

Quality process in European Higher Education

Sakarya Turkey 24.11. 2016

Henrik Toft Jensen Roskilde University, Denmark and

The Institutional Evaluation Programme of The European University Association



Quality processes in Europe

In Europe: From Evaluation to Accreditation

Evaluation: Development, improvement and advise orientated

- Quality Control
- Quality assurance
- Quality assessment
- Quality Culture
- Creativity in education

Accreditation: Approved/not Approved, passed/not passed, not development orientated.

Ambassador/new accreditation

sikring

vurdering



Quality processes in Europe the focus could be

- Program Evaluation/ Accreditation
- Institutional Evaluation/ Accreditation
- Quality audit.

Revision

- Done by:
- Peers or specialists evaluators?
- National agencies or international programmes?
- National or International teams with participants from several -5- European countries

...3...



Quality assurance Institutions

- Bologna Process
- National agencies
- International agencies: IEP and several national agencies with international activities.
- E4:= EUA, EURASJE, ESIP, ENQA,
- Council of Ministers of education (meetings every second or third year)

...4...

- European standards and guidelines
- EQAR
- Quality Forum



Quality Processes in European HE

Agencies, members Of EQAR 43.





Quality processes in Europe HE

....6....

Countries, members of EQAR 38. Bologna follow up Group.



Quality processes in Europe HE In Turkey and In other parts of Europe

In Turkey:

- The Commission for Academic Assessment and Quality Improvement in HE" : YODEK is Accrediting:
- Independent external quality assurance agencies
- The Institutional Evaluation Programme IEP of EUA has had more than 40 university evaluations in Turkey since 1995.

...7...

 And more than 400 university evaluations in all Europe.



Institutional Evaluation Programme of EUA (1,1).

The focus of IEP is: Institutional structure organisation and communication.

- IEP
 - Affords a global view of the university
 - Examines major characteristics of the university, its mission and its vision for future development
 - Investigate if and how the university carries out its mission: i.e. examines how the university provides a stimulating, effective and efficient environment for learning, research and service to society.



Institutionel Evaluation Programme (1.2)

IEP use a holistic view at the university as the point of departure for analysing, looking at:

- Connections and communications at the university. Are the communication tubes clean or blocked ??
- The spirit of the leadership, teachers, researchers and students – enthusiastic/commited or without commitment
- The self-evaluation report and especially SWOT analyses.
- The daily communication between students and teachers. Easy or difficult aces to the teachers
- The communication between staff members and the meeting culture (decisions² or just information's)



Institutional Evaluation programme (1,3)

IEP analyses:

- The quality system: Policy for and tools used for quality assurance and for creating a quality culture.
- Processes for design and approval of teaching programmes at the university
- The use of student-centred Learning
- The teaching culture
- Admission requirement to study programmes
- Study forms related to examination forms
- Study environment



Institutional Evaluation Programme (1,4)

IEP analyses – are there:

- Staff competence development initiatives and tools
- Pedagogical education and seminars
- Carrier coaching for staff and students
- Tools in increasing the quality of teaching
- Course description: Learning outcome or curriculum orientated.
- Monitoring research and publication activities.
- Courses in the use of new technology in education
- Courses in academic English
- Annual development conversation



Institutional evaluation programme (1.5) IEP analyses how are

- The recruitment of the academic staff external standards and internal criteria of quality
- The dialogue between teacher and students oral or written evaluations
- The empowerment of students in the administrative structure: Class representatives, board members ect.





Institutional Evaluation Programme (2)

Philosophy:

- Based on *fitness for purpose* but also examines *fitness of purpose* (does the institution have a realistic strategic plan given its resources, etc?)
- Emphasise the *self-evaluation* phase (as an opportunity for improving quality culture)
- No single definition of quality : linked with the institution's objectives
- The evaluation team acts as a mirror of/for the institution.



Methodology : Evaluation Guidelines (3.1)

Key questions:

- What does the institution do, and want to do ? (Mission)
- How does it do it? (Activities)
- How does it know it works? (Quality culture)
- What does it do to change in order to improve? (Strategic capacity for change)



Methodology : Evaluation Guidelines Procedures (3.2)

Self-Evaluation report by Institution :

- Most important step, collaborative work,
- Involves the whole institution
- Organized by institution, following suggested framework,
- Trying to analyze the institution's situation and give a fair view on it,
- Try to answer the key questions from IEP (and some others regarded as important at the university ...)



Methodology : Evaluation Guidelines Procedures (3.3)

Site Visits Preparation:

Evaluation team is chosen by IEP 3 current or former rectors or vice rectors, a student + 1 team secretary, all of them from different countries.

 Evaluation team visits university twice: Preliminary visit: 2 days duration
to understand national and institutional constraints and opportunities; programme established by university
Main visit: 3 days duration
to understand strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations; programme established by IEP.

EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme Methodology : Evaluation Guidelines Procedures, all we mete should formulate an opinion (3.4)

Site visits : People to meet often between 100 -200.

- Rector + other members of the rectorate,
- Self-evaluation group,
- Representatives of central staff, international office, financial service, quality management unit, research office, etc.
- Members of Senate/Council of university
- Deans, Academic staff, Administrative and Technical staff,
- Students,
- External stakeholders,
- Visits: Some faculties, special centers

Main purpose of the team: understand the institution ...



3. Methodology : Evaluation Guidelines Procedures (3.5)

Key Success Factors for the Evaluation :

- Address fears and any misunderstanding of the IEP Programme's philosophy
- Involve a cross-section of the HEI from the start to the end of the process
- Focus should rather be on the process (collective task) than on the report
- Find the truth Triangulation



Methodology : Evaluation Guidelines (3.6)

About the evaluation teams

- European peer review by senior HE leaders:
- A stable pool that has accumulated a wealth of international experience
- Annual training focusing on emerging HE trends
- Involvement of experienced peers from different types of HEIs
- Teams composed by peers of different countries, none from the country of the evaluated institution.



Institutional evaluation programme Lessons learned (4)

- A single set of narrowly defined standards for HE is not desirable since it clashes with the need to have an innovative and diverse HE sector
- But it is important that each institution is clear about its own standards and are able to relate them to European standards and Guidelines



Institutional Evaluation Programme (5)

IEP offers

- A critical and supportive evaluation.
- Useful?? Depends (Recommendations at least 10!!)



Institutional Evaluation Programme

- Thanks for your attention
- Remember:
- Good evaluations can inspire to increase Quality and the joy of teaching.
- BUT
- To many evaluations and accreditations need a lot of time and therefore they are reducing the time used for teaching and research.