



Final Training on QA

Yerevan/The Hague, 30 January 2013

Subproject 12SUB11

Training HEIs and ANQA on EQA, Dec 2012

Subproject 12SUB13

Workshop ANQA on QA, Dec 2012

Meeting 12COM06

Visit 7 – NVAO, Dec 2012

Report 13REP01

Report on visit and training, December 2012/January 2013

LINE 2 – EQA / LINE 3 – ANQA

Subproject 12SUB01

Project Website

ALL LINES

Amendment 12AME04

Amendment 4, December 2012

With this last NVAO visit in 2012, the phase of training sessions in Yerevan has come to an end. During the past ten months – February until December 2012 – the focus in the training programme has gradually shifted from internal to external quality assurance, making sure to link both where appropriate. Starting off with eight universities on internal quality assurance (IQA) in Line 1 of the project, Line 2 continued on external quality assurance (EQA) involving two universities: Yerevan State University (YSU) and Yerevan State Medical University (YSMU). In the next phase, both universities are being prepared to undergo an institutional audit and programme assessments. These pilots are to take place in June 2013.

At the same time, ANQA has been offered guidance and assistance to further professionalize its organisation. During the December visit issues discussed and worked on during the March visit have been finalised, and new internal quality tools are being made fit for purpose. In 2013, ANQA will also prepare for the proof external review scheduled for September 2013.

All training sessions with HEIs and ANQA obviously offered input for the pilots and proof review (EQA). Even so, it is important to realise at all times that there cannot be external quality assurance without internal quality assurance. This has been stated at various occasions, also during Q-week. NVAO's technical assistance is therefore primarily focused on the internal processes of quality assurance for both HEIs and ANQA.

In 2013, NVAO will continue to offer guidance and assistance mainly online. But also the panels and review team will be actively involved in the further development of quality assurance systems and an Armenian quality culture. Feedback sessions by the experts, follow-up sessions with NVAO and the National Stakeholder's Conference in December 2014 offer ample opportunity to do so.

Observations

Meeting HEIs and ANQA on IQA (12SUB10): outcomes Line 1 on the basis of report on IQA (12REP07)

During this final meeting on internal quality assurance the outcomes of Line on IQA were presented and discussed with the eight participating HEIs and ANQA staff members.

The main issues discussed:

Recommendations

- Refocus quality assurance activities on the further development of internal quality assurance;
- 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);
- Faculty need to be responsible for the quality assurance at programme level with reference to earlier comments on academic leadership;
- It is clear that HEIs have still much to work on policy and procedures, assessment of students, QA of teaching staff, and information systems.

Training suggestions for the further implementation of quality assurance in HEIs

- Develop a training policy for HEI staff;
- Make the training material in the QA Toolkit and possibly from other sources fit for purpose according to the HEI's training policy;
- Develop a knowledge circle within HEI with representatives of all programmes;
- Organize a network of HEI quality assurance coordinators.

Evaluation line 1 – IQA in HEIs

At the end of the meeting the participants had the possibility to give three good aspects and three not so good aspects regarding Line 1.

Positive:

- A comprehensive understanding of internal quality insurance in relation to external quality assurance;
- the role the SER and the actual process of writing the SER;
- working with a fixed time table;
- the training sessions with all stakeholders.

Less positive:

- the choice of the two programme accreditations was too late;
- the feedback of the expert panel (visit September) was late;
- the feedback of the expert panel (visit September) was on a general level. The remarks per SER were rather limited.

Training HEIs and ANQA on EQA, Dec 2012 (12SUB11)

Representatives of the Yerevan State University (YSU) and the Yerevan State Medical University (YSMU) and the ANQA coordinators responsible for the 4 pilots (two on institutional level and two on programme level) participated in a final one-day training on EQA. Feedback was given on the first drafts of the self-evaluation reports (SER) on both institutional and programme level. A panel of NVAO staff scrutinized the draft reports and commented on the outline and the texts covering the first criteria of the frameworks. Their written comments were discussed in more detail.

The main issues to take into account when continuing writing the SERs:

1. General remarks
 - General remarks on the text;
 - Remarks on outline SER;
 - Remarks on institutional level;
 - Remarks on programme level;
 - Remarks on annexes.
2. Remarks per SER.

The participants were especially interested in the remarks per SER. The discussions about the remarks were very interesting for all participants. The discussion on detailed level led to a discussion on a higher level, to the level of the general remarks. The discussions made clear again that there is no common understanding of the ANQA framework on institutional level and on programme level. The discussion of the outline SER was less effective. The necessity of making an outline before writing a SER is not a priority for YSMU and YSU. The pressure on writing the SER is evidently too high.

The second part of the training dealt with the actual organisation of the pilots i.e. the external audit/assessment. Topics covered included the composition of the panel and the timetable of the visits. The HEI participants appear to lack relevant information about the actual audit. It seems that YMSU and YSU have no clear idea about the 'ownership' of this process.

Workshop ANQA on QA, Dec 2012 (12SUB13)

The training sessions with ANQA included:

- a One-day workshop on QA (part 1): QA tools continued (12SUB13)
- b Workshop ANQA on QA (part 2): completing the QA handbook (12SUB06/12SUB13)
- c Workshop ANQA on external review (part 3): preparing for the external proof audit (12SUB13)

Ad a and b

In the March 2012 meeting, some tools were presented and elaborated on. The same tools were to be made fit for purpose:

- Guideline assessment theses by the panel
- Description of the domains of the organisation (protocols)
- Flowchart on institutional accreditation
- Agenda board meeting

ANQA has developed their protocols further during the past months. Presently, most of the protocols are finalised. Unfortunately, most of these protocols as well as other documents requested by NVAO were not provided in advance and thus could not be analysed before the workshop. During the meeting some aspects of these protocols were discussed, such as the definitions, the purpose and nature of indicators and targets. Some of the protocols were discussed more in detail such as the protocol for institutional and programme accreditation. ANQA will make some adaptations to the protocols, considering the outcomes and suggestions of the discussions. Other protocols have not been discussed in detail.

Also discussed were the evaluation matrix and the set of questions for accreditation procedures. The evaluation matrix used by NVAO is only an example that presently is not very well suited to ANQA, considering the implementation phase of the Armenian accreditation legislation and procedures.

Ad c

The focus in this workshop was on discussing the European Standards and Guidelines in relation to the ANQA accreditation manual. Each of the standards has been thoroughly analysed and strengths and weaknesses of the ANQA procedures were discussed. The quality assurance framework seems to be a well-defined framework, with properly described underlying procedures, but it is still in an implementation phase and its robustness has still to be proven. First results are promising though.

Attention should be paid to the composition of the Accreditation Committee (independence, international composition), the further development of the internal quality assurance within ANQA, the selection procedure for expert panels and the role of ANQA coordinators and director, and their role during the site visit process. Other points of attention are the development of the review reports, the professionalization of and the instructions for the expert panels, the role of students in the external reviews and the decision making process.

Regarding the ANQA accreditation standards, particular attention has been paid to the high ambition of these standards that could be too high for HEIs considering the present state of Armenian HE. The academic standards on research focus in bachelor's and master's programmes are very ambitious and

could be tough to realise at this moment. The same applies for the research profile of the staff, the resources and the development of internal quality procedures in HEIs. IQA seems to be primarily a task for quality managers and quality assurance staff, rather than fully developed within the whole university staff.

First attempt has been made to define a general outline of a SER. The NVAO SER was discussed and commented. This SER is available on the NVAO website. The outline of the NVAO SER of NVAO might be a good starting point for the development of the ANQA SER. The composition of the review team has been discussed and a time frame has been worked out. The deputy director will be project coordinator for the SER.

Recommendations

HEIs – YSU & YSMU

- Intensify the contact with ANQA about the frameworks on institutional level and programme level. This is necessary to have fruitful discussions with the panel members during the side visits;
- Be more proactive towards ANQA about the process of the forthcoming side visits.

ANQA

- Further development of the protocols;
- development of a fit for purpose evaluation matrix and evaluation questions, with definition of the appropriate stakeholders;
- handling the aforementioned points of attention regarding the Armenian Accreditation Manual and the ANQA procedures;
- looking for a more structural funding of ANQA. At present ANQA is primarily a project organisation, relying heavily on project funding;
- evaluation of the outcomes of the different projects and integration of these results in the IQA cycle of ANQA.

ANNEX 1 – Brief reports on the meetings (12COM06)

1 Meeting ANQA – NVAO Yerevan, 18 & 20 December 2012

As is the standard procedure, ANQA and NVAO meet at the occasion of every event.

Purpose:

PART I

- a) to discuss recommendations stage 1: 12REP05
- b) to evaluate Q-week: 12REP06
 - 1. National Stakeholders' Conference (12SUB09)
 - 2. Training HEI on IQA Implementation (with J. Brakels) (12SUB10)
 - 3. Training HEI and ANQA on EQA (with J. Brakels & M. Frederiks) (12SUB11)
 - 4. E-train: Train the Trainer (with M. Frederiks & G. King) (12SUB12)
- c) to evaluate Line 1: internal quality assurance: 12REP07
- d) to evaluate Line 4: quality culture i.e. international visits (12SUB07 & 12SUB08): 12REP08
- e) to discuss the project website (12SUB01).

PART II

- f) to evaluate training HEI and ANQA staff on EQA (12SUB11);
- g) to evaluate workshop ANQA on external review (12SUB13);
- h) to discuss remaining issues re. the pilots (June 2013) (13SUB01-6);
- i) to discuss the proof external review (Sep 2013) (13SUB07/8);
- j) to discuss the national stakeholders' conference (Dec 2013)(12SUB09);
- k) to discuss Amendment 4 (12AME04) > PIU-meeting.

PART I

Ad a

The recommendations of stage 1 have not yet been fully analysed. The report itself will be endorsed. NVAO emphasises that it will put all necessary effort in helping ANQA and HEIs to develop a robust internal and external quality assurance system, within the project goals. However, it cannot provide a guarantee that ANQA and HEIs will succeed in the pilot evaluations, considering the points of attention mentioned previously.

ad b

- Positive: the Q-week was well organized. Many participants. Interesting meetings, discussions. Universities found it very useful.
Less positive: the choice of speakers (ASIIN) and some topics (FIBAA) that were not practical enough. It was a pity that the outcomes of the FIBAA desk research were not presented. ANQA was very positive about the outcomes of the Q-week. Experts said they were positive about the drive of ANQA staff. ANQA expected also more about the E-train presentation. The presentation of the ESG standards was useful, but the relationship to the ANQA standards was missed. ANQA would have liked more tools on how they could improve their work as coordinators of site visits and how to support expert panels. The training session on E-train was premature, regarding the present state of QA in Armenia and the expertise of national panel members. The last group would have preferred tools how to become a better quality assurance expert.
- ANQA staff was not always actively involved in the discussions, although some ANQA coordinators did a good job.
- ANQA should be able to come up with the evaluation results of all events. These evaluations will be finished by mid-January 2013. The results will be presented on the website. NVAO needs the data (and the analysis) for further reference and of course to improve future events. The evaluations are part of the internal quality assurance of ANQA.

Ad c

- Report on Line 1 has not yet been analysed. However, it can be endorsed without substantial comments.

Ad d

- Report on Line 4 will be endorsed by ANQA. Regarding the remark on the low involvement of some participants ANQA points out that it was not responsible for the selection of some participants.

Ad e

- The website has been updated recently. It gives a good overview on the developments of the last months. ANQA is encouraged to continue its efforts.
- The responsible ANQA staff member has been replaced due to a change in staff.

PART II

Ad f and g

The training sessions and the workshop have been unanimously evaluated as detailed, practical, franc, very helpful and productive but unfortunately too short. Suggestions were made for further online help facilities. The ARQATA certificate for the training was much appreciated. ANQA and HEI staff regarded it as a positive evaluation of their individual efforts.

Ad h

- Composition of panels: ANQA has not yet finalized the selection of the remaining panel members. This should be finalized at the latest beginning of February 2013.
- Role ANQA coordinators: they will coordinate the site visits and write the report. NVAO staff will primarily be observers; they can also offer some guidance and assistance when necessary. Involvement of ANQA coordinators during the process of writing SER: ANQA coordinators should follow the feedback sessions very closely, both via mail and during the final training session in December 2012. This is helpful for them in fully understanding the step of writing a SER (both content and process), and in offering guidance and assistance to HEIs in future. A better understanding of the SER (and the framework) will also help them to coordinate the process. Their involvement in the SER preparation therefore is basically rather passive and hence limited. They are expected though to organize the pilots following the ANQA manual, starting with the contract and the composition of the panel. And of course, they will be responsible for the panel report.
- The expert panel will speak with rectors, QA-staff, staff responsible for SER, representatives of the administration and student supporting staff, deans, teachers, employers and last but not least the students. A formal agenda is available and will be communicated with the panel chairs.
- ANQA manual/procedures: NVAO will use the ANQA manual as guiding tool for the expert panel, but not all procedures will be followed as strict as described in the manual, due to the specific composition of the panel and its experience.
- Writing of the reports should be finalized by October 2013
- Subject specific reference framework of the medicine programmes was handed over to NVAO

Ad i

- To take place week 37: between 8-12 September 2013. This was agreed by ANQA.
- Composition of review team is finalized. It is composed of Helmut Conrad (chair), dean of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities and former rector of the Karl-Fransens Universitat Graz, Austria; Elisabeth Fiorioli, secretary general of the Austrian Rectors' Conference; Olav Oye, student at Free University of Brussels and representative of European Students' Union, Norway. Stephanie Maurer will act as secretary. She is a scientific collaborator of OAQ, Switzerland. She is a certified ENQA secretary. All panel members are experienced ENQA auditors.
- The preparatory meeting with the expert panel will be held in Vienna on January, 17th.
- ANQA staff member responsible: ANQA deputy director.
- Deadlines SER: 1 June 2013 (instead of 1 July 2013) is agreed upon by ANQA.
- Deadlines for feedback SER: outline mid-February, stage 1 mid-March and stage 2 mid-April.

Ad j

- Preferably to take place in week 50, although ANQA cannot guarantee the exact date at the moment.
- During the conference the outcomes of the pilots (Armenian experts) & proof review (e.g. by the chair) will be presented. This is considered as very useful by ANQA
- International expert (chair) can give QA presentations on various QA topics

Ad k

- ANQA agrees on the amendments:
 - Postponement pilots (March > June 2013)
 - Guidance SER ANQA on line (no extra visit necessary)

2 Meeting CfEP PIU – ANQA – NVAO Yerevan, 20 December 2012

CfEP PIU, ANQA and NVAO discussed Amendment 4 following the postponement of the pilots in HEIs. The rescheduling of the pilots also has consequences for some other ARQATA activities.

NVAO, PIU, ANQA agree on the suggested changes for 2013 resulting in:

- On line assistance and guidance primarily related to writing SERs and organizing pilots HEIs and proof review ANQA;
- Pilots HEIs in June 2013 including immediate feedback by panels;
- Proof external review ANQA in September 2013 including immediate feedback by review team;
- National Stakeholders' Conference mid December 2013 reporting on outcomes both pilots and proof external review.

In addition, whenever ANQA management or staff members travel to Europe both parties (NVAO and ANQA) will agree on arranging a meeting to further discuss matters related to ARQATA if need be. This implies that ANQA informs NVAO if such occasion arises.

One point should be further clarified: the project plan foresees internships in the first half of 2013. It is unclear if the proposed data are still relevant, considering the postponement of the pilots. Furthermore the financial aspects of these internships should be clarified. The project coordinator will respond to these questions in the first week of January 2013.

Amendment 4 will be finalised after receiving these final comments.

ANNEX 2 – Programme Visit 7

Final Training on QA

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 – ANQA & HEIs

<arrival NVAO delegation>

13.30 – 15.45 (ca. 2hrs)

S1 – Meeting ANQA-NVAO: follow up ARQATA project i.e. recommendations & reports (12COM06)

16.00 – 18.00 (2hrs)

S2 – Meeting 8 HEIs and ANQA on IQA (12SUB10): outcomes Line 1 on the basis of report on IQA (12REP07)

Wednesday 19 December 2012 – ANQA & HEIs

Two concurrent sessions: 09.00 – 17.00

1. S3 – YSU and YSMU, including ANQA coordinators (*Irma Franssen*)
One-day training on EQA: feedback on SERs and organizing an external audit/assessment (12SUB11)
2. S4 – ANQA (*Rudy Derdelinckx*)
One-day workshop on QA (part 1): QA tools continued (12SUB13)

Thursday 20 December 2012 – ANQA & PIU

09.00 – 12.00 (3hrs)

S5 – Workshop ANQA on QA (part 2): completing the QA handbook (12SUB06/12SUB13)

12.30 – 14.30 (2hrs)

S6 – Workshop ANQA on external review (part 3): preparing for the external proof audit (12SUB13)

1. Project proposal
2. Outline SER

15.00 – 16.00 (1hr)

S7 – Meeting ANQA-NVAO: follow up ARQATA project i.e. activities 2013 (12COM06)

16.30 – 17.00 (1/2 hr)

S8 – Meeting PIU-ANQA-NVAO: Amendment 4 (12COM06/12AME04)

Friday 21 December 2012

<departure NVAO delegation>

ANNEX 3 – Feedback on SERs (stage 1)

TAKING WRITING SELF-EVALUATION REPORTS TO THE FINAL STEP

Feedback stage 1

Date 11 December 2012

NVAO-team Irma Franssen, Hans Baeyens, Thomas de Bruijn

1. Introductory remark

In an earlier stage (Line 1) feedback was given on a number of criteria. It seems that little has been done with this feedback in that the text dealing with the same criteria in the present SERs has hardly changed. At this stage (Line 2, round 1) more or less the same remarks are repeated as they are still valid. In the next round (February 2013), however, it is expected that the feedback is used to improve the text. If remarks and suggestions are not clear, further assistance and guidance on line is available at all times. HEIs are urgently invited to make full use of that possibility.

2. General remarks on the SERs

- The self-evaluation reports clearly show that the institution is in an initial phase of implementing the bachelor-master structure. The management has made all the required rules and regulations and has put in place all sorts of programmes to ensure the implementation of the new system, but this is far from completed;
- There is a large difference between the formal state of affairs and the ‘human’ factor, the attitudes and skills of the teachers and the people involved in the programmes. There seems to be a lot of theoretical knowledge on the new system but the implementation of this new system both at institutional and on programme level is only just starting. This becomes evident with the description of the implementation of the learning outcomes and the revision of the programmes to adopt this new system. Also, the assessments are not fully adapted over to the new system;
- The problems involved in this change and initial phase that are expressed at university level present themselves also at the programme level;
- The SERs show the beginning of cyclical quality assurance, but in its earliest phase. The problems with implementing the new system should be tackled by (short) cyclical improvement schemes at the level of the teachers and those close to the students, not only at management level. This is lacking from the description in the SERs. How does the institution make a connection between the strategic mission and goals with regards to implementing the bachelor-master structure and the ‘work floor’ of academics and teachers? That is the main challenge;
- The international panel members are well aware of the Bologna process and the impact it had on institutional and programme level. There is no need therefore to go into too much detail in the SER (e.g. the description of the bama-structure);
- The SERs elaborate extensively on regulations and the status quo of work. There is a lack of information on processes, evaluation of processes and how to improve. The panel will be able only to check if the regulations are met but that is not really the purpose of the assessment. The panel wants to see how institutions and programmes evaluate and improve the quality.

3. Remarks on the texts

- There is some reflection and evaluation, but not enough. In fact, the institutional SERs are completely lacking in this respect. The achievements and shortcomings (SWOT) are not connected with the main text and are even contradictory.
- The texts focus too much on the formal status and structures and too little on the policies and practices that operate within the structure. They should show how people deal with the system and what problems they face and how they solve them or improve on the existing situation. Examples are the problem with bringing assessments in line with the new learning outcomes and the system of recruiting and evaluation of academics, which is not linked with a cyclical system of review.

- Often, the texts fail to grasp that the standards are about the effectiveness of the systems not about whether or not all the rules are in place or have been adopted. Try to focus the descriptions on this aspect of the standards.

4. Remarks on outline SERs

- An outline per criterion and per standard is a must for starting writing a SER. The method to be followed can be compared with writing a research proposal first and then doing research and writing a research paper. The outline is a framework with the most important arguments for the SER.
- There is a lack of arguments in the outline. The outlines now only show a summary of facts and a classification of these facts.

5. Remarks on institutional level

Criterion 1

- The text of the achievements and shortcomings does not connect very well with the main text. The main text only describes the process and structures, not how it is being operated in practice. The achievements and shortcoming introduce new and very important elements that are mentioned without context or explanation. Move these to the main text and discuss the challenges and shortcomings there. Use the short list of achievements and shortcomings just as a summary;
- Try to include more information on particular profiles and choices made by your institution. Be much more specific on how the university judges itself, not only in the achievements and shortcomings, but also in the main text;
- Try to emphasize what is unique and particular for the institution, and not the things that are general for all universities (e.g. offering higher education programmes);
- The text does not allow a good assessment of whether the current mission is a good one. There should be more reflection in the text;
- Every shortcoming should be followed by a plan of action, an expected result. That is cyclical quality management.

Criterion 2

- The text needs to be much more informative on the effectiveness of the structures and formal arrangements being described. In most cases it just sums up the formal rules but does not evaluate the working of these processes;
- Try to avoid general statements in the mains descriptive texts. Argue why certain choices have been made and do not present them as facts;
- There is a severe unbalance and lack of logical coherence between the list of achievements and shortcomings and the main text. Use the main text to discuss the shortcomings and the strong points by evaluating how things are going and what challenges are ahead. Also indicate for the weaknesses the way they are being dealt with. There is no information on the improvement processes and the monitoring in the present text.

Criterion 3

- When something is seen as a shortcoming, there should be a plan for improvement and a time frame for achieving results. The text leaves the reader with the undesirable impression that certain problems are just there and that the institution does not know how to deal with them. In itself, this is understandable in the new context, but there is no description of a plan of improvement;
- There should be more detailed data on the structure of quality assurance, using diagrams and organograms. Use pictorial information to avoid long descriptive passages;
- Ask yourself the questions: if something is a problem, what is its importance, who is dealing with it and what is the expected improvement? This shows how the institution is functioning as a learning organization, which is a crucial element in an institutional review.

6. Remarks on programme level

Criterion 1

- Some of the achievements contradict with the shortcomings. In most of the shortcomings, there is no indication of what is being done to solve a problem;
- The main text can be more specific and contain more examples to explain the argument better. It is often too descriptive and focused at the situation rather than at the process of improvement;
- It is good that problems are clearly recognized and mentioned, but there is little sign of truly cyclical quality management. There are no measures for improvement or targets and time scheduled mentioned for the problems, such as the assessment of learning outcomes;
- Much of the information in the text is given as statements, without qualification or mentioning the sources. Try to present them as observations by the people involved: what do teachers, students and the management think of the situation and what is their role in improving things? The process is more important than the static situation.

Criterion 2

- The text gives a lot of information on the structure and the formalities, but fails to grasp the essence of the standard: is there a good and effective policy in recruiting the right teachers and in evaluating their performance. Are there enough measures to safeguard the professional and didactic training of teachers and how effective is this?
- The text does not deal with the system that is in place to measure if there are deficiencies and how these are remedied. It also describes the teaching programme as a static entity. It should be part of a cyclical system of improvement; first evaluate and measure, then make a plan for the improvement and measure the outcomes;
- This criterion is on personnel policy and should deal with the management structures and processes for recruiting, evaluating the right quality and quantity of teachers.

7. Remarks on annexes

- The annexes do not always have the right connection with the main text. It is important that the content of the annexes substantiate to this text. Sometimes in the text there is a reference to the annex but there is a lack of arguments in the text why the information in the annex is important for the substantiation of the text;
- The title of the annexes is not always in line with the title of the reference in the text;
- Important annexes are missing: the strategic plan (old and new), the outline of the programme with modules, literature and teachers (programme level).

ANNEX 4 – Pilots HEIs: Planning June 2013 (*draft*)

Pilots YSMU: 9 – 15 June 2013 (13SUB03/05)

- Sunday 9 June – panel meeting institutional audit & programme assessment (morning/lunch)
- Monday 10 June – interviews institutional audit
- Tuesday 11 June – interviews institutional audit
- Wednesday 12 June – interviews institutional audit & panel meeting
- Thursday 13 June – interviews programme assessment
- Friday 14 June – interviews programme assessment & panel meeting institutional audit & programme assessment re. reports

- Saturday 15 June – feedback session institutional audit & programme assessment (late afternoon + dinner with YSMU)

- [Sunday 16 June – dep. H. Hillen; arrival J. Kijne]

Pilots YSU: 16 – 22 June 2013 (13SUB02/04)

- Sunday 16 June – panel meeting institutional audit & programme assessment (morning/lunch)

- Monday 17 June – interviews institutional audit
- Wednesday 19 June – interviews & panel meeting & feedback YSU institutional audit

- Thursday 20 June – panel meeting & interviews programme assessment [dep. B. Van Camp]
- Friday 21 June – interviews & panel meeting programme assessment re. report

- Saturday 22 June – feedback session programme assessment (late afternoon + dinner with YSU)

ANNEX 5 – Proof External Review: Planning September 2013 (*draft*)

Visit 1: review team – September 2013 (13SUB08)

Proof external review: 9 – 11 September 2013

- Sunday 8 Sep, 14.00 hrs. – panel meeting
- Monday 9 Sep – interviews
- Tuesday 10 Sep – interviews
- Wednesday 11 Sep – interviews (morning) + panel meeting (afternoon)
- Thursday 12 Sep – panel meeting (morning) and extensive feedback session ANQA (+ dinner)

Visit 2: chair – December 2013 (13SUB09)

National Stakeholders' Conference: 9 & 10 December 2013

- Monday 9 Dec – Conference day 1
- Tuesday 10 Dec – Conference day 2
- [Wednesday 11 Dec – meeting ANQA/NVAO/PIU: end of project]

ANNEX 6 – COMPOSITION PANELS

Pilots HEIs – June 2013 (13SUB02-05)

COMPOSITION OF PANELS - PILOTS YSU & YSMU							
<i>Pilots/Members</i>	<i>Chair 1 (NVAO)</i>	<i>Member 2 (NVAO/ANQA)</i>	<i>Member 3 (Armenian peer abroad)</i>	<i>Member 4 (professional field)</i>	<i>Student 5 (QA trained)</i>	<i>Process coordinator &secretary (ANQA)</i>	<i>Senior process coordinator (NVAO/ANQA)</i>
YSU <i>(institutional audit)</i>	NVAO 1 Ben Van Camp	NVAO 2 Jan Kijne	ANQA 5 xxx	ANQA 6 xxx	ANQA 1 xxx	ANQA PC & Secr 1 Ani Mkrtchyan	ANQA PC 1 Susanna Karakhanyan NVAO PC 1 Frank Wamelink
YSMU <i>(institutional audit)</i>	NVAO 1 Ben Van Camp	NVAO 3 Harry Hillen	ANQA 7 xxx	ANQA 8 xxx	ANQA 2 xxx	ANQA PC & Secr 2 Alina Khachikyan	ANQA PC 2 Anushavan Makaryan NVAO PC 2 Michèle Wera
YSU <i>(Biology)</i>	NVAO 2 Jan Kijne	ANQA 9 xxx	ANQA 10 xxx	ANQA 11 xxx	ANQA 3 xxx	ANQA PC & Secr 3 Varduhi Gyulazyan	ANQA PC 1 Susanna Karakhanyan NVAO PC 1 Frank Wamelink
YSMU <i>(General Medicine)</i>	NVAO 3 Harry Hillen	NVAO 1 Ben Van Camp	ANQA 12 xxx	ANQA 13 xxx	ANQA 4 xxx	ANQA PC & Secr 4 Anna Karapetyan	ANQA PC 2 Anushavan Makaryan NVAO PC 2 Michèle Wera

Proof External Review – September 2013 (13SUB08)

Composition of the review team:

1. Helmut Konrad (chair), dean Faculty of Arts and Humanities, and former rector Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, Austria
2. Elisabeth Fiorioli, secretary general Austrian Rectors' Conference, and former managing director Austrian Accreditation Council, Austria
3. Olav Øye, student at the Free University of Brussels (ULB) and representative of the European Students' Union, Norway
4. Stephanie Maurer (secretary), scientific collaborator, Swiss Center of Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Higher Education (OAQ), Switzerland