



Minutes of Meeting

Date: 17.-19.1.2012

Location: Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Slovakia

Head of Meeting: Ľubica Lachká

Minute taker: Silvia Hrozenká

Attendees:

- Alena Hašková
- Helena Šebková
- Josef Beneš
- Vladimír Roskovec
- Jakub Brdulak
- Aneta Szydłowska
- Ray Land
- Heather Eggins
- Alberts Prikulis
- Alberto Amaral
- Maria João Rosa
- Don F. Westerheijden - via Skype

Date: 18.1.2012

1. **Welcome speech** by Ľubica Lachká
2. **Power Point presentation by Don F. Westerheijden (University of Twente, Netherlands)**

Because of the unexpected problems with the transport from Netherlands to Slovakia caused by the bad weather conditions, Mr Don F. Westerheijden had to present his contribution "WP9 Stakeholders' Involvement in Quality Assurance Comparative Analysis of WP9" by the Internet (Skype).

He introduced main research problems of WP9:

Question 1 - National rules on representation decision-making bodies

Question 2 - Institutional (additional) rules on representation decision-making bodies

Question 3 - Real stakeholder's representation / Real stakeholder's influence

Conclusions of his presentation involved following barriers:

- ESG have been implemented
- National regulations are prime "channel"
- Stakeholders include external academics
- Widening of range of stakeholders is needed in some cases
- Stakeholders are not always taken seriously
- Attitude change is needed among academics

Recommendations:

- Bologna process could showcase good practice
- To be clearer about different roles of different stakeholders

- Widen range of stakeholders involved in education quality work

Discussion:

Two of the participants have presented their comments (Ray Land, University of Durham, UK, and Helena Šebková, Centre for Higher Education Studies, CZ):

They were interested in the methods of the data collection to be used in each comparative report, number of people involved in the database, international rankings and negative comments in media (newspapers, TV programmes, university magazines, etc.).

3. Ľubica Lachká thanked for the presentation of Don F. Westerheijden and asked Jakub Brdulak (Warsaw School of Economics, Poland) to present his contribution.
4. **Power Point presentation of Jakub Brdulak “WP10 - IBAR WP10: Quality and Teaching Staff”.**

He introduced 6 questions with synthesis answers from all teams involved in the project:

Question 1 - What is the institutional policy on assuring quality of teaching staff? How is it related to the national rules concerning QA and employment?

Question 2 - What are the criteria of staff recruitment and appointment procedures? How they assure the quality of teaching?

Question 3 - How the HEI is supporting the quality of teaching performances?

Question 4 - How the quality of teaching performance is assessed? In which way the assessment is done? How does the HEI use results of the assessment?

Question 5 - How teachers are motivated by the HEI?

Question 6 - Who is (what does it mean to be) a good university teacher?

Conclusions of his presentation involved following barriers:

- Underpayment of teachers
- Financial crisis

- Preference of research over teaching

Discussion:

Ray Land, University of Durham, UK, has presented his comments:

He emphasized lack of national benchmarks by which the higher education providers can demonstrate how they support staff and assure themselves that they are qualified to teach and support learning.

Project participants agreed on February 7, 2013 as deadline for sending remarks, feedback and recommendations to Jakub Brdulak.

5. **Power Point presentation of Jakub Brdulak „Short overview on opportunities of the IBAR dissemination“**

Jakub Brdulak introduced the structure, Publication list: including conferences, discussions, research, books, and papers accepted for future conferences etc. and suggested dissemination of project outcomes at conferences, seminars and events

Suggestions:

- o Send via e-mail information about upcoming event to Jakub
- o Jakub will fill the table and circulate it

Discussion:

Helena Šebková pointed out that dissemination is required by the project WP2 as follows

- website ,
- book,
- final synthesis report

Recommendation:

Send 2 representatives to Quality Forum - November 2013 in Goteborg.

Annual conference of EUA on 15-19 March 2013, Milan Italy (no possibility to present final results of IBAR)

EAIR Forum - in Rotterdam August 2013 - track on quality management (Maria and other members of PT team will participate actively)

Bologna Seminars

CHER Conference - Lausanne, 9-11th September 2013

Don F. Westerheijden agree to present at Quality Forum in November

Maria João Rosa presented the opportunity (repeated what already offered in Warsaw) to send full paper to Journal of Higher Education Area (www.ehea-journal.eu) - Alberto Amaral and Cláudia Sarrico are guest editors of special issue on IBAR outcomes - each WP will be presented by one article prepared by leading country of WP

Until April 30 send to Cláudia Sarrico full paper according to journal guidelines

Members agreed to put a footnote on all publications (Ray Land will provide all teams with suggested text).

6. **Power Point presentation of Ray Land „Methodology of WP 12“**

Ray Land presented the revised questions of WP12:

Q1 In what way does institutional policy on quality take into account issues of progression from secondary education to HE?

Q2 To what extent are secondary school pupils prepared to take maximum advantage of the higher education opportunity offered to them?

Q3 Are quality assurance requirements for secondary education at odds with those for higher education?

Q4 Are there formal processes in which the secondary and higher education sectors communicate with each other, either at institutional level or national level?

Q5 In what ways might more efficient alignment between secondary and higher education be achieved?

Conclusion:

- We will need to consider other WP's

- We might need to anticipate a nil return from some countries, but that in itself is a valuable contribution to EU knowledge

-One issue is how to frame the enquiry to ensure the most valuable data

LV- school curriculum designed by governance

UK- governance suggested university should design school curriculum

PL- polytechnic make an effort, university do not make sufficient effort

CZ- has an association of Directors of Secondary Schools

UK- private Schools group

- o Trade Union of Heads of Secondary Schools
- o Examination syndicates

Curriculum context - develop the HE sector interface.

7. Short discussion on opportunities of the IBAR follow-up activities - Heather Eggins, UK

LLP- Call of proposals 31.1.2013, topic Developing of HE, developing curricula, examine aspects of curricula and make recommendation - LLP-programme is not open area of continue of IBAR

Suggestion: The (finding of WP12 will be used as a pilot to look for funding e.g. George Soros Foundation, Sutton Trust, others ...

Investigate the financial sources

Suggestion:

- o prepare the project proposal and then find the financial sources
- o prepare abstract on base of WP12 for the next project.

Book- suggestion of opening chapter with Don/Helena/Jan

Date: 19.1.2013

1. Planning of the Final Report and

Mid-term evaluation of the IBAR outcomes presented by Helena Šebková

Helena informed the IBAR team about External mid-term evaluation of the IBAR outcomes and evaluation of Progress Report done by experts of the Agency.

External evaluation Terms and Conditions- done by prof. B Stensaker and prof. E. Hazelkorn, utilisation of all sorts of project output, they were evaluated 4 WP (WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8)

Helena presented brief overview of the evaluation report and preliminary reflections of CZ team on recommendations made by the evaluators.

General view of evaluators: Project is doing well

Reflections of CZ team:

Review/up-date/improvement of the comparative studies of WP5 – WP8 (on the basis of recommendations) can be done using the savings of staff costs (when regular wages are lower than EU ceilings). It will fit the Agency rules that these money should be used only for an extra work for the project and that the additional value of the project should be approved.

Project management – internal evaluation report show continual progress, project is running to time. Conceptual framework: CZ team will review possibilities of enriching the current version of the conceptual framework by insights from institutional logics research.

Dissemination and pro-active strategies: collaboration with Bologna experts, Bologna Follow-up Group, national representatives, national QA Agencies, rectors conferences, EUA members,

Scope and depth of the ESG, other instruments and measures – recommendations of this kind would be pointers for future research (beyond scope of IBAR)

To rethink how current standards and guidelines could be formulated (to meet more interest and engagement by various stakeholders):
Formulating final policy recommendation

Management : Final year of project will be demanding in terms of coordination and management to produce all necessary outputs, focus on keeping will be crucial for finalising the IBAR successfully.

Discussion:

Alberts Prikulis suggested organising Bologna seminar.

Don F. Westerheijden asking on a ranking system of EC; interpretation that it is almost ready is too optimistic, Consortium should still work on pilot results, U-multirank should be applicable
Heather Eggins suggested expanding opening chapter, paragraph, concluding chapter by Jan Kohoutek.

Maria João Rosa suggested that it would be useful everyone writing the chapter within the couple of months. Don F. Westerheijden will send notes to everybody.

Don F. Westerheijden will cooperate with Helena and Jan and draft the opening chapter. Send around the notes before the meeting in Prague.

Ray Land- theoretical points

- o Consider that our conceptual framework does not engage with our data. We are not using the framework to make sense of all the data.

It is not a question of refining conceptual framework, we have 7 different contexts.

- o What tendencies are really in place ? Do UK universities need QAA? It would collapse within several years. UK universities are driven by a market. We don't want to produce a report that looks very out of date in 2 years.
- o Should we drawing attention to issues rather than recommendations

Maria João Rosa asked if we should consider revising the comparative reports for the final report.

Don F. Westerheijden could get an outline draft of opening chapter by Prague meeting.

Ray Land will send short revised document and send around the IBAR team.

Date of Prague seminar is planned on 4.-6. March. Later time will be useful for collaboration on the book (all participants agreed). CZ team will circulate proposal of news possible dates. Don F. Westerheijden suggested the date of Prague seminar not later than 22. April 2013.

Helena Šebková informed the team that the closing seminar in November will be opened to bigger audience. It will focus on dissemination and on debate on final/prefinal IBAR results.

Helena Šebková presented Final Synthesis Report - power point presentation

Basic project outcomes are book, final synthesis report.

The final synthesis report should summarize and reflect on: IBAR theory, methodology, major findings from WPs 5-12 and recommendations on the ESG Part 1 modification (WP2).

The report will use the recommendations from the expert External mid-term evaluation as well as, to an extent, from other (EUA) projects and stakeholders consulted/interviewed on formal or informal basis should also be taken into account

Emphasis should be put on the identification of barriers and effective practices at different organisational levels (institutional, national, supra-national), possibly with a particular focus on the (uneasy) relationship between secondary and HE sectors. This is due to the transversal character of the project and may enhance the IBAR added value.

2. **Administration matters and Conclusions, information about the Progress Report evaluation, information about the next meeting presented by Helena Šebková**

Progress report - power point presentation Helena Šebková

Public part - ready for publication on the Executive Agency's website

Confidential part- important basis for the project activities assessment

The change of the partner in the UK has been officially approved by the Agency. Since the change of the partner organisation in the UK has caused some delay the project should ensure that the partnership continues to work effectively to achieve the project objectives according to the plan."

Global Score 8/10 (80%)

OVERAL EVALUTION (comments):

The project activities have been implemented in accordance with the objectives of the original application

Strong points: Publicly available outcomes on the project's website

Weak points: The change of the partner organisation in the UK has caused some delay in the activities

Possible problems related financing (they will be assessed at final report stage) :

Recommendations from Agency:

The costs per day are higher than the ceilings: If these are the real costs, please leave it as it is mentioned in the table, BUT be aware, please, that all the expenses which are higher than the ceilings will be cut at the stage of the final report

Travel and subsistence:

Different extra missions of travelling (interviews). They are not subject to an amendment due to low costs of the missions. BUT please be careful to add interviews (costs for local travelling were not included into the project budget) only if they bring some added value to the project. Similarly the staff costs related to other missions than originally not planned.

Approval of the Progress report does not imply a confirmation of the eligibility of expenditures as declared in the progress report.

A complete financial analysis will be made at the Final Report stage.

Any ineligible cost will be deducted from the total amount of expenditures reported, in order to calculate the total eligible costs of the project

Total eligible costs x 0.75 = final EU grant

Date of seminar in Prague is planned on 4.-6. March. On the basis of agreement of all participants the CZ team will circulate proposed new dates in April/May.

Preliminary program for meeting in Prague

- First result of the WP11, comparative analysis, approval of comparative study delivery
- WP12- preliminary results
- final external evaluation
- Dissemination of IBAR project results, new possibilities, EUA conference (discussion - all partners)
- Final synthesis report, progress of work, if any at the time of seminar (CZ/UK team)
- Book, progress of work (Heather)
- Information about IBAR follow-up (Heather, other partners)
- Closing seminar (responsibility - CZ team), planned date 11/11/2013, discussion - programme, invited people (10 persons can be supported from the IBAR project budget, flight ticket and daily subsistence)

3. Seminar was closed by Lubica Lachka who thanked for attending the meeting to all members of IBAR team.

Helena Šebková expressed her thanks to SK team for very flexible management of the seminar activities with respect to travelling problems of most teams due to weather.