INQAAHE 2012 Foorum Melbourne'is

Rahvusvahelise kvaliteediagentuuride võrgustiku (INQAAHE) 2012. aasta foorum toimus 17-18. aprillil Austraalias, Melbourne'i äärelinnas St Kildas. Osavõtjaid oli enam kui 130 üle kogu maailma. Korraldajaks oli Austraalia agentuur TEQSA (Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency).

Foorumi teemaks oli **„Välise kvaliteedikindlustuse tulevik"**, mis jagunes omakorda neljaks alateemaks:

1) Välise kvaliteedikindlustuse metodoloogia arengud
2) Institutsionaalne mitmekesisus ning kvaliteedikindlustus
3) Sisemine kvaliteedikindlustus ning institutsionaalse kvaliteedikultuuri areng
4) Välise kvaliteedikindlustuse sõltumatuse muutuvad ettekujutused

Kõigil neil teemadel toimusid nii plenaar- kui ka töögruppide sessioonid, kokkuvõtted neljast teemast esitati viimasel plenaarsessioonil. Teise alateema ühe töögrupi juhiks ning pearaportööriks oli Maiki Udam. Esimese alateema plenaarsessioonil tõi Julien Lecocq Prantsusmaalt oma ettekandes eraldi välja ka Hillar Baumani poolt foorumile esitatud käsitluse Eestis toimuvast õppekavagruppide hindamisest.

17.04 toimus INQAAHE Peaassamblee, kus mh valiti 2014. aasta INQAAHE foorumi korraldaja. Taotlused foorumi korraldamiseks olid esitanud 3 riigi agentuurid ning INQAAHE juhatuse poolt väljavalituks osutus Eesti Kõrghariduse Kvaliteediagentuur. Maiki Udam tutvustas foorumist osavõtjatele Eestit ning esines 2014.a foorumi korraldamist tutvustava ettekandega, misjärel foorumist osavõtjad ka Eesti järgmise foorumi korraldajaks kinnitasid.

INQAAHE foorumi ettekanded on kättesaadavad aadressil:

http://www.inqaahe.org/main/events-and-proceedings/inqaahe-2012-forum/presentations

Olulisemaid mõtteid:

INQAAHE presidendi ettekandest 7 riigi projekti kohta (impact of EQA)

1) Strong consensus on the positive impact of quality assurance standards and procedures on the development of HE
2) Teaching is a central issue in QA, which is widely valued by internal stakeholders; however, most QA agencies treat teaching related issues in a mostly formal way (indicators, formal qualifications) without focusing on the more significant processes.

3) It is important that the government takes on the responsibility for the provision of valid, relevant and timely information, taking into account the needs of different users (not just HEI, or researchers, but the public, which has very different needs)

4) Need to avoid excessive formalization and burocratization of QA processes (which are reducing their legitimacy)

5) Need to pay attention to increased complaints about conflicts of interest or lack of independence, of agencies and external reviewers. Criticism about lack of academic authority, biases and arbitrary decisions, which affect the credibility of QA processes

6) Need to increase participation opportunities for HEI and academic staff in the review of standards and procedures of national agencies: Increased legitimacy and acceptance of processes and decisions; learning of unanticipated effects; increased consideration of institutional diversity

7) Need to revise and improve the mechanism for selection, training and evaluation of external reviewers
   a. Increased focus of QA on the teaching and learning process, going beyond a formal and procedural approach: Avoid a prescriptive approach regarding curricular changes and other teaching aspects
   b. Analyse the links between the different components of the teaching and learning process
   c. Pay attention to differences among institutions (selectivity, purposes, modes of work)

Mark Hay - LAV: riskid EQA-s

- Threat to EQA independence: eg political interference, or by EQA protecting the national reputation (by taking a light touch approach).

   •Failure of EQA to adapt to changing HE conditions: eg technology, modes of learning, types of students, funding (do more with less), private higher education.

   •Failure to engage with our critics, cynics and sceptics.

   •Is it true that: ''trust is good but control is better''?

Teema 2 – Maiki kokkuvõte:

Challenges:

- QA of joint programs
- QA of branches of HEI-s
- Regulation of new entrants
- Considering context of HEI-s, e.g., exclusiveness *vs* inclusiveness

- Standard-based QA has made all programs identical -how to promote diversity?
- Division of the roles of QA agencies and professional accreditation bodies

How do QA agencies manage to balance diversity and homogeneity through EQA?

- Focus on outcomes instead of input
- Adoption of 'fitness for purpose' approach
- Adoption of 'non-prescriptive' standards and criteria that are open for interpretation
- Diversity of panels, including international expertise and representatives of employers

Issues to be resolved:

- Poor communication outward from agencies: we know what we mean but does the sector?
- Speed of action/info
- Conservative tendencies – we do not want to make mistakes
- Demarcation - what responsibilities should be left to students, universities, QA agencies

Teema 4 – sõltumatus: kokkuvõte (lessons)

- Absolute independence is not possible...

- But we can ensure that professional process and decisions are not influenced.

- Need to ensure that independence of QA is ensured at all levels -determining criteria of assessment/ review , schedule of visits, constitution of peer Review team, considering the recommendation of the Peers, final decision on QA process outcome, etc.

- Learning from Washington Accord.

- International bodies/ guidelines can play positive role

- Periodic external reviews of EQAs can help

- Credibility of QA is of paramount importance

- Independence is pre-condition for credibility of EQA

Kokkuvõtte koostasid:

Hillar Bauman, Maiki Udam

26.04.2012