

1. PROJECT SUMMARY

1.1. Project title

Quality Assurance through Linqed (QAL)-towards a higher quality of education

1.2. Short Project Description

Project purpose

To develop a reference framework for educational quality assurance that takes into account the specificities (e.g. resources, culture and organisation) of network partners.

Expected results

1. Relevant international accreditation frameworks have been reviewed and importance for IQA has been assessed / inferred
2. Generic guidelines for Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) of key processes in education have been developed
3. Exchange on IQA tools and practices among network partners takes place
4. Network members have strengthened key aspects of their quality assurance policy and practice at course and/or institutional level

1.3. LINQED partners involved

Project commitment was expressed by PUCE (Ecuador), ITM (Belgium), IMTAvH (Peru), INHEM & IPK (Cuba), INAS (Morocco) and GMU (Indonesia)

Other partners involved: ESP (DR Congo), BPKIHS (Nepal), MUSPH (Uganda), UMSS (Bolivia), DVTD (South Africa), IPH (India)

Project Management:

Phase 1, development of present proposal by Linqed Executive committee members: GMU, UMSS, ESP, ITM

Phase 2, management, implementation and evaluation: PUCE, GMU, INAS, ITM (to be further specified in the process)

1.4. Duration

Phase 1: May. 2010 – Dec. 2010 (FA3-I)

Phase 2: Jan. 2011 – Dec. 2013 (FA3-II)

1.5. *Indicative budget (in € per year and in total)*

2. CONTEXT ANALYSIS

2.1. *Problem analysis*

During the first Linged workshop (Dec. 2008, Antwerpen) it was decided that the network would focus on quality in higher education. In the second workshop (Dec. 2009, Rabat) three priority projects were identified for future networking. One of them concerned exchange on internal quality assurance (IQA) practices. In this IQA project, to be as concrete as possible, the network would start working on “student assessment” as this was identified as a priority quality aspect by all members (2009 Survey on priorities). In Rabat a workshop session was dedicated to the discussion of concrete examples of student assessment tools from member institutions. This led to enriching discussions but failed to crystallize into a conceptual framework guiding evaluation of specific assessment practices. The question “how do we know we are doing a good job?” could not yet be answered. Which specific quality criteria could be useful as a basis for IQA? Even if there was a consensus that common frameworks for (internal and external) quality (and quality assurance) would never be able to take into account the diversity of contexts, a set of “guiding quality criteria” for key processes in education was thought to be necessary especially in view of (international) collaboration. These guiding criteria should mainly clarify what is meant by quality of specific aspects (e.g. student assessment, curriculum design or didactic approach). This project will thus aim at formulating guiding principles/criteria as a basis for IQA of key processes in education, and stimulate sharing of concrete experiences with IQA methods and tools among partners. A common quality assurance framework is not the objective.

2.2. *Objectives*

- To discuss and select, based on evidence-based instructional theories, most contextual proper principles and guidelines for key processes in higher education
- To test and apply these to key aspects (initially e.g. “student assessment”)
- To share experiences in IQA methods and tools
- To review, and learn from, international quality frameworks

2.3. *Problems addressed in the project*

The main problem addressed is the wish of partner institutions to develop a scaffold or guide for internal quality assurance avoiding a context insensitive prescriptive framework. Quality may differ (fortunately!) as well as value judgments (what we consider better or improved quality and what not).

On the one hand, the exist differences in reference standard among institutes; on the other hand, there is a need for consensus on a set of principles to identify the key elements for effective and efficient education. In addition, a consensus can also make the characteristics of our education transparent and thus facilitate (international) cooperation.

2.4. *Expected benefit from LINQED network collaboration on these problems*

Working in a network with partners from different continents and from very different cultural, socio-economic and institutional contexts should offer the best opportunities to come to a generic set of criteria / characteristics with a rather universal applicability.

It is expected that partners will have an agreement at conceptual level about what is a high quality student assessment. All partners should also have an in-depth understanding of the most essential elements on assessment (e.g., what the key factors determine the effectiveness of formative assessment?)

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION (Logical framework)

INTERVENTION LOGIC	Objectively verifiable indicators	Source of verification	Assumptions
<p>OVERALL OBJECTIVES (OO) Educational networking will strengthen training capacities in the field of international health at all partner institutions by building on the specific expertise and comparative strengths of network participants.</p>			
<p>PROJECT PURPOSE To develop a reference framework for educational quality assurance that takes into account the specificities (e.g. resources, culture and organisation) of network partners.</p>			
<p>RESULTS</p>			
<p>Result 1 Relevant international accreditation frameworks have been reviewed and importance for IQA has been assessed / inferred</p>	<p>A consensus is reached on reference documents. A general framework is uploaded to LINQED website for Quality assurance project.</p>	<p>Annual reports</p>	
<p>Result 2 Exchange on IQA tools and practices among network partners takes place</p>	<p>At least half of the partners posted a practical experience or concrete IQA tool on the website.</p> <p>These experiences or tools are at least consulted by half of the other network partners</p>	<p>Survey among partners</p>	
<p>Result 3 Network members have strengthened key aspects of their quality assurance policy</p>	<p>60% of partners developed initiatives or introduced changes in IQA at institutional or</p>	<p>Survey among partners</p>	

INTERVENTION LOGIC	Objectively verifiable indicators	Source of verification	Assumptions
and practice at course and/or institutional level	course level		
Result 4 Generic guidelines for Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) of key processes in education have been developed	Guidelines published for at least three key processes in education	Annual reports	

ACTIVITIES	Assumptions
Act. 1.1 Defining three key processes on which to work during 2011-2013 (based on learnt different evaluation policies in partner institutions)	
Act. 1.2 Preparing a discussion paper for each key process (e.g. quality characteristics for student assessment) with the help of experts	Sufficient specific educational expertise can be mobilised
Act. 1.3 Testing the appropriateness / usefulness at different partner institutions	
Act. 1.4 Publishing a consensus document for each key process	
....	
Act. 2 Creating a exchange structure on the Linqed website for IQA experiences / tools	
...	
Act. 3.1 Developing opportunities during Linqed workshops to report on institutional or course level QA developments	
Act. 3.2 Preparing a survey (for 2013)	
Act. 3.3 Analysing and publishing survey results	
...	
Act. 4.1 Establishing a task force for review of international QA frameworks	
Act. 4.2 Data collection including the possibility to attend international forums on QA in HE	
Act. 4.3 Analysis and publication of a descriptive overview and lessons learned for the network	
...	

3. BUDGET

- B. Investment costs: Costs made for purchases of valuable goods (over 1.000 €) for long-term duration (minimum 1 year). Investment costs are only permitted when specifically announced in the (submitted and approved) budget.
- C. Consumables: Costs that are directly connected to a specific activity of the project made for the purchase and/or the operational use of goods or services.
These goods and services are different from investment goods because
- they have a short-term duration
 - cannot function on their own (e.g. spare parts) or
 - are very activity-related (e.g. costs for the organization of a training session).
- E. Grants: Grants include fees, travel and boarding costs allowing project collaborators to follow a course at home or abroad; or for students and scientists from elsewhere to follow a course at the partner's institution.
- F. Travel expenses: Travel expenses can include all costs made for transportation of personnel from "door to door", needed for the execution of the project.
- G. Subsistence/Accommodation: Subsistence /Accommodation refer to personal costs strictly connected to missions (taxi, lunch, hotel ...). *Per diems can never be paid to persons that are not on a mission (e.g. local residents that attend a meeting or a workshop can never be entitled to a per diem). Invoices, receipts or statements for food, drinks and other personal costs during missions will not be accepted. Please apply the per diem system.*

Cost category	2011	2012	2013	2011–2013
B. Investment costs				
C. Consumables				
E. Grant				
F. Travel Expenses				
G. Subsistence/Accommodation				
Total				