

**Project: Identifying Barriers in Promoting the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance at Institutional Level and Making Recommendation as to How These Might Be Addressed (IBAR)**

16-18 January 2011, Institute of Chemical Technology, Prague

**MINUTES OF THE SEMINAR**

**Sunday, 16 January**

**Welcome session (19.00-21.00)**

- Greeting of participants: Helena Šebková (CHES).
- Opening words: Helena Šebková (CHES), Jakub Dürr (Palacký University), Josef Koubek (Institute of Chemical Technology): introduction of the IBAR project, introduction of two Czech higher education institutions to be participating in the project (Palacký University, Institute of Chemical Technology).
- Open discussion among participants about the IBAR project and agenda ahead.

**Monday, 17 January**

**Morning session (9.00-11.00)**

- **Opening words: Helena Šebková** (CHES), **Jan Roda** (Accreditation Commission of CR (ACCR)) – position of ACCR in Czech higher education; current activities; major achievements and challenges.
- **General information on IBAR project: Helena Šebková** – project background, aims, duration; organisation; project partners (incl. staff names); target group size; outputs planned (incl. the timeline).

Discussion

Question: Albers Prikulis (University of Latvia). What do the names of partner staff in brackets refer to?

Answer: Helena Šebková. These staff members can collaborate but are not officially listed as project participants per partner country.

Question: Alberto Amaral (CIPES). On what basis are partner countries to be paid and what are the daily rates per country?

Answer: Helena Šebková. Letters of mandate sufficient to make payments to partner countries; bilateral agreements between the project coordinator and partner possible but not necessary. Daily rates given in the project application form (budget).

Question: Ludvika Leisyte (CHEPS). Are there just four higher education institutions (HEIs) to be analysed per country? Why?

Answer: Helena Šebková. Number of HEIs per country obligatory, cannot be changed; based on arbitrary judgement considering the major criteria for institutional selection (size, location, profile, type) to maintain institutional variety.

Comment: Alberto Amaral. There are eight development (thematic) workpackages (WPs) (WPs 5-12). The obligation on the target group size (number of respondents to be contacted in every HEI) means a lot of work; respondents cannot be contacted more than once/twice a year; work incl. questions must be carefully planned in advance.

Comment: Helena Šebková. Project timeline can be changed but only after agreed by the EACEA in Brussels; well grounded reasons necessary.

### **Coffee break (11.00-11.30)**

### **Morning session (11.30-12.30)**

- **Project theory and methodology: Jan Kohoutek (CHES)** – theory for project research can be based on the instrument-context approach to policy implementation and the corresponding typology of policy instruments. Knowledge of institutional contexts is crucial. Enquiry framed by research questions in every thematic WP (5-12). Methodology likely to entail secondary data analysis and collection and analysis of qualitative primary data.

#### Discussion:

Question: Cláudia S. Sarrico (CIPES). Thematic WPs (5-12) are broader than the content of the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG), Part 1. Why?

Answer: Jan Kohoutek. The intention was to cover wider policy areas also with regard to the official requirements and project category (lifelong learning). For this, relations between higher and secondary education of special importance.

Comment: Ray Land (University of Strathclyde). Because of the factually non-existing points of reference for some thematic WPs in ESG Part 1, application of the deficit concept can be problematic. Also, implementation of ESG Part 1 entails different institutional levels and discretion of front-line academics; for taking them into account, the concepts of the implementation staircase and street-level bureaucracy may be employed.

Comment: Jan Kohoutek. The extent of implicit ESG Part 1 coverage in WPs such as “Quality and Access” or “Quality and Secondary Education” needs to be checked again.

Comment: Heather Eggins (University of Strathclyde). There is a need of the model we all can follow.

Comment: Ludvika Leisyte. Before fieldwork starts, a consensus about what to study, the level of research and form of research is necessary.

Comment: Don Westerheijden (CHEPS). Orientation on barriers of implementation is crucial.

Comment: Cláudia S. Sarrico. To make the enquiry effective, a matrix of WPs 5-12 themes and the corresponding ESG Part 1 content.

Comment: Lubica Lachká (University in Nitra). To make a final comparative study, it is needed to agree on one framework and common criteria to be considered in data collection.

Closing comment: Heather Eggins. Participants should divide into two smaller groups to further discuss points concerning project theory; the focus on the barriers of implementation should be kept.

*Major points from discussion in Group 1:*

Consensus on project theory should be reached before March; papers on different theoretical perspectives usable for the IBAR enquiry should be circulated and commented on. Prior summary of generic issues covered and types of actors addressed is needed for answering research questions across WPs 5-12. For selection of HEIs, only two criteria (size, type) useful to arrive at the 2 x 2 matrix. Deadline for delivering WP 6 may be postponed to allow for collection of data for WP 6 and 7 at the same time; this possibility should be discussed with EACEA officials at the Brussels meeting in February.

*Major points from discussion in Group 2:*

Clarification of research questions and the type of data for answering them is needed. Based on modified research questions, a template for each thematic WP (5-12) should be created by the coordinating country. Work on WP 5 can be separated, in case of WPs 6-12, only a small chance of adjusting the timeline. Separation of the questions per every thematic WP from the application form useful for further discussion.

**Lunch break (12.30-14.00)**

**Afternoon session (14.00-15.30)**

- **General information on project financing: Helena Šebková, Josef Beneš (CHES)** – information on total costs, eligibility of costs, co-financing, model of financing and payment arrangements (incl. seminar organisation, travel and subsistence).

Discussion:

Opening comment: Helena Šebková. Some details on financing not yet known; special meeting in Brussels in early February to discuss them. Any questions on project financing by every partner country should be sent in writing to CHES. The list will be made and questions discussed at the Brussels meeting.

Comment: Josef Beneš. The model of financing for 2010: 40% of total eligible costs paid out in February to coordinator (CHES); 70% of the corresponding budget to all partners before the WP 5 start, 30% after the submission of requested outputs and their evaluation.

Question: Lubica Lachká. How should travel and subsistence be reimbursed?

Answer: Helena Šebková. Travel costs 300 EUR per country on average; reimbursement on the basis of the flight ticket and boarding pass proof. Daily subsistence rates per country, reduction applied if accommodation/meals paid by third party, the remaining amount reimbursed.

Question: Lubica Lachká. What kind of document do we need to keep in original and which should be sent to CHES?

Answer: Helena Šebková. After the Brussels meeting, further specification of this will be made and sent to partner countries

Comment: Albers Prikulis. Some options how to co-finance but additional national restrictions may apply.

Closing comment: Helena Šebková. All unclear points should be sent to CHES to clarify them at the Brussels meeting. A special slot should be reserved at the next project seminar in Latvia to discuss financial matters.

Closing comment: Helena Šebková. The Prague seminar was organised before the advance payment to project partners could be made by CHES (will be done once the transfer is made to CHES by EACEA, estimate: beginning of February). Due to this fact,

CHES provided seminar participants from partner countries with inexpensive accommodation in Masarykovy koleje on condition that social dinner (16.1.) and lunch (17.1.) worth 40 EUR/participant would be covered by participants from their per diem (460 EUR for 2 days per participant, maximum number of two participants per partner country).

**Agreement: Seminar participants agree that CHES as a seminar organiser and project coordinator will deduce the amount of 40 EUR from the per diem total of every seminar participant (460 EUR). The amount of per diem reimbursed to every participant for the Prague seminar thus will be 420 EUR.**

- **General information on project website: Vladimír Roskovec** (CHES) – domain name registered (www.ibar-llp.eu), website up from February, up to February information through CHES website (www.csvs.cz/ka1\_ibar). Comments and proposals on the new website structure welcome via email (ibar@csvs.cz).

#### Discussion:

Question: Lubica Lachká. Who will be responsible for website maintenance?

Answer: Helena Šebková. Primarily CHES in cooperation with the University of Strathclyde

Comment: Ray Land. A private section would be very useful for sharing and circulating drafts.

Comment: Don Westerheijden. Any project partner should have the right to upload materials to the private section (not just CHES) to save time.

Comment: Heather Eggins. Any information on the public section of the website should be proofread first; information on project budget should not be freely accessible, except the basic information which is annexed to the project proposal.

Question: Ludvika Leisyte. Who owns the data?

Answer: Heather Eggins. Probably EACEA in Brussels; special permission for using the IBAR data for other purposes likely; needs to be checked at the Brussels meeting in February.

[Addendum: Issue of the data ownership explicitly addressed in the project contract (Article II-3)].

- **Structure of project outcomes: Jan Kohoutek** (CHES) – eight thematic WPs (5-12), three kinds of outputs for each WP. WP outputs: institutional “micro” case studies (28), national studies (7), comparative study (1). Language: institutional “micro” cases in mother tongue, national studies in mother tongue + English (except GB), comparative study in English.

#### Discussion:

Question: Ludvika Leisyte. Why should national studies be also written in mother tongue and not just English?

Answer: Jan Kohoutek. The reason is to make them available for national policy makers who as a rule do not speak English (especially in CEE countries)

Comment: Heather Eggins. In case of the Netherlands, English is enough; EACEA may be asked to grant the exception.

Comment: Don Westerheijden. No special costs for translation included in the project budget.

[Addendum: The translation costs covered in staff days (researchers, Cat. 2) calculated per WPs 5-12. For example, see WP 5: National case studies will require following

working staff: researchers (Cat. 2) – 34 days (exception Partner 2/GB – *10 days less as translation is not needed*)].

Question: Jan Kohoutek. Should there be only two criteria (size, profile) for institutional selection?

Comment: Ray Land. Inclusion of private HEIs useful, the private HE sector is a rapidly expanding area.

Comment: Ewa Chmielecka (Warsaw School of Economics). Institutional selection and comparison is also about the size of the country and sectoral path-dependencies.

### Coffee break (15.30-16.00)

### Afternoon session (16.00-17.00)

- **Information on the EUA project on ESG: Heather Eggins** (University of Strathclyde) – EUA project: aiming at identification of the need to revise ESG Part 1; survey at 50 European HEIs, presentation of preliminary findings in July; good to keep in touch with the EUA project developments.

Comment: Don Westherheijden. ESG Part 1 content likely not to be fixed after the ministerial meeting in 2012, future revisions still possible.

- **Information on publication opportunities of the project outcome (book): Heather Eggins** (University of Strathclyde) – two publishers contacted (Springer, Sense). Springer: long publication times; books in expensive hard cover (99 EUR per 200 pages); e-books possible but not clear how long on offer. Sense: much shorter publication times, print on demand, books in soft cover for much lower price (45 EUR per 350 pages), e-books stay for long.

Comment: Ray Land. Good experience with Sense, very good quality, let the editors design the cover. However, more careful editing work needed before sending the manuscript to Sense.

Comment: Heather Eggins. Some catchy title needed, decision on editorship and book structure should be made soon.

- **Information about the next IBAR seminar in Latvia: Agnese Rusakova, Alberts Prikulis** (University of Latvia) – the Faculty of Chemistry of the University of Latvia will host the event; reasonable accommodation provided, the seminar will start with a short presentation of the latest HE developments in Latvia.

Comment: Cláudia S. Sarrico. A lot of work can be done before the seminar. Templates of WPs 5-12 should be made in the meantime to be discussed and finalised at the seminar.

Comment: Helena Šebková. When planning the seminar, enough time should be given to the issues of financing and theory.

Comment: Heather Eggins. Things concerning the book structure should also be discussed (separately from other issues).

Comment: Jan Kohoutek. The seminar should be organised as two full days.

**Tuesday, 18 January**

**Morning session (after separate working breakfast) (9.15-11.00)**

**Outcomes of the session:**

- Need to think further about theory underlying the project enquiry, e.g. need to specify the concept of *the barrier or trust*;
- Need to identify generic factors bearing on ESG Part 1 implementation. These can be: institutional policy, legal regulation, funding, organisational culture, secondary education, barriers, examples of good practice;
- These factors should be considered in WPs 5-12 templates when modifying the research questions;
- When modifying the questions, the original content should not be completely removed;
- Need to specify typical respondents for WPs 5-12;
- Secondary education must be addressed in WPs 5-12;
- Easy access to the website including uploading materials should be made;
- Criteria for institutional selection may be broader than size and profile; active institutional involvement and reasonable openness also important.

**Coffee break (11.00-11.15)**

**Morning session (11.15-12.00)**

**Outcomes of bilateral discussion (GB + CZ) on WP 12**

- Weak cooperation on both sides (HEIs, secondary schools) but rules set by HEIs;
- Little information on interaction between secondary and higher education; insights useful for enriching policy practice;
- Who will be the respondents? ... Heads of specialised institutional departments, Ministry officials, possibly heads of schools (corresponding umbrella organisations);
- Need to modify the question 4 and to add two or three more questions.

**CONCLUSIONS FROM THE SEMINAR:**

- Every partner country should create the template of the WP which coordinates. The template should include revised research questions and identification of the key respondents for every question. The original content in the questions should not be completely lost. The following generic factors should be considered: institutional policy, organisational structures, legislation, funding, trust, relationship to secondary education, barriers to implementation, examples of good practice.

**Deadline: 20 February**

- GB, CZ and NL should produce and circulate theory usable for the conceptual framework.

**Deadline: by 14 February**