Paper abstracts 9.30-10.15 (Saturday 24 November)

IVA.1 International accreditation – effects of national and cultural differences

By: Aras Viligaila Vėbra, Vilnius University of Applied Engineering Sciences, Lithuania
    Harald Scheuthle, evalag, Germany

Room: M648

Chair: Norma Ryan, EQAF Steering Committee

Abstract: The creation of the ESG was a step towards a pan-European Quality Assurances market. Nevertheless, the majority of evaluations or accreditations still remain within the national frameworks. The current paper presents a case study of a truly international accreditation of Lithuanian study programmes by a German quality assurance agency. The case is presented from the points of view of the two partners and cultural differences are discussed, as well as the differences in the higher education and quality assurance systems of the two countries, and how these affected the accreditation. The paper concludes with the specific impact of the international accreditation on the further development of the study programmes.

IVA.2 Quality reviews in service and support units: value added?

By: Hester Geyser, University of Johannesburg, South Africa
    Dragana Weistra, University of Johannesburg, South Africa
    Ina Pretorius, University of Johannesburg, South Africa

Room: M226

Chair: Fernando Galán Palomares, EQAF Steering Committee

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to report on a qualitative investigation to identify and explore: the value added by quality reviews in service and support units in the University of
Johannesburg (UJ); improvements to the review process to enhance the value added, and differences in the actors’ experiences. Five service and support units were included in the research project and three key actors from each unit were interviewed. The responses on the value added were categorised and then organised into two sections, namely value added to: the functioning of the unit, i.e. understanding the bigger picture, identifying gaps for improvement and collaboration with other units; the staff in the unit, i.e. teambuilding, the identification of strengths, the feeling of pride and an increase in quality awareness. Improvements to increase the value were identified as generic across the units, i.e. evidence management, workload and self-evaluation report writing, but also unit-specific responses.

IVa.3 Benchmarking, an appropriate tool for decision-making and improving or just hype?

By: Hilde Sels, Thomas More Kempen University College, Belgium
    Nine Hooge, Leuven University College, Belgium

Room: A242

Chair: Barbara Michalk, EQAF Steering Committee

Abstract: In 2011/2012 higher education institutions in Flanders started a benchmarking exercise. All of them are members of the KU Leuven Association. The ambition was to build expertise in benchmarking according to the ESMU definition and approach which focuses on benchmarking as a voluntary and collaborative process with the aim to learn and self-improve. During one year participants worked together to decide upon the theme (how to effectively handle results of surveys and performance indicators), to define the indicators, to set the benchmark, do the self-evaluation and develop action plans. This paper takes you through the process of benchmarking and discusses challenges and benefits encountered.

IVa.4 Organising quality assurance for multiple programmes in a decentralised organisational setting – the case of Copenhagen Business School

By: Ole Stenvinkel Nilsson, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

Room: A121 A

Chair: Oliver Vettori, Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria

Abstract: Programme QA at Copenhagen Business School (CBS) faces two major challenges; (1) large number of different programmes, and (2) decentralised organisation of the programme area. CBS has more than 60 programmes in the portfolio, each managed by an autonomous Study Board. The paper demonstrates how CBS has addressed these challenges in a quality policy based on two main elements. Standards and Guidelines for day-to-day quality operations are combined with recurrent five-year cycle peer reviews of every programme. It is demonstrated how optimal use of existing information from various sources can be combined to provide a parsimonious picture of programme performance, without putting too much burden on program managers. Both external and internal peer reviewers are used in order to create dialogue, mutual inspiration, increased alignment across programmes, and balance between formative development and summative assessment. Early experiences with implementation of the QA system are discussed.
IVa.5 ORPHEUS consensus about internal, external and international evaluation of PhD programmes in biomedicine and health sciences

By: Roland Jonsson, ORPHEUS, Norway
Michael J. Mulvany, ORPHEUS, Norway
Zdravko Lackovic, ORPHEUS, Norway

Room: A121 B

Chair: Lucien Bollaert, NVAO, the Netherlands

Abstract: The ORPHEUS/AMSE/WFME PhD standards document, published January 2012, is a practical tool for quality assurance of PhD programmes. Another document, the new PhD principles document: ‘Best practice based principles for innovative doctoral training’, approved by the EU Council of Ministers is fully compatible with the PhD standards document. For this reason, ORPHEUS has expressed a wish to work closely with the European Commission on implementing this in the field of biomedicine and health sciences. The PhD standards document could also provide a basis for global conversations concerning the quality and content of PhD programmes. To increase awareness of the PhD standards document, national workshops should be held. In addition, ORPHEUS will introduce a labelling project based on initial self-evaluation and external evaluation of website, which may be followed up by some form of site visit, by academics with experience in PhD education.

IVa.6 Institutional integration of quality assurance and enhancement in an Irish university context

By: Sarah Ingle, Dublin City University, Ireland

Room: A007

Chair: Andrée Sursock, European University Association

Abstract: The main aim of this paper is to provide examples of how quality assurance and enhancement activities have provided a clear means of integrating QA into an Irish third-level institution, Dublin City University (DCU). The background to quality assurance at a national level in Ireland is first outlined to set the context. This is followed by an examination of the development of a quality assurance and enhancement system at DCU, including an outline of the internal quality review process. A number of innovative quality initiatives which have been introduced in DCU over the last two years are then outlined, and the benefits that these have provided to the university are discussed. The details of these initiatives may be interesting for those working in quality offices internationally, as well as other academics and heads of departments in higher education institutions.
Paper abstracts 10.30-11.15 (Saturday 24 November)

**IVb.1 International cooperation in discipline-specific quality assurance: NCPA-AEC joint accreditation of Russian higher music education programmes**

*By:* Zhanna Kuzminykh, National Centre of Public Accreditation, Russia
Linda Messas, Association Européenne des Conservatoires, the Netherlands

*Room:* M648

*Chair:* Georg Schulz, Graz University of Music and Dramatic Arts, Austria

**Abstract:** This paper presents a cooperation model between a Russian organisation aiming at fostering quality culture in higher education, the National Centre of Public Accreditation (NCPA) and a European membership association promoting subject-specific quality assurance in music, the European Association of Conservatoires (AEC). The authors believe that this European and subject-specific approach to quality assurance has achieved a level of success and makes a positive difference both for the reviewed institutions and for the coordinating organisations. Based on interviews of the institutional representatives and on reflections on the impact of this cooperation for their own organisations, the authors will describe the joint accreditation process, address the outcomes of the procedures (both from the institutions’ and from the quality assurance organisations’ perspectives), and draw conclusions from this experience. Although areas for further improvement have been identified, the authors believe this model could easily be exported to other countries and to other disciplines.

**IVb.2 E-xcellence: quality assurance in e-learning; a coooperational model between universities and QA-agencies**

*By:* George Ubachs, European Association of Distance Teaching Universities, the Netherlands
Fred Mulder, NVAO, the Netherlands

*Room:* M226

*Chair:* Barbara Michalk, EQAF Steering Committee

**Abstract:** Although e-learning has become mainstream provision in European higher education, it has not yet become an integral part of the QA systems. Surveys like the E-learning Quality (ELQ) report (2008:11R) show that quality in e-learning is a non-issue for many and there is a need for methodological development within QA-agencies. At the same time, there is a need for increased cooperation between national agencies on QA in e-learning (ENQA Workshop 14). An opportunity is created by the European Association of Distance Teaching Universities (EADTU) in partnership with European and global stakeholders for the existing channels in QA to adopt new quality guidelines. EADTU serves universities and QA agencies in a co-operative model with the open source instrument E-xcellence. This will be a co-presentation by EADTU and NVAO addressing:

A. New benchmarks for quality in e-learning; social media and OER

B. Recommendations by UNESCO’s Global TF QA in e-learning

C. Challenges for Quality Assurance Organisations in Europe.
IVb.3 The relationship between quality assurance and what students really know and can do after a period of study. Assessing achieved learning outcomes in an external quality assurance system

By: Karin Järplid Linde, Swedish National Agency for Higher Education, Sweden
    Maria Sundkvist, Swedish National Agency for Higher Education, Sweden

Room: A242

Chair: Allan Päll, EQAF Steering Committee

Abstract: The Swedish National Agency for Higher Education (the Agency), established in 1995, has the national responsibility for quality assurance of higher education through quality evaluation of first-, second- and third-cycle study programmes. The Agency is also responsible for the appraisal of higher education institutions' entitlement to award qualifications. This paper will, however, focus on the system for quality evaluations of first- and second-cycle programmes. A model focusing on student attainment of the learning outcomes specified in the Higher Education Ordinance was introduced in 2011. The question is: can results of an academic study programme be measured? If yes: how can that be done? And last, but not least: is this European quality assurance of the 21st century?

IVb.4 Impact of new standards on quality improvement of study programmes in Bosnia and Herzegovina

By: Dejan Bokonjić, University of East Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
    Nenad Marković, University of East Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
    Mitar Novaković, University of East Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
    Stevan Trbojević, University of East Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
    Radoslav Grujić, University of East Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
    Darko Petković, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina
    Dino Mujkić, World University Service Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Room: A121 A

Chair: Fernando Galán Palomares, EQAF Steering Committee

Abstract: The idea for the study of these issues arose as a result of the current state of higher education in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which has not yet begun the process of accreditation of higher education institutions and study programmes. The existence of 43 higher education institutions and about 1,400 study programmes at private and public universities in BiH requires efforts in their comparison, taking into account that there are no formal criteria for comparing their quality. This paper presents the development of criteria for accreditation of academic programs that will allow comparisons, training of the BiH academic community regarding the implementation of accreditation of academic programmes and a pilot accreditation of 32 study programmes in eight public universities in accordance with the developed criteria. Advantages and disadvantages identified by this procedure are presented.
IVb.5  Transitional evaluation: a special case of external evaluation of higher education in Estonia 2009-2011

By:  Hillar Bauman, Estonian Higher Education Quality Agency, Estonia
     Heli Mattisen, Estonian Higher Education Quality Agency, Estonia

Room:  A121 B

Chair:  Colin Tück, European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education

Abstract: From 1997 to 2009 the main instrument of external quality assurance in Estonian higher education was accreditation of study programmes. This system appeared to be expensive and the results not comparable. Therefore, Estonia decided in 2009 to implement a new system consisting of institutional accreditation and quality assessment of study programme groups (28 groups in total). For the transition from study programme accreditation to assessment of study programme groups, all groups were assessed for licensing during the period from autumn 2009 to autumn 2011. This assessment was called ‘transitional evaluation’. In this evaluation, there were some substantial differences from the previous system: higher education institutions did not submit self-evaluation reports; the evaluation was based on data submitted electronically by higher education institutions, statistics from the Ministry of Education and Research, and additional data gathered during assessment visits; assessment committees were composed of local experts only; the decision was made not on a study programme, but on the entire study programme group; some decisions were made without an assessment visit, solely on the basis of written data.