Project acronym: QFORTE
Project title: QFORTE - Enhancement of Quality Assurance in Higher Education System in Moldova (Ref. nr.: 618742-EPP-1-2020-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP)

THE EXPERIENCE OF INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION CARRIED OUT BY ARACIS

Seminar
5 December, 2023

Petru Todos,

ANACEC expert
Teaching staff representative

External evaluation panel

Panel composition:

- Mission director;

- Expert evaluator coordinator;

- Institutional evaluation expert;

- International expert;

- Employer representative ;

- 2 student representatives;

- Specialist inspector.

** mission director - from among the members of the ARACIS board. The coordinator of the team of experts who carry out the visit is proposed by the mission director and can be a representative of the Institutional Evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities or, as the case may be, a representative of one of the permanent specialized expert commissions that evaluate a field, or one or more study programs.

Proposal/recommendation (PR): Professionals in the field of educational management, well-trained experts in the field of external evaluation should be sent to the institutional evaluation.

Training activities

- An online training session was organized.

- Self-training based on the Methodology, Standards and evaluation standards, the standard form of the visit to the institution that describes in detail the external evaluation procedures.

It should be noted that several articles of this document have been adapted to the provisions of the legislation of the Republic of Moldova.

- The communication process: distribution of roles, how to prepare the final documentation of the External Evaluation Committee.

The ARACIS methodology provides for the guidance of the institution during the preparation of the self-evaluation report and the preparation of the Sheets.

The mandatory JUSTIFICATION ANNEXES are attached to the report and validated by the External Evaluation Committee at the last meeting of the visit to the institution.

PR: These best practices for guiding the institution during the preparatory period should be taken over.

Evaluation methods used

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

QFORTE
Fortifying higher education quality in Moldova.
No boundaries for quality

The evaluation methods and tools used during the institutional visit used by ARACIS:

1) Analysis of the self-evaluation report of the evaluated university and its annexes;
2) Analysis of the USC Charter and its annexes;
3) Analysis of documents, data and information available on the institution's website, in electronic format;
4) Meetings with: the management of the institution; teaching staff; students; graduates; employers;
5) Institution visit - lecture halls; the library of the institution; laboratories; Career counseling and guidance center; reading rooms; student dormitories and canteen; sports base etc.

PR. I have not noticed any fundamental differences in this regards, they are similar to those used by ANACEC and other EU External Evaluation Agencies. The genesis is common (Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, ESG 2015). The ARACIS evaluation guidelines reflect the European Standards, but being structured on three Domains and sub-domains of evaluation.

Tools: standards and performance indicators

The ARACIS methodology provides - 3 evaluation areas:

A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY (3 subfields, 3 standards, 16 PIs, 49 mandatory normative requirements)

B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (4 subfields, 4 standards, 16 IP, 37 mandatory requirements)

C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT (9 subfields, 9 standards, 17 IP, 28 mandatory requirements)

- Subdomains (criteria), e.g.

C.1 - strategies and procedures for quality assurance

C.2 - procedures regarding the initiation, monitoring and periodic review of the programs and activities carried out

C.3 - objective and transparent procedures for evaluating learning outcomes

C.4 - periodic evaluation procedures of the quality of the teaching staff

C.5 - the accessibility of resources suitable for learning

Standards: total 16,

Performance indicators: total 49

Mandatory normative requirements (2-5 for each performance indicator): total 113

Method of assessment of the achievement of the requirements of the standards – fulfilled, partially fulfilled, not fulfilled.

Mandatory annexes to the self-evaluation report

Annex 1. List of teaching staff according to the departments' job descriptions

Annex 2. The centralizing situation of the educational and research spaces

Annex 3. The number of enrolled students by educational levels and years of study

Annex 4. Data centralizer regarding scientific research

Annex 5. The situation of the degree of occupation of the full-time teaching staff in the educational institution

PR: They are very useful, it is good to take over.

It is also of interest: The performance standards for the accreditation of study programs are complemented with specific standards for fields of training: engineering, educational sciences, arts, etc. (ARACIS external evaluation methodology)

Reporting

1. SITE VISIT RECORD SHEET - EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

- Report of the international expert evaluator

- Report of the student experts

2. External evaluation departmental report (mission director, expert group coordinator)

3. The report of the ARACIS COUNCIL regarding the external evaluation of the academic quality of the higher education institution

The reports on p.1, 2 and 3 are published on the website

PR: It would be reasonable to take over some elements of good practices regarding reporting

Pictures from the external evaluation visit to USC

Why institutional evaluation?

The added value of the institutional evaluation: For a harmonious development of the programs they must be orchestrated, directed towards the achievement of a major common mission, applying synergistic strategies. The internal and external institutional evaluation will facilitate the rethinking of strategies and tactics, increasing the efficiency of the use of human and financial resources.

1. Given that the majority of programs have gone through the accreditation procedure once, their re-accreditation may take place simultaneously with the institution's re-accreditation. Therefore, only new programs that require authorization of provisional operation and accreditation after the first promotion should be subject to external evaluation.

2. To change accents. A more pronounced emphasis should be placed on the implementation of the NQF - standards. Evaluation should be focused on the analysis of the degree of reflection in the plans, curricula on the requirements of SC and St. of qualification. The learning outcomes, which make up the essence of the SC, how they are found in the documentation and how the institution can demonstrate that they (RÎ) are fulfilled/achieved by the students (in projects, exam content, etc.)

Thank you for your attention!