offering assistance and guidance to HEI, facilitating peer reviews, training of experts, and organising audits. Q-week also made it clear that there is considerable overlap in the objectives of the international projects, and that the overall management of these projects (including ARQATA) is at times a burden for ANQA even up to a point that these projects are no longer effective.
4. ANQA's preoccupation with projects also hinders the process of becoming a fully operative and independent quality organisation. ANQA should focus its particular attention on developing policy plans and prioritizing activities, staff capacity building, actually using quality assurance instruments and developing a quality culture. In order to be able to do so, it is essential for **all ANQA staff members** to be actively involved in the core business of the agency: the actual implementation of quality assurance. Most ANQA staff members are well qualified and have undergone the necessary training. Time has come to give individual staff members the responsibility that comes with the job: process management of institutional audits and programme assessments.

The second stage of the ARQATA project is set in with Q-week. The outcomes of stage 1 were presented and discussed at the national stakeholders' conference, and stage 2 continues the training sessions with HEI and ANQA. In stage 1, eight HEI were involved; in stage 2 two HEI will be offered guidance and assistance in preparing and undergoing the pilots for institutional audit and programme assessment in June 2013 and not in March as originally planned. The focus of the training will shift from internal towards external quality assurance although at all times the interrelation between both will be emphasized.

As to the further professionalization of ANQA, the training on internal quality assurance will continue keeping in mind that at one point ANQA will also need to prepare for the proof external review scheduled for September 2013. Also ANQA's further training of experts will be given due attention.

The programme and the material for both the national stakeholders' conference and the training sessions are published on the project website. The programme is also to be found in annex. Also included are an update of the time and activity line, brief reports of the various meetings, a draft programme for upcoming events and a draft amendment 4.

### ***12SUB09 – National Stakeholders' Conference (8 & 9 October 2012)***

Some 250 stakeholders participated at the two-day event on internal quality assurance. The conference was opened by the Deputy Minister of Education and Science. She expressed her full support for the ongoing quality assurance activities, and she urged HEI to cooperate with ANQA to make the further development of quality assurance a success. The expectations are high but for the benefit of Armenian higher education and society at large it is necessary to make this effort. In the end, all will profit from the new accreditation system.

The conference dealt with a variety of aspects of quality assurance put into practice mainly at institutional level. All relevant stakeholders contributed to the event, and often in more than one session: HEI, ANQA, students, experts, and employers. Topics covered include the impact of quality assurance on Armenian higher education and the challenges to be met, the present state of affairs in quality assurance both from the viewpoint of ANQA and HEI, panel experts' reflections on the process of auditing and assessing, the mechanism of internal quality assurance, and the roles of both students and employers in quality assurance.

Also a number of international experts presented their views on internal and external quality assurance, and gave input to the discussion. At the invitation of NVAO, Karl Dittrich (chair NVAO and board member ENQA) and Paul Rullmann (vice president Technology University of Delft) delivered a speech within the framework of the ARQATA project. Other international speakers were invited by ANQA, and have no direct relation with the ARQATA project. K. Dittrich presented a paper on quality assurance being a must and a chance. He talked about quality enhancement on programme level, about the importance of content over procedures, about the ownership of quality lying with teaching staff and students. Also P. Rullmann stressed the importance of internal quality assurance. HEI need to approach quality assurance as an event (not a thing), as an ongoing process not without a struggle. Key factors for success are quality culture, and the notion of keeping it simple and doing more with less.

On day 2 of the conference, stakeholders having participated in stage 1 of the ARQATA project on internal quality assurance shared their views and experiences with the other stakeholders. The conference was concluded with round table discussions. International experts and HEI representatives reflected on quality assurance issues in four parallel sessions: management (Delft), faculty (NVAO), students (NVAO) and quality assurance coordinators/units (Delft/NVAO). These round table discussions proved a success with 50 to 70 participants per session.

### ***12SUB10 – Training HEI in IQA Implementation (10 & 11 October 2012)***

Following the conference with stakeholders, some 15 key persons of two HEI – Yerevan State University (YSU) and Yerevan State Medical University (YSMU) – attended a two-day training on internal quality assurance (12SUB10). ANQA staff members attended this training as observers to continue the process of professionalization. The training session focused on internal quality assurance at programme level and

the organisational aspects of an institutional audit. As such, day 2 of the training marked the transition from IQA to EQA to be continued in yet another training session on day 3 on ESG (12SUB11).

Quality enhancement on programme level is not the same as having a sound quality assurance system on paper. The main objective is not the system as such, but it is the quality of the programme. A sound system is supportive of this goal: the instruments chosen have to be fit for purpose (related to the quality targets), stakeholders have to be involved (leave it to professionals wherever possible) and results have to be analysed and have to be given a proper follow-up.

A number of tools to enhance the quality of educational programmes have been presented and discussed first in small groups and later in plenary sessions: a quick scan for a quick insight in the current state of affairs on programme level; a matrix for the involvement of stakeholders; an index for a policy document on student assessment on programme or faculty level. And once more, the importance of relating all QA activities to the PDCA-cycle was made apparent.

Next HEI representatives worked in pairs, completing two lines of the framework on quality aspects on programme level: (1) embedding of research in education and (2) student satisfaction. The last session dealt with quality assurance and the use of quantitative data making use of good practice: the Management Information Dashboards of the Technology University of Delft. The training was concluded with drawing up a plan for improvement discussing which actions to be taken on programme level, who to involve, etc. And once again: by completing the PDCA cycle.

In December 2012, the outcomes of Line 1 on IQA will be presented to and discussed with HEI during a final meeting (Report 12REP07). All aspects of IQA worked on in the previous training sessions will be presented in relation to each other. Participating HEI are offered one more chance to bring in concerns to be addressed. Plans for further training can be considered. By the end of the training, HEI should have a comprehensive idea about a good functioning system of IQA. The handbook IQA for HEI will be finalized conveniently bringing together tools to further develop IQA within HEI.

### ***12SUB11 – Training HEI and ANQA on EQA (11 & 12 October 2012)***

In a training (12SUB11) both HEI and ANQA staff will develop competencies for carrying out (HEI) and coordinate (ANQA) pilots on EQA. The training will cover the understanding of the framework, starting the process of writing the self-evaluation report and actually writing it, organising the actual audit, and developing a handbook for EQA. The training will be continued in December 2012 (day 3/3).

#### ***Day 1 – Organisational aspects of an institutional audit (Delft & NVAO)***

As mentioned before, the first day of this training continued with IQA and gradually proceeds towards EQA. This training session was set up as a discussion rather than a workshop. Agenda of the session as based on tips and tricks that were derived from the experiences of the Technology University of Delft with the institutional audits (both the pilot in 2008 and the formal audit in 2011). Whenever necessary or desirable, the perspective of the NVAO on these experiences was addressed. And obviously, both the pilots in YSU and YSMU were discussed at length.

Organisational aspects of an institutional audit, were dealt with in two sessions: (1) Preparing the institutional audit – from zero to SER, and (2) Which are the key elements in preparing the audit? How are these elements planned in a timely schedule? Which stakeholders are involved and why? What is an audit trail and how do HEI prepare for audit trails? What are the dos and don'ts when meeting the panel? Which follow-up is given to the institutional audit and why is the formalisation of this follow-up necessary? By the end of the day, HEI decided on the important steps in organising an institutional audit.

#### ***Day 2 – European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)(NVAO)***

The aims of the training were twofold:

- To provide participants with knowledge on Part 1 of the ESG within the context of the European QA landscape;
- To increase the understanding of participants with regard to the implementation of Part 1 of the ESG in their own HEIs.

The programme is attached as Annex 6.I. The participants included faculty from Yerevan State Medical University (YSMU) and Yerevan State University (YSU) as well as staff members from ANQA. A provisional participants list was provided. However, changes in participation occurred during the day and some ANQA staff members were present but not included on the participants list. Some participants were familiar with the ESG, others were not. The majority of participants were working on the self-evaluation report for the institutional audit whilst a few participants were preparing the self-evaluation report for programme accreditation. As a consequence the group work and ensuing discussions focused on the institutional audit. The participants who stayed for the whole training were well motivated and showed an eagerness to learn about the ESG and to implement these in their own institutional setting.

In the morning, the training sessions focused on an overview of the European QA landscape, the position of the ESG Part 1 within this landscape, and how the ESG Part 1 are related to the ANQA criteria for institutional and programme accreditation. For the latter session two groups were formed; one group who were preparing for the institutional audit related the ESG part 1 to the ANQA institutional accreditation criteria. The other group did the same with the ANQA programme accreditation criteria. The results showed that in general participants were able to understand the ESG Part 1 and their relationship with the ANQA criteria (see Annex 6.II). There was some minor disagreement within the groups about whether a particular criterion should be related to a certain standard of the ESG or not. Also there was some misunderstanding about terminology, e.g. information systems were interpreted by a few participants in a IT setting instead of the ESG meaning. But these discussions proved to be useful for a better understanding of the ESG and their relationship with the ANQA criteria.

After lunch the implementation of the ESG part 1 in YSMU and YSU formed the core part of the discussions. The remaining participants were preparing for the institutional audit. Hence a YSMU group and a YSU group were formed. They were asked to discuss and write down the implementation problems that they experienced in their HEI for each of the ESG Part 1 standards. The results were then presented plenary by each group. This led to the overview in Annex 6.III. As can be seen from the overview the major problems relate to policy and procedures, information systems, assessment of students, and teaching staff. Particularly the latter two standards generated much discussion and the trainer was asked how very specific aspects (e.g. promotion system of teachers, workload measurements and assessments) were arranged in other countries.

Due to lack of time (the other training had already finished) and, after a long week, clearly visible training fatigue among participants it was decided not to discuss possible solutions to the implementation problems anymore. Nevertheless, participants expressed that they found the training useful.

#### ***12SUB12 – E-train: Train the Trainer (11 & 12 October 2012)***

The aim of the two-day training was to provide ANQA staff and panel members with tools which they can use when designing and implementing an external reviewer training programme. After an introductory session on the national frameworks and quality assurance documents, trainer skills and attributes were discussed in smaller groups. In subsequent sessions, participants' needs were assessed, and aims and outcomes were defined for the training programme. As a group it was decided what knowledge, skills, etc. should be covered. During the second day of the training, the focus was on matching learning outcomes and delivery methods to materials. Topics covered include: aim of session, material to be covered and how it will be delivered (ppt, group work, role play, etc), learning outcome(s), and explanation of how the session will be conducted. A last session dealt with the pros and cons of assessment and/or feedback to participants.

At the end of both the conference and the various training sessions, participants were invited to fill in the evaluation forms on paper (conference) and on line (training). The results of the surveys are not available yet; they will be analysed at the next meeting with ANQA (12COM06).

## Observations

- The main observations are listed on pages 1-2 and concern:
  1. Ambitions and expectations;
  2. Academic leadership;
  3. International projects and experts;
  4. ANQA staff.
  
- Stakeholders' opinions on the model of quality assurance were touched upon although it was not the main focus of the conference. Even so, recurrent concerns include the overlap in frameworks for both institution and programme accreditation, the large number of criteria and standards, the system based on institutional accreditation versus the more common model starting with programme assessment, the independence and expertise of Armenian experts/panel members, and the tight time schedule for accreditation. These issues will be dealt with in the ARQATA pilots, and result in recommendations by the end of the project.
- Once more, it became apparent that more time is needed for the accreditation process at large and the ARQATA pilots in particular. By the end of Q-week, it was decided to postpone the pilots with three months i.e. visits in June 2013 (instead of March 2013). An Amendment to the contract is being proposed.
  
- It is good to notice that even at the level of the prime minister Armenia comes to recognize the importance of good higher education in direction relation to a knowledge(-based) economy within a broader, European oriented context. The government not only wants to enhance the quality of Armenian educational programmes; it also aims at differentiating between universities filtering out those which do not deliver quality.
- All stakeholders including HEIs have to work through an ambiguous situation: on the one hand, accreditation procedures are considered time-consuming with little added value; on the other, audits and assessments are expected to consolidate one's position. Especially the established HEIs hope to benefit from accreditation although they also seem to be somehow lacking in a self-critical attitude. Against this background, it is regrettable that the State Engineering University of Armenia (SEUA) does not continue in Line 2 of the ARQATA project as there is evidence of good practice.
- It remains unclear how well the smaller and private HEIs are prepared for the process of accreditation. During Q-week they remained somewhat aloof. This is definitely the case with private HEIs which feel uncertain about what to expect.
- Faculty still seem to operate in relative isolation and with a large degree of freedom. In order to make quality assurance a success, faculty needs to work as a team. They should be open for necessary changes, student evaluations, curriculum evaluations etc.
- Quality assurance staff are very involved and eager to participate in the ARQATA project. They certainly are crucial in the further development of an Armenian quality culture but their efforts are fruitless without the full commitment of the academic leaders.
  
- The National Qualifications framework is potentially confusing to reviewers and HEIs, since it does not seem to reflect the Dublin descriptors. It is markedly different in format from other NQFs, and also includes references to staff and to linguistic skills which do not seem entirely appropriate in a document of this kind, but this might well be a cultural matter.
- The ANQA manual is very detailed in prescribing the process for review and reporting. The pilots will be used to test whether such rigid procedures are effective and efficient.
  
- The responses to the pre-course questionnaire for 'Train the Trainer', made clear that some participants thought that the training to be delivered was reviewer training (even though the aims and outcomes had been communicated to them). This may have been simply due to lack of clarity in the pre-course information, or it might reflect lack of clarity in the understanding where ANQA stands in the process of building capacity for reviews. Some participants may have assumed that since they had not already received reviewer training, they would be offered this *before* train the trainer.
- Not all participants of 'Train the Trainer' had the same level of knowledge and skills in areas such as communication skills, learning styles, adult learning. It may be worthwhile to carry out a more detailed pre-course questionnaire to determine whether participants need such elements in the training.



- At present, there is a lack of sufficiently trained experts. Armenian reviewers are being trained as reviewers and participating as such in other projects (Tempus) but this is not done in a consistent way. And it is doubtful whether the ‘Train the Trainer’ session will solve that problem in the near future. In fact, although it has been clear from the onset what the E-train project involves, some participants and even ANQA management were not fully aware of the objectives of the training. This is all the more surprising as the training is explicitly part of the ARQATA project (visit 6). To this purpose ANQA management was present at the dissemination conference of the E-train project in Madrid in June 2012. Given the confusion and misunderstanding about the objectives of the ‘Train the Trainer’ session, it is all the more urgent to give a follow-up on the training and for ANQA to start with the actual training of experts.
- There seems to be a basic understanding of the ESG Part 1 and how these are related to the ANQA criteria. As the ESG have only 7 standards (and the ANQA criteria have many) a discussion on major implementation problems under these headings proved useful. Implementation problems are mainly related to policy and procedures, assessment of students, QA of teaching staff and information systems.
- The group work on implementation problems showed a difference in critical attitude between both HEIs. Whilst one faculty were quite straightforward in naming the implementation problems, the other faculty were rather descriptive and more hesitant in mentioning problems.
- By now, the process of Plan-Do-Check-Act is a familiar concept for quality assurance staff, not yet for faculty. Using this four-step model though for improving the quality is far from common practice.
- The combination of various trainings and a major conference within one week seemed to be efficient from an organisational perspective. However, from a perspective of training effectiveness and span of attention of participants it was less beneficial. Indeed, it has been a long and rather demanding week for all participants, especially for the representatives of both YSU and YSMU being involved in both the conference and all training sessions. Even so participants were well motivated and eager to contribute even when on occasions people had to leave due to prior engagements. Also on Friday afternoon, only half of the participants were present at the training session on ESG.
- The exercises in the various training sessions depended on some basic knowledge of the ANQA accreditation process and participants varied in their preparedness for this.
- A recurrent observation is that ANQA is very critical about international experts using their own good practice as reference. These experts should not overemphasise their home experience as it might hinder the further development of the QA system in Armenian HEIs (cf. 12REP01). Even so, ANQA needs to accept that international experts can contribute to the further development of Armenian higher education by explaining their choices in QA matters. That is their specific expertise. International experts cannot be expected to be fully familiar with the Armenian context. It is up to ANQA and HEIs to discuss the various possibilities presented to them, and make them fit for purpose if relevant. In order to avoid future disappointment and possible misunderstandings it is essential to agree on these terms of cooperation.
- Communication between ANQA, HEIs and experts/panel members is mainly on the level of management. ANQA staff members and quality assurance HEI staff are hardly involved. This is not conducive for the guidance and assistance of HEIs in the process of accreditation.
- Knowing your participants is a critical part of any training. This was not possible as an adequate participants list was not available prior to the training, a pre-questionnaire could therefore not be sent, and participants changed during the day. As a consequence it was not possible to adapt the training to the level of experience of participants. This has been observed at all previous occasions.
- The translation by ANQA staff members was excellent. However, the time taken by translations (including translations of discussions among participants) means that the discussions can hardly go in-depth. In the next stage of the project, this might cause problems.
- ANQA staff members could not really participate in the group work on implementation problems in HEIs. However, they were able to fully participate in the previous parts of the training.
- Again a cd with the conference documents was distributed. On the occasion of the March seminar, it has already been remarked upon that offering a cd might not be conducive for the use of the project website as interactive medium (cf. 12REP02).

- A survey on paper was available for the conference, not for the various training sessions. For the training a survey was carried out via the website but at a rather late stage.
- It is not clear in how far ANQA follows up on the recommendations within the ARQATA project. During the December meeting ANQA and NVAO will go through all recommendations and actions taken and/or to be taken.

## **Recommendations**

- The main recommendations are listed on pages 1-2 and concern:
  1. Ambitions and expectations;
  2. Academic leadership;
  3. International projects and experts;
  4. ANQA staff.
- Academic leaders should make good use of the external force of circumstances (accreditation) to carry the HEIs through the inevitable changes resulting from quality assurance (quality enhancement). Now is the momentum for change.
- With so many small and unique programmes, it is advisable to opt for clustering when assessing the quality of these programmes.
- For HEIs with more branches it might be more efficient to include these in the institutional audit provided they also opt for programme assessment, if only at random.
- Faculty need to be responsible for the quality assurance at programme level with reference to earlier comments on academic leadership. As a consequence, faculty should also take the lead in writing the self-evaluation report on programme level. Reference can be made to the self-evaluation report on the institutional level to avoid overlap.
- It is clear that HEIs have still much to work on policy and procedures, assessment of students, QA of teaching staff, and information systems. Therefore it seems logical to concentrate efforts (either within or outside of ARQATA) on these issues.
- In working with the HEIs it should be emphasised that international practices can be useful to look at but should always be adapted to the local context. It can be harmful if an international practice is taken out of context to legitimise a certain choice within the HEI.
- More attention may be needed to foster a self-critical attitude in some HEIs as became apparent in some training sessions.
- Also smaller and private HEIs need to be involved in all quality assurance matters. If need be, a specific strategy might be developed in order to ensure that also these HEIs are well prepared to go through the accreditation process.
- In order to assure that enough qualified reviewers are available, ANQA needs to set up a policy plan for the recruitment and training of experts. Urgent action needs to be taken if one wants to avoid that HEIs are better informed about QA matters than their peers. This issue needs to be addressed in the next meeting ANQA-NVAO in December 2012 (12COM06).
- More training on the content and on the operation of the EQA process is required, both for those who will be reviewers (panel members) and those who will train reviewers.
- It is necessary to clarify which documents should be used to inform reviewers and trainers (e.g. the ANQA accreditation manual) and these should be easily available on the ANQA website.
- ANQA staff members should be allowed to take full responsibility as process managers for each individual assessment procedure.
- For future trainings ANQA needs to deliver an accurate participants list prior to the training, enabling a pre-questionnaire and a more tailor-made training. That also enables trainers to limit the amount of participants as more people tend to attend the meetings than agreed upon. Also participants are not always matching the requirements. This has been recommended before.
- Translation hinders an effective dialogue if trainings go more in-depth and require an intensive dialogue between participants and trainer (which would have been the case if the training would have touched on the possible solutions for implementation problems). In such cases it should be investigated whether only participants who are sufficiently proficient in English can be allowed to participate. They could then inform their colleagues in their HEI. The ARQATA project management and/or ANQA staff members could monitor whether this knowledge transfer indeed takes place.



- For future trainings there may be a need to clearly define the role of ANQA staff as participants in the trainings. It is not clear whether HEI representatives feel less open when future assessors are in their midst.
- ANQA coordinators are involved in the organisation of various activities. During the training sessions, however, they should not be preoccupied with organisational matters so as to allow them to fully benefit from the training. Again, this has been touched upon before (cf. 12REP01).

**ANNEX 1 – Time and Activity Line**

Separate attachment (dated 14 November 2012).

## **ANNEX 2 – Brief reports on the meetings (12COM05)**

### **1 Meeting ANQA – NVAO Yerevan, 8-11 October 2012**

As is the standard procedure, ANQA and NVAO meet at the occasion of every event (12COM05) to discuss the progress of the ARQATA project. Given the tight schedule of both the conference and the numerous training sessions during Q-week, various shorter meetings were held in-between other activities.

Outcomes:

- Postponement of the pilots with three months: June 2013 instead of March 2013. HEIs clearly need more time to prepare for writing the SERs. As a result also the roundtable conference with the presentation of the outcomes of the pilots needs to be postponed: September/October 2013 instead of June 2013.
- Amendment 4 deals with the postponement of the pilots and the roundtable conference, and will be part of the present report on Q-week. (12REP06)
- The interim report (12REP05) covering stage 1 of the project will be commented on before the second international visit (end October 2012).

Other issues raised:

- Communication with HEIs regarding the pilots.
- Composition of the panels for both the pilots.
- Delegation for the Swiss visit i.c. representative of YSMU.
- Updating the ARQATA website.
- ANQA reports: the first assessment reports both on programme and institutional level are written by ANQA coordinators and translated into English. These will be sent to NVAO.

### **2 ANQA Board Meeting Yerevan, 8 October 2012**

Topics discussed:

- Accreditation Committee: the procedure envisaged is in line with the ECA principles keeping in mind that the criteria for independence and expertise are being met.
- Stakeholders: Involvement of all stakeholders in a systematic way – and especially student involvement – contributes to quality assurance and enhancement of quality of all educational programmes. Student centred education is also in line with the Bologna objectives. At present students' voice are taken into account but students do not (yet) take part in the decision taking. It is essential though to include students as full members in review committees/panels; the next stage can be full membership of bodies such as the Accreditation Committee.
- Panels: useful information on the composition of panels is to be found on
  - NVAO-website ([www.nvao.net](http://www.nvao.net)) under heading "panels", in red: "Leidraad eisen panelsamenstelling"(English version): it gives you the English version of our regulations and rules regarding the composition of the panels;
  - ECA-website ([www.eaconsortium.net](http://www.eaconsortium.net)) under heading "Documents", subheading "Main documents", "Principles for the selection of experts". This is the agreement between ECA-partners and consists of principles for the composition of panels for "institutional audits" and "programme evaluations".
- Programmes: the present emphasis in Armenian HE on theoretical learning is slowly shifting towards a more balanced approach according to three leading principles: content, attitude and skills. Programme assessments will certainly look at the way these three principles are dealt with in the respective programmes.
- Quality of HEIs: eight HEIs participated in the ARQATA training sessions on writing SERs. These documents are reviewed by international peers. Many recommendations have been given in order to make the SERs more self-critical, concise and focused. It is too early in the process to comment on

the quality assurance systems of the HEIs; the pilots in two HEIs based on the SERs are yet to start. Also, it is up to the panels – and not NVAO – to audit the HEIs.

### **3 Meeting PIU – NVAO Yerevan, 8-9 October 2012**

Outcomes:

- The payment of the third instalment (20%) will be paid upon receipt of the consent of ANQA with the interim report (12REP05). Comments on the report are expected before the second international visit (end October 2012).

### **4 Visit & Meeting SEUA – ANQA – NVAO Yerevan, 9 October 2012**

Topics discussed:

- Historical overview of SEUA as provider of HE from Soviet time until now. Major changes started in the early 1990's with the introduction of strategic plans for five years, the credit system (ECTS), and the redesign of the programmes to meet the Bologna standards. SEUA wants to be part of the Bologna process, and focuses on quality enhancement. SEUA management and staff manage to be self-critical as to be able to continue offering good educational programmes.
- SEUA aims at involving its stakeholders in a systematic way. It clearly has a good relationship with the labour market, and continues investing in the relationship with future employers. SEUA also works closely together with schools for attracting students from the very start of their educational career.
- Branches can be included in the institutional audit if Armenian legislation allows it. NVAO does include all locations in the institutional audits because the central management of HEIs are also responsible for the locations, and hence for the quality of all education programmes regardless of the location. As to the NVAO procedure regarding the location(s):
  - The SER for HEI including location(s) is one document and should include information on the location(s) per criteria;
  - The panel does not need to visit the location(s);
  - The HEI delegation the panel talks with should include representatives of a location(s);
  - The panel report on HEI including location(s) will be one document.

If locations are included in the general audit, it is advisable to also opt for programme assessment, if only at random.

- International recognition of the quality of the individual programmes is essential for SEUA graduates. This is the main reason why SEUA seeks international accreditation. NVAO's jurisdiction is restricted to The Netherlands and Flanders. Therefore, NVAO cannot accredit institutions or programmes outside these boundaries. International recognition of institutions or programmes is based on assessments by independent panels preferably including international peers, and accreditation decisions by agencies complying with ESG. (cf. 12REP05)
- Premises visited included new facilities financed by Microsoft.

### **5 Meeting YSU – ANQA – NVAO Yerevan, 9 October 2012**

Topics discussed:

- General outline of the pilot institutional audit.
- Branches and institutional audits. (cf. SEUA)
- Pilot programme assessment: Bachelor in Biology and Master in Applied Biology.
- Composition of both panels for pilots to be further discussed with ANQA. NVAO will provide both chairs.
- Interesting topics for the panel to explore: link between research and education; counselling of students; student assessment.

**6      Meeting YSMU – ANQA – NVAO**  
**Yerevan, 10 October 2012**

Topics discussed:

- General outline of the pilot institutional audit.
- Pilot programme assessment: general medical programme (5 years).
- Composition of both panels for pilots to be further discussed with ANQA. NVAO will provide both chairs.
- Interesting topics for the panel to explore: link between research and education; international WHO standards



## ANNEX 3 – Programme National Stakeholders’ Conference (12SUB09)

8-9 October, 2012

THE STATES OF ARTS IN QUALITY ASSURANCE IN ARMENIAN TERTIARY EDUCATION  
ANQA II BIENNIAL STAKEHOLDER CONFERENCE

### AGENDA

Start	End	
		<i>Date: Monday, October 8, 2012</i> <i>Venue: Yerevan State Medical University, Main Administrative Building</i> <i>Chairperson: Alexander Grigoryan</i>
9:00	9:30	<b>Registration</b>
9:30	9:45	Opening note -Ruben Topchyan, ANQA Director
9:45	10:00	Welcome note -Armen Ashotyan, RA Minister of Education and Science
10:00	10:30	Quality Assurance: A Must and A Chance for Armenian Higher Education - Karl Dittrich, NVAO President
10:30	11:00	Quality Assurance: An external obligation or An Institutional Need- P. Rullmann, Education Quality Assurance at Delft University of Technology
11:00	11:30	<b>Coffee Break</b>
11:30	12:00	ANQA’s approaches: Accreditation Process - Ruben Topchyan, ANQA Director
12:00	12:30	Impact of External Quality Assurance on the Tertiary Level Education System in the Republic of Armenia – Susanna Kharakhanyan, Head of ANQA Policy Development and Implementation Unit
12:30	13:00	Recognition and Mutual Recognition of Quality Assurance Results - Rolf Heusser, President of the European Consortium for Accreditation
13:00	13:30	A Glance at ANQA State of Arts: reflections of an ENQA expert – Heinz-Ulrich Schmidt, Special Representative, Foundation for International Business Administration Accreditation (FIBAA), Germany
13:30	14:30	<b>Lunch</b>
14:30	15:00	Reflections of Expert Panel Members on the ANQA Approaches to Accreditation - Margarita Shahverdyan/ Edward Hakobyan
15:00	16:00	Reflections of Higher Education Establishments on the ANQA Approaches to Accreditation – Sargis Tovmasyan, Yerevan State University of Architecture and Construction
16:00	16:30	<b>Coffee Break</b>
16:30	17:00	Reflections of Students on the State of Arts at Higher Education Institutions and the Role of ANQA – Tatevik Sargsyan, Students’ Voice
17:00	18:00	Discussion and conclusions Chairperson – Alexander Grigoryan

THE STATES OF ARTS IN QUALITY ASSURANCE IN ARMENIAN TERTIARY EDUCATION  
ANQA II BIENNIAL STAKEHOLDER CONFERENCE

## AGENDA

Start	End				
		<p><i>Date: Tuesday, October 9, 2012</i>  <i>Venue: Yerevan State Medical University, Main Administrative Building</i>  <i>Chairperson: Ruben Topchyan</i></p>			
9:00	9:30	<b>Registration</b>			
9:30	9:45	<p>Morning Session            Chairperson's opening note – Ruben Topchyan, chairperson</p>			
9:45	10:15	<p>Development and Integration of Internal Quality Assurance Systems –Mariam Movsisyan, Armenian State Agrarian University</p>			
10:15	10:45	<p>Employer - University Cooperation within the Frames of Quality Assurance - Arsen Ghazaryan, The Union of Manufacturers and Businessmen (Employers) of Armenia</p>			
10:45	11:15	<b>Coffee Break</b>			
11:15	11:45	<p>Students' Role in the Internal Quality Assurance Processes</p>			
11:45	12:15	<p>Internal Quality Assurance Mechanisms: ANQA reflections – Anushavan Makaryan/Anna Karapetyan, ANQA</p>			
12:15	13:00	<p>Writing of self-assessment report- Birgit Hanny, Yana Moehren, ASIIN</p>			
13:00	13:30	<p>Discussion and Conclusions            Chairperson – Ruben Topchyan</p>			
13:30	14:30	<b>Lunch</b>			
14:30	14:40	<p>Presentation of ARQATA project - Michèle Wera/Ruben Topchyan</p>			
14:40	15:40	<p>Presentation of the outcomes of the pilot SER - Irma Franssen/ Susanna Karakhanyan, Armen Budaghyan, Hayk Mamijanyan</p>			
15:40	17:30	<p><i>Training the students in internal quality assurance implementation</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>I.Franssen NVAO</i></p>	<p><i>Training the faculty in internal quality assurance implementation</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>K. Dittrich, NVAO</i></p>	<p><i>Training the HEI management in Internal Quality Assurance implementation</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>P. Rullmann Delft University of Technology</i></p>	<p><i>Training the quality assurance coordinators in Internal Quality Assurance implementation</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>J. Brakels Delft University of Technology</i></p>
17:30	17:45	<b>Coffee Break</b>			
17:45	18:00	<p>Conclusions and Discussion            Closing note - Ruben Topchyan</p>			

## **ANNEX 4 – Training HEI in IQA Implementation (12SUB10)**

### **QUALITY ENHANCEMENT ON PROGRAMME LEVEL**

**Jenny BRAKELS,  
Delft University of Technology**

***Wednesday 10 October 2012***

#### **Quality Objectives**

Quality enhancement on programme level is not the same as having a sound quality assurance system on paper. The main objective is not the system as such, but it is the quality of the programme. A sound system is supportive of this goal: the instruments chosen have to be fit for purpose (related to the quality targets), stakeholders have to be involved (leave it to professionals wherever possible) and results have to be analysed and have to be given a proper follow-up.

#### **Participants**

15 representatives including students of YSU and YSMU, responsible for quality assurance at programme level (biology and general medicine)  
+ ANQA observers

#### **Introduction**

09.00 – 09.15 Short introduction of participants  
09.15 – 09.45 Short introductory presentation to the Delft QA plan  
09.45 – 10.00 Questions and discussion

#### **Quality enhancement on programme level – session 1**

10.00 – 11.00 Introduction Quick Scan: a quick insight in current state of affairs on programme level  
In small groups: complete tab1 and tab 2 quick scan for one of your programmes  
Discussing results - Insights? Usefulness? What would be the follow-up? Frame it to QA cycle

11.00 – 11.15 Short break

11.15 – 11.45 Introducing tab4 - involvement of stakeholders both internal and external  
Plenary completion of matrix  
Discussing organisation structure TU Delft

11.45 – 12.30 Introduction of policy on student assessment and examination  
Topics to be addressed in a policy document on student assessment on programme (or even Faculty) level?  
In small groups: discuss the topics and come to an index  
Presentation of findings - introducing format of TU Delft  
Who are involved in this process? Plenary exercise - completion of chapter 1

12.30 – 12.45 Round up morning sessions - framing activities to QA cycle: quality of the programme is main target; stakeholder involvement and quality of assessment and examination are key elements!

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch break

## Quality enhancement on programme level – session 2

- 13.30 – 13.45 Intermezzo: different instruments for different purposes
- 13.45 – 14.30 Framework quality handbook  
In pairs: complete two lines of the framework for the quality aspects programme, embedding of research in education and student satisfaction > the lecturer has to play a role  
Discussing outcomes: different roles of lecturer when it comes to QA and use of handbook in framing QA activities.
- 14.30 – 15.15 Quality assurance and the use of quantitative data  
Discussing findings and presentation of Management Information Dashboards TU Delft (definitions are key as well as targets)
- 15.15 – 15.30 Short break
- 15.30 – 15.40 Short case introduction
- 15.40 – 16.30 Draw up a plan for improvement. Which actions should be taken on programme level?  
Discussing plans: who is involved, results in short time? Does it imply adjustment of Quality definition? Make PDCA complete!
- 16.30 – 17.15 Final issues  
Round up of the day: important aspects of QA on programme level (PDCA)

## **ANNEX 5 – Training HEI in IQA Implementation (12SUB10) & Training HEI and ANQA on EQA (12SUB11)**

### **ORGANISATION OF AN INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT**

**Jenny BRAKELS,  
Delft University of Technology**

***Thursday 11 October 2012***

#### **Quality Objectives**

Organisational aspects of an institutional audit. Which are the key elements in preparing the audit? How are these elements be planned in a timely schedule? Which stakeholders are involved? Why? How do you prepare for an audit trail? Which follow-up is given to the institutional audit? Why is the formalisation of this follow-up necessary? These and similar questions will be discussed. At the end of the day the group will have decided on the important steps in organising an institutional audit.

#### **Participants**

15 representatives including students of YSU and YSMU, responsible for quality assurance at institutional level + ANQA-staff as observers

#### **Working method**

This session is set up as a discussion group rather than a workshop. Agenda of the session is based on tips and tricks that are derived from the experiences of TU Delft with the institutional audits. Whenever necessary or desirable, the perspective of the NVAO on these experiences will be addressed.

#### **Introduction**

- 09.00 – 09.15 Short introduction of participants
- 09.15 – 09.45 Short introductory presentation to the institutional audits held at TU Delft (both the pilot and the formal audit in 2011)
- 09.45 – 10.00 Questions and discussion

#### **Preparing the institutional audit – from zero to SER**

- 10.00 – 12.30 Which actions should be taken in order to prepare a clear SER? Topics that will be discussed are for example the meeting with HEI top management, profile of HEI, time planning, stakeholder involvement, roles and responsibilities etc. Participants will prepare and discuss a time schedule for their own HEI. Important dates in this schedule are:
  - 11 October 2012 Training ARQATA
  - 18 December 2012 Final training ARQATA
  - 31 January 2013 Submission of SER
  - 11 March 2013 Institutional Audit – visit panel

- 12.30 – 13.00 Round up morning part: main lessons and most important steps so far.

- 13.00 – 14.00 Lunch break

#### **Preparing the institutional audit – from SER to a successful audit**

- 14.00 – 17.00 Which aspects should be taken into account in preparing the visit of the panel? What can be expected during the visit? Should you prepare your faculty and students for the visit? If so, how can this be done? What are the do's and don'ts when meeting the panel? What is an audit trail? How would you give adequate follow-up to the feedback of the audit panel? These topics will be discussed and transferred to important steps in the process. A list of do's and don'ts will be drawn up.
- 17.00 – 17.30 Final issues  
Round up of the day: important steps in organising an institutional audit



## **ANNEX 6.I – Training HEI and ANQA on EQA (12SUB11)**

### **ESG Training Programme**

**Friday 12 October 2012, Yerevan**

**(M. Frederiks, NVAO)**

#### **Aims of the workshop**

- To provide participants with knowledge on Part 1 of the ESG within the context of the European QA landscape
- To increase the understanding of participants with regard to the implementation of Part 1 of the ESG in their own HEIs

#### **Topics to be covered**

- Overview of the European QA landscape
- Part 1 of the ESG in the European QA context
- Part 1 of ESG and the ANQA accreditation manual
- Bottlenecks in the implementation of Part 1 of ESG
- Towards effective implementation of Part 1 of ESG

#### **Learning outcomes for participants**

At the end of the programme participants should:

1. Know the main elements of European QA landscape (LO 1)
2. Know the significance of the ESG Part 1 within the European QA landscape (LO 2)
3. Be able to relate the ESG Part 1 to the institutional and programme accreditation standards of ANQA (LO 3)
4. Be able to identify the main bottlenecks for implementation of standards in your own HEI (LO 4)
5. Be aware of possible solutions for bottlenecks in the implementation of standards (LO 5)

Time	Title	Format
09:00	<b>Introductions</b>	Plenary group information swap
	<b>1. Workshop aims and outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ground rules</li> <li>• House-keeping</li> <li>• Outline of the day</li> </ul>	Leader input
09:30	<b>2. Overview of the European QA landscape and Part 1 of ESG</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of the European QA landscape</li> <li>• European Standards and Guidelines for QA, Part 1 within the European QA context</li> </ul>	Leader input with plenary discussion  LO 1  LO 2
11:00	<b>Break</b>	
11:30	<b>3. Part 1 of ESG and the ANQA accreditation manual</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are the ESG Part1 covered in the institutional accreditation standards in the ANQA accreditation manual?</li> </ul>	Small group work and then plenary discussion  LO 3
12:30	Lunch	
13:15	<b>4. Bottlenecks in the implementation of standards</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which standards require special attention in your HEI?</li> <li>• Which bottlenecks do you experience when implementing the standards?</li> </ul>	Small group work and then plenary discussion  LO 4
14:45	<b>Break</b>	
15:15	<b>5. Towards effective implementation of standards</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying good practices</li> <li>• Proposing solutions for implementation problems</li> </ul>	Small group work and then plenary discussion  LO 5
16:45	<b>6. Conclusions and wrap up</b>	Plenary group information swap
17:00	<b>End of day</b>	

## ANNEX 6.II – Training HEI and ANQA on EQA (12SUB11)

### Session 3. ESG Part 1 and ANQA *institutional* accreditation criteria

ESG Part 1	ANQA <i>institutional</i> accreditation criteria
1.1 <i>Policy and procedures for quality assurance</i>	I , II X IX
1.2 <i>Approval, monitoring and periodic review of programmes and awards</i>	I II X III IV VI (IX)
1.3 <i>Assessment of students</i>	I II X III IV (VI) IX
1.4 <i>Quality assurance of teaching staff</i>	I II X V VI III IX
1.5 <i>Learning resources and student support</i>	I II X VI III IV VII (VIII)
1.6 <i>Information systems</i>	I II X VII IX IV
1.7 <i>Public information</i>	I II X VIII IV

### Session 3. ESG Part 1 and ANQA *programme* accreditation standards

ESG Part 1	ANQA <i>programme</i> accreditation criteria
1.1 <i>Policy and procedures for quality assurance</i>	All criteria VII
1.2 <i>Approval, monitoring and periodic review of programmes and awards</i>	VII I III V
1.3 <i>Assessment of students</i>	VII IV III
1.4 <i>Quality assurance of teaching staff</i>	VII II V
1.5 <i>Learning resources and student support</i>	VII VI
1.6 <i>Information systems</i>	VII VI
1.7 <i>Public information</i>	VI VII All other criteria

## ANNEX 6.III – Training HEI and ANQA on EQA (12SUB11)

### Session 4. Bottlenecks when implementing standards

ESG Part 1	Bottlenecks/problems in implementation
1.8 <i>Policy and procedures for quality assurance</i>	<p>No culture of developing QA procedures</p> <p>No QA handbook</p> <p>QA procedures not properly formulated</p> <p>Plans available but implementation not clear</p> <p>Weak involvement of stakeholders</p>
1.9 <i>Approval, monitoring and periodic review of programmes and awards</i>	<p>Procedures not well documented and sustained</p> <p>Learning outcomes not well defined on bachelor level; medical education will introduce 1 integrative degree (combined bachelor and master), therefore development of separate LOs for bachelor not considered necessary</p> <p>Plans/regulations finished but implementation in progress</p>
1.10 <i>Assessment of students</i>	<p>Oral examinations/assessment methods in progress</p> <p>Testing system is not good yet (e.g. how to assess communication skills?)</p> <p>Assessing student involvement in research</p> <p>Contradiction between expectations regarding oral and written examinations</p> <p>Examination results not always transparent for students</p>
1.11 <i>Quality assurance of teaching staff</i>	<p>Teachers are not obliged to advance their knowledge</p> <p>Small proportion of teachers do not work on self-development/difficult to motivate teachers for training</p> <p>Teacher promotion mechanisms not (always) in use</p>
1.12 <i>Learning resources and student support</i>	<p>No career advising centre for students (not regulated)</p>



1.13 <i>Information systems</i>	No central information system In development No electronic documentation system
1.14 <i>Public information</i>	Absence of evaluation of effectiveness of providing public information

## **ANNEX 7 – Train the Trainer programme for ARQATA E-TRAIN**

### **A programme for agency staff and panel members who will be training external reviewers for the ANQA.**

Participants will be asked to fill out a brief questionnaire and submit it to the training leader 10 days before the programme. The questionnaire will ask participants about their training background and what are the most important things for them to achieve in this training programme. Participants will be expected to know the agency's quality assurance review process in detail and to bring with them any relevant manual, handbook, codes of practice, qualifications framework, etc., which will inform the agency's training.

#### ***Aim of the workshop***

- To provide agency staff and panel members with tools which they can use when designing and implementing an external reviewer training programme.

#### ***Topics to be covered***

- Review of national documentation for quality assurance
- Skills and aptitudes required of a trainer – personal strengths and areas for development
- Assessing participant needs; 'what's in it for them?'
- Setting aims and outcomes for the training programme; deciding what knowledge, skills, etc. should be covered
- Developing relevant training materials and structuring the programme
- Should the participants be assessed?
- Evaluating the programme

#### ***Learning outcomes for participants***

At the end of the programme participants should:

1. be aware of their own skills as a trainer and have identified areas for development (LO 1)
2. be aware of the need to know their participants and the material to be communicated (LO 2)
3. be able to write session aims and outcomes (LO 3)
4. be able to choose delivery methods which suit the participants and the material (LO 4)
5. be able to develop training materials (notes, visuals) which deliver the outcomes (LO 5)
6. consider assessment tools, if required (LO 6)
7. understand the importance of evaluating the programme (LO 7).

Timings in the programme are provisional and will be amended in the light of participant needs

## DAY 1

Time	Title	Format
1000	<b>Introductions</b>	Plenary group information swap
	<b>1 Workshop aims and outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Journal or learning log.</li> <li>• Ground rules</li> <li>• House-keeping</li> <li>• Outline of the day</li> </ul>	Leader input
1030	<b>2 Recap on national quality assurance documents</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ANQA Accreditation Manual</li> <li>• European Standards and Guidelines</li> <li>• ANQA Strategic Plan (for background only)</li> </ul>	Leader input with plenary discussion
1115	<b>Break</b>	
1130	<b>3 Trainer skills and attributes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training styles</li> <li>• Attributes of an effective trainer</li> <li>• The participant's main objectives for this workshop</li> <li>• The participant's project for today</li> <li>• Choosing a buddy</li> </ul>	Leader input followed by small group discussion. Participants will be encouraged to identify for themselves one objective or area of preparation to take forward through the day. They will be encouraged to choose a buddy for the day – a person they can bounce ideas off, try out ideas, ask for advice/encouragement. LO 1
1215	<b>4 Participant profile and needs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who are the participants?</li> <li>• What do they need to know?</li> <li>• How will they learn most effectively?</li> </ul>	Leader input followed by small group discussion and then work with buddy; <b>each participant to draw up a profile of the people to be trained and to decide what subject matter</b> the training needs to cover. LO 2
1315	Lunch	
1400	<b>5 From subject matter to learning outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to construct an effective learning outcome</li> </ul>	Leader input followed by small group discussion and/or buddy conference. <b>Each participant to write learning outcomes for some of the subject matter</b> identified above. LO 3
1530	<b>Break</b>	
1600	<b>6 From outcomes to session design</b> <b>(a) Structure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to structure and sequence training</li> <li>• How to decide how to deliver the training</li> <li>• What resources are necessary?</li> </ul>	Leader input followed by plenary brainstorm: what imaginative ideas do you have for delivering the material? Ideas to be captured for distribution. Followed by short plenary discussion on what ideas are appropriate for different outcomes. <b>Each participant to decide what delivery method</b> is appropriate for the learning outcomes identified and to begin to think about resources. LO 4 and 5
1700	<b>6 From outcomes to session design</b> <b>(b) Effective delivery</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication skills</li> <li>• How to deal with difficult situations</li> </ul>	Leader input followed by small group exercises
1800 (latest)	<b>End of day</b>	

## DAY 2

Time	Title	Format
0900	Introduction to the day	
0915	<b>7 Matching learning outcomes and delivery methods to materials</b>	Leader input followed by individual activity: <b>each participant to write a handout for a participant for one training session</b> describing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aim of the session</li> <li>• Material to be covered and how it will delivered (ppt, group work, role play, etc)</li> <li>• Learning outcome(s)</li> <li>• Explanation of how the session will be conducted.</li> </ul> Discuss with buddy and improve if necessary. Buddy acts as a potential participant on your programme! LO 4 and 5
1045	Break	
1115	<b>8 Does the training need to be assessed?</b>	Plenary discussion of the pros and cons of assessment and/or feedback to participants. Suggestions for how training might appropriately be assessed or feedback given. Capture for later distribution. LO 6
1145	<b>9 It's not over until the evaluation is done!</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The training cycle</li> <li>•Transfer of training to the real review situation</li> </ul>	Leader input: the importance of getting feedback from your participants and using it to improve the programme in the future. Each participant to construct a list of questions for a feedback questionnaire. LO 7
1245	Lunch	
1345	<b>10 Putting learning from this workshop into action</b> How to maximise retention	Leader input and discussion.
1415	<b>11 Summary and next steps</b> <b>12 Action planning</b>	Trainer summary of the day. Plenary or small group sharing of the most important learning points – one from each participant if possible. Where do we need to go next? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a group of trainers</li> <li>• Personally as a trainer for my agency</li> </ul> Personal reflection; formulation of personal next steps and action planning Discussion with buddies
1530	Close	

During the day, participants will build up their own personal portfolio of materials relevant to the reviewer training as follows:

- **a profile of the people to be trained and the subject matter** the training needs to cover
- **learning outcomes for some of the subject matter** identified above
- **the delivery method(s)** appropriate for the learning outcomes identified and initial consideration of resources
- **a handout for a participant for one training session**
- **a list of questions for a feedback questionnaire.**

## **ANNEX 8 – Programme International Visit (12SUB08)**

### **Study Tour in Switzerland 29 October – 2 November 2012**

#### **Objectives**

The objective of the second study tour is to get familiar with the Swiss system of quality assurance in higher education, and to draw lessons from the various meetings and workshops for further use in Armenia. The overall objective of the international visits is to contribute to the further development of an Armenian quality culture.

#### **Delegation**

1. ANQA – Ruben Topchyan, director
2. ANQA – Susanna Karakhanyan, head policy development and implementation unit/deputy director
3. YSU representative – Alexander Grigoryan, deputy rector for academic affairs
4. YSMU representative – Armen Mkrtychyan, assistant professor and senior specialist quality assurance
5. SEUA representative – Eduard Hakobyan, head Electrical Engineering and Electric Drive (and panel chair)
6. YSU student representative – Laura Simonyan, student bachelor Romance-Germanic Philology
7. NVAO – Michèle Wera, senior policy advisor & project manager ARQATA

#### **Programme**

##### *DAY 1 – Sunday 28 October: Zurich & Bern*

- Travel to Bern via Zurich; no official programme

##### *DAY 2 – Monday 29 October: Bern*

- S1 – State Secretariat for Education and Research (SER)
- S2 – Rector's Conference of Swiss Universities (CRUS) & Swiss University Conference (CUS)
- Meeting / Dinner with stakeholders

##### *DAY 3 – Tuesday 30 October: Bern*

- S3 – Swiss Center of Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Higher Education (OAQ)

##### *DAY 4 – Wednesday 31 October: Bern & Lausanne*

- S4 – Student Union (VSS-UNES-USU)
- Travel to Lausanne
- S5 – Visit HEI 1: University of Lausanne

##### *DAY 5 – Thursday 1 November: Lausanne & Zurich*

- S6 – Visit HEI 2: Federal Polytechnic Lausanne
- Travel to Zürich
- S7 – Meeting / Dinner with Rolf Heusser, chairman European Consortium for Accreditation in higher education (ECA)

##### *DAY 6 – Friday 2 November: Zurich*

- S8 – Visit HEI 3: University of Zürich
- Farewell lunch
- Travel home

## ANNEX 9 – Amendment 4

As previously discussed with the director of CfEP PIU on the occasion of Amendment 3, a justification per item is required in order to amend the contract. Also prior approval by ANQA is needed for the suggested changes.

The adjustment has been discussed and agreed upon by both the director of ANQA and the chair of NVAO on Wednesday 10 October 2012 during Q-week. The change concerns the postponement of the pilots on external quality assurance at the explicit request of the universities involved. HEIs need more time to prepare for the self-evaluation reports, and the site visits for the institutional audit and the programme assessment. Obviously, HEIs have underestimated the work involved.

Two activities need to be rescheduled:

- (a) HEIs are not ready for the activity planned in March 2013;
- (b) One activity rescheduled (pilots) causes rescheduling the next activity (conference) as they are interrelated.

The new time line is as follows:

- 1 May 2013: deadline self-evaluation reports (*instead of 1 February*)
- 10-21 June 2013: site visits (first week YSMU and general medicine programme, and second week YSU and two biology programmes) (*instead of March*)

### *Line 2 – EQA*

- Pilots in 2 HEI planned for March 2013
  - To take place in **June 2013** (*three months later*)
- Roundtable conference Report on EQA planned for May 2013
  - To take place in **September/October 2013** (*after the pilots*)

## ANNEX 10 – NVAO Visit 7

### **Subproject 12SUB11**

Training HEI and ANQA on EQA, Nov/Dec 2012

### **Subproject 12SUB13**

Workshop ANQA on QA, Nov/Dec 2012

### **Meeting 12COM06**

Visit 7 – NVAO, Nov/Dec 2012

### **Report 12REP09**

Report on visit and training, December 2012

**LINE 2 – EQA / LINE 3 – ANQA**

NVAO team:

- Rudy Derdelinckx, director and responsible for line 3-ANQA
- Irma Franssen, policy advisor and team member responsible for line 1-IQA and training

### ***Tuesday 18 December 2012***

<arrival>

- meeting ANQA-NVAO: follow up ARQATA project i.e. recommendations & reports
- (2hrs) meeting YSU and YSMU on IQA: outcomes Line 1 on the basis of report on IQA

### ***Wednesday 19 December 2012***

Two concurrent sessions:

- training YSU and YSMU on EQA: feedback on SERs (*Irma Franssen*)
- workshop ANQA on QA (part 1) (*Rudy Derdelinckx*)

### ***Thursday 20 December 2012***

- workshop ANQA on QA (part 2)
- workshop ANQA on external review (part 3)
- meeting ANQA-NVAO: follow up ARQATA project i.e. next steps
- meeting PIU-ANQA-NVAO, if need be

### ***Friday 21 December 2012***

<departure>