

Quality Assurance in Higher Education

TLQAA Workpackage 3

Bruno Curvale

Former president of ENQA

Bologna expert

Project leader at *Centre international d'études pédagogiques (CIEP)*, France

Objectives of workpackage 3

- Design of criteria for the selection of the experts
- Selection of experts able to conduct external evaluation at the institutional level
- Preparation of training materials
- Training of experts in Lebanon
- Study tours in Europe (institutions and agencies)

Workpackage 3 is made of:

- WP.3-1 - Selection criteria
 - 15/06/2012 – Report – National level
- WP.3-2 Selected experts
 - 10/07/2012 – Report - National level
- WP.3-3 - Preparation of the training materials
 - 28/09/2012 – Teaching material - Department/Faculty level
- WP.3-4 - Training the experts
 - 23/11/2012 – Training - National level
- WP.3-5 - Study tour
 - 22/01/2013 – Training - National level

Who is involved?

CIEP – 32 days

- Animate the efforts in this workpackage
- Assure the progress towards the objectives of the workpackage
- Provide input on experts selection criteria
- Prepare training materials
- Participate to training
- Organize and follow the study tours

Who is involved?

UOB – 12 days

- Participate to setting expert selection criteria
- Nominate experts and participate in experts selection

DGHE – 10 days

- Participate to the setting the selection criteria
- Encourage proposing candidates experts and animate the selection of the experts
- Assist to the training of experts
- Participate to the study tour

Who is involved?

European Higher Education Institutions

ULB – 17 days

UTC – 17 days

INPL – 17 days

UA – 17 days

- Provide Input to the selection criteria
- Prepare the training materials
- Train experts
- Receive the experts and perform a study tour

Who is involved?

European Quality Assurance Agencies

AERES – 22 days

ANECA – 22 days

- Provide Input to the selection criteria
- Participate as advisor in the selection of the experts
- Prepare the training materials
- Train experts
- Receive the experts and perform a study tour

Who is involved?

Lebanese Higher Education Institutions

LU – 13 days

- Provide Input to the selection criteria
- Nominate expert candidates
- Participate to the selection of the experts
- Prepare the training materials
- Attend the training sessions
- Participate to the study tour

Who is involved?

Lebanese Higher Education Institutions

USJ – 12 days

MUT – 12 days

BAU – 9 days

- Provide Input to the selection criteria
- Nominate expert candidates
- Participate to the selection of the experts
- Attend the training sessions
- Participate to the study tour

Who is involved?

Lebanese Higher Education Institutions

NDU – 12 days

LAES – 12 days

USF – 10 days

MUBS – 12 days

- Nominate expert candidates
- Prepare the training materials
- Attend the training sessions
- Participate to the study tour

Who is involved?

Lebanese Higher Education Institutions

AUCE – 6 days

- Nominate expert candidates
- Attend the training sessions
- Participate to the study tour

Main goals of work package 3

- 1. To decide about the experts' selection criteria**
- 2. To organise the training of experts**

What do we need to complete workpackage 3?

Inputs of:

Workpackage 1

- Lebanese quality assurance model
- Lebanese quality assurance system description

Workpackage 2

- Set of standards and procedures to be used

**but we can start working on the experts'
selection criteria from now**

Clarifications we need

- Objectives, Procedures, Criteria, Data...
- Relationships between experts and agency
- Relationship between the experts and the higher education institution (confidentiality, reporting...)
- Relationships in the panel (role of the chair, possibility of having a minority report...)
- Role of experts (evaluation, recommendation making, participation to decision making...)

Clarification we need

- Notion of compliance (partial, substantial, total...)
- Notion of possible compensation between criteria
- Notion of evidence
- Type of report (public, non-public, partially public, size...)
- Type of support provided by the agency. Support staff in charge of protecting the interest of the agency

Brainstorming outcomes

The three next slides list ideas and remarks made during the meeting

Brainstorming outcomes

- Definition of peers has to be made precise. It can be restrictive or broad. The notion of having diversity of expertise and type of experts may be important.
- Internationalization of the panels should be considered.
- The number of trainees will be rather low and the project should allow for the training of future trainers
- How to detect possible experts? Should that be based on a voluntary basis? Should rectors play a role?
- Notion of due process. The selection of experts should be based on robust and opposable mechanisms

Brainstorming outcomes

- The experts' selection criteria should take into account a diversity of needs. Shouldn't we have different sets of criteria for selecting:
 - experts (pool)
 - permanent staff
 - trainers - senior reviewers -(Study tour) – practical considerations (language, discipline...) Sample representativeness
 - experts from the pool for a specific evaluation

Brainstorming outcomes

- Training materials should comprise
 - Code of ethics
 - Conflict of interest policy
 - ...
- WP3 will use all inputs from partners about:
 - Set of criteria for...
 - Pending issues
 - Training material (documentation...)
 - Organization of the trainings (who, where, reporting...)

Thank you for your attention

curvale@ciep.fr