



With the support of the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



# **IQAinAR**

**Enhancement of internal quality assurance of  
education in teaching, learning and assessment  
in HEIs of Azerbaijan and Russia**



## WP 1.2.

### Peer-Learning Seminar

#### Author(s)

P1-WUAS (Wittenborg University of Applied Sciences)

#### Contributors

IQainAR consortium members

#### Disclaimer

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.





## Contents

Executive Summary .....	4
1. Introduction.....	5
2. Participants.....	6
3. Program.....	7
4. Outcomes .....	9
Annex A - Agenda .....	10
Annex B – Meeting notes .....	12
Annex C – Attendance list.....	16
Annex D – Discussion Questions .....	19



## Executive Summary

The IQAinAR Peer Learning Seminar Summary Report describes the activities and outcomes of the Peer Learning Seminar that took place on 10-11<sup>th</sup> March 2021 online in MSTeams. The Seminar served as an event, where the participants of the projects and members of the consortium presented their findings on the initial report on quality assessment standards, monitoring assessment strategies and considering the strengths of different IQA and improvements to be made. This report presents the preparation of the peer learning seminar, the content discussed at the event and the overall outcomes for the next steps in work package one (1) and its final deliverables.



# 1. Introduction

The Peer Learning seminar has been held as an online event, with live sessions and discussion on the key topic areas. P1 -WUAS researchers, dr Rauf Abdul and Kriszta Kaspers and P2 – Natalia Lekareva (456 International BV) presented at the meeting from the comparative analysis of the initial reports submitted by the partners, on the identification of IQA needs and review of existing IQA quality systems, on areas such as Quality Assurance Standards, IQA Monitoring and Assessment strategies & procedures. All partners have presented their own findings regarding these aspects shortly at different sessions of the seminar.

The peer learning seminar was held as part of WP 1, which constitutes the core preparation phase that will provide the framework in which the consortium will work for the successful implementation of the activities in the WPs 2, 3 & 4, offering the insight for the IQA indicators, IQA in teaching, learning and assessment and content of the project actions and deliverables.

The peer learning seminar was targeted at: researchers, teachers and administrative staff involved in IQA system.

The peer learning seminar objectives were to:

- To clarify the different national contexts and the specific characteristics of existing or non-existing IQA systems
- To share and discuss best practices of EU HEIs, as well as focus on Partner country situation (RU and AZ) in the broader context of the European Region
- To agree on the 1st version of IQA indicators that will be used as a base in developing IQA roadmap, policy and strategy



## 2. Participants

We had 31 attendees, who are listed in the attendance list in Annex C.

The participants belonged to the partners in the IQAinAR consortium:

- Wittenborg University of Applied Sciences (NL) – P1 – 5 attendees
- IUBH Internationale Hochschule – P2 – 2 attendees
- 456 International BV (NL) – P3 – 1 attendee
- Fundacion Universitaria San Antonio – UCAM (ES) -P4 – 7 attendees
- Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation (RU) – P5
- Russian Academy of Education (RU) – P6 – 1 attendee
- Tver State University (RU) – P7 – 5 attendees
- Belgorod National Research University (RU) – P8 – 7 attendees
- Nakhchivan State University (AZ)-P9 – 1 attendee
- Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University (AZ) – P10 – 3 attendees
- Guest speaker was Mag.a Diane Freiberger, managing director of the Foundation for International Business Administration Accreditation (FIBAA).



### 3. Program



The detailed program agenda can be seen in Annex A. This section mainly presents the content of the agenda items.

Day 1 program has been kicked off with a Welcome & Introduction, where the aims and objectives of the seminar were presented, the target groups within the scope of the project and the expected results of the seminar. Furthermore, Day 1 consisted of two sessions:

1. Session 1: Quality Assurance Standards National & International perspectives, presented by representative of each participating country (the Netherlands, Germany, Spain, Russia and Azerbaijan)
2. Session 2: IQA Monitoring and Assessment strategies & procedures were presented by each partner of the IQAinAR consortium

The common traits of these strategies and procedures were the following:

- Internal Quality Assurance is ensured by external and internal controls.
- They adhere to accreditation requirements, national, international and government regulations.
- Policy monitoring based on a semi-structured systems were in place.
- Periodical Internal Quality Assurance System Audit was seen as part of this process.

The program on Day 2 consisted of three sessions with all research partners involved and the project coordinator meeting. The three sessions have had the following subjects:

1. Session 1: Strengths of the IQAS & Areas for Improvement

Key areas and IQA strengths highlighted were:

- Involvement of all stakeholders: staff, students (and parents), alumni and professional field (Advisory Board) are part of the quality assurance system to have a holistic view.
- Different committees and bodies are set-up to provide input, solicited and unsolicited advice to the Executive Board.
- Clear definition of responsibilities and high level of transparency regarding teaching, assessments and various processes
- Student centered IQA
- Monitoring based on the PDCA cycle
- Both internal and external controls monitor the IQAs.
- Policies and procedures in place to safeguard IQA processes

IQA improvement suggested:

- Effective implementation of such systems
- Actual implementation and output/results are important in benchmarking against national and/or international standards for continuous improvement.
- An effective research assessment system (quantitative measurement)
- Focus on research-based teaching
-



- Evaluation of curriculum on continuous basis in developing job market specific skill sets.
2. Session 2: Associate Partner Introduction – FIBAA  
Mag. A Diane Freiburger was a guest speaker, who talked about quality assurance implications from a accreditation foundation point of view.
  3. Session 3: Key Points from the Comparative Analysis
    - Strategic Frameworks, supporting policies and committees
    - Internal and external controls
    - Student-centred IQAs-students as clients
    - Involving all relevant stakeholders in the IQA process
    - Collective effort (teaching and non-teaching staff, students, alumni)
    - Tools used to monitor IQA performances
    - Demings-cycle or PDCA cycle could be helpful in the effective implementation of IQA systems

#### Key Indicators List – 1st Version,

Key indicators are important in developing an effective Roadmap for IQA at a HEI level

- Student Satisfaction
- Student Work-placement after graduation
- Tools and techniques for monitoring IQA
- Implementation of IQA
- Outcome/effects of IQA
- International Rankings

A possible level structure of the roadmap has been presented and members of the consortium have been asked to provide input.

#### Discussions, Next Steps

- a. WP 1.3 – National Workshops
- b. WP 1.4 – Roadmap, Policy and Strategy

In Annex D there is a detailed overview of the discussion topics (by the means of eight questions) put up and discussed during the meeting as well as asked partner to fill in the answers within two weeks after the seminar has taken place.





## 4. Outcomes

The results of the Peer Learning Seminar in reflection to the proposed objectives of the seminar:

- Clarified the different national contexts and the specific characteristics of existing or non-existing IQA systems, by the partners conducting prior to the meeting an internal research which they have presented on selected topics at the seminar.
- Shared and discussed best practices of EU HEIs, with a focus on partner country situation (RU and AZ) in the broader context of the European Region
- Agreed on the first version of the key indicators that will serve as base in developing IQA roadmap, policy and strategy

The feedback has been positive both on the individual partner works as well as the work and research that has been done by P1.



## Annex A - Agenda

Identification		
<b>Project:</b>	Enhancement of internal quality assurance of education in teaching, learning and assessment in HEIs of Azerbaijan and Russia (IQAiAR)	
<b>Project Ref.:</b>	619477-EPP-1-2020-1-NL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	
<b>Meeting:</b>	Peer Learning Seminar	
<b>Date:</b>	10-11 <sup>th</sup> March 2021	
<b>Time:</b>	9:30 – 12:30 CET	
<b>Location:</b>	Online via MS Teams	
Meeting Agenda		
Time (CET)	Agenda Item	Presenter
Day 1: 10 <sup>th</sup> of March 2021		
9:30 - 9:45	Welcome & Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Aim and Objectives of the Seminar</li> <li>● Target groups</li> <li>● Expected Results of the Seminar</li> </ul>	P1
9:45 – 10:30	Session 1: Quality Assurance Standards – National & International: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 5 Partner Presentations (NL/DE/ES/RU/AZ)</li> </ul>	P1, P2, P4, P5, P9
10:30 - 10:45	Break	All
10:45 – 12:30	Session 2: IQA Monitoring and Assessment strategies & procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teaching, learning, assessment</li> <li>● Research &amp; Researcher</li> <li>● Tools used for assessment</li> <li>● The procedure of the IQA monitoring</li> <li>● Discussions</li> </ul>	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10
Day 2: 11 <sup>th</sup> of March 2021		
9:30 - 9:45	Welcome & Summary of Day 1	P1
9:45 – 11:00	Session 1: Strengths of the IQAS & Areas for Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presentations</li> <li>● Discussions</li> </ul>	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10



11:00 – 11:15	Break	All
11:15 – 11:45	Session 2: Associate Partner Introduction - FIBAA	Diane Freiberger Managing Director FIBAA
11:45 – 12:30	Session 3: Key Points/Key Indicators List – 1 <sup>st</sup> Version <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Discussions</li></ul> Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● WP 1.3 – National Workshops</li><li>● WP 1.4 – Roadmap, Policy and Strategy</li></ul>	P1 & P5
12.30- 13.00	Project Coordinator Meeting	All
<b>Additional information</b>		
<b>Handouts</b>	– N/A	



## Annex B – Meeting notes

Meeting Minutes		
<b>Project:</b>	Enhancement of internal quality assurance of education in teaching, learning and assessment in HEIs of Azerbaijan and Russia (IQainAR)	
<b>Project Ref.:</b>	619477-EPP-1-2020-1-NL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	
<b>Meeting:</b>	Peer Learning Seminar	
<b>Date:</b>	10-11 <sup>th</sup> of March 2021	
<b>Time:</b>	9:30 – 12:30 CET	
<b>Location:</b>	Online via MS Teams	
Decisions and Recommendations		
Action Item	Responsible	Deadline
<b>WP1 Remaining Tasks</b>		
1. To provide input with regard to the topics discussed during two days of Seminar sessions. The document can be accessed <a href="#">here</a>	All Partners	<b>15<sup>th</sup> of March, 13:00 CET</b>



With the support of the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



2.	To submit the existing questionnaires at your institution if you have not done so already by uploading them to <a href="#">this folder</a>	All Partners	<b>15<sup>th</sup> of March</b>
3.	To develop 1 <sup>st</sup> draft of questionnaires targeting different groups (students/teachers/alumni/employers/governmental bodies) - WP 1.1.1. and 1.1.4.	P1 & P5	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> of April.</b>
4.	To review and provide feedback on the questionnaires	All Partners	<b>9<sup>th</sup> of April</b>
5.	Final version of questionnaires to be distributed	P1	<b>16<sup>th</sup> of April</b>
6.	Surveys to be conducted and reports to be submitted	All Partners	<b>31<sup>st</sup> of May</b>
7.	RU and AZ universities to organise national workshops. For more information on the national workshops please check <a href="#">Project Plan</a> or contact Kate at <a href="mailto:kkabakhidze@gmail.com">kkabakhidze@gmail.com</a> and Wittenborg research team - WP 1.3.	P5 – P10	<b>Between 19<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> of April</b>
8.	Reports on the national workshops to be submitted	P5 – P10	<b>31<sup>st</sup> of May</b>
9.	To develop the draft of the Roadmap and strategy - WP 1.4.	P1	<b>30<sup>th</sup> of June</b>
10.	To provide feedback on the draft of the Roadmap and strategy	All Partners	<b>31<sup>st</sup> of July</b>
11.	Final version of the Roadmap to be communicated to all partners	P1	<b>31<sup>st</sup> of August</b>
<b>Administrative Tasks</b>			



With the support of the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



12.	To fill in the <a href="#">Attendance list</a> for both days of the seminar	All Partners	<b>15<sup>th</sup> of March</b>
13.	To submit the completed partnership agreement (if you have not done so yet).	All Partners	<b>15<sup>th</sup> of March</b>
14.	All agreements to be mutually signed (Wittenborg & Partner).	All Partners	<b>31<sup>st</sup> of March</b>
15.	Project logo is selected and can be accessed <a href="#">here</a> , as well as EU logo. Please moving forward use both project and EU logos on all project related documentation. Please also upload your organisational logo in the same folder if you have not done so yet.	All Partners	<b>15<sup>th</sup> of March</b>
16.	To fill in <a href="#">Risk Management forms</a> . For more information on quality assurance related questions please contact Natalia Lekareva at <a href="mailto:leknatgeorg@gmail.com">leknatgeorg@gmail.com</a>	All Partners	<b>15<sup>th</sup> of March</b>
17.	If your organisation is planning to write a news brief about the seminar, please use the <a href="#">press release template</a> . If you have already published any news about the project on your website or social media, please be so kind to share the link. For more information on the communication and dissemination strategy please contact Ramona Bucur at <a href="mailto:rmbucur@ucam.edu">rmbucur@ucam.edu</a>	All Partners	<b>Ongoing</b>
18.	To fill in the timesheets covering the period from 15/01/2021 till 31/03/2021. Please submit all the timesheets by uploading them in your respective <a href="#">folder</a> . Please use the <a href="#">timesheet template</a> .	All Partners	<b>10<sup>th</sup> of April</b>
19.	Next Project Management team meeting will be scheduled on the week of <b>19<sup>th</sup> of April</b> . Project coordinators will receive a <a href="#">Datumprikker</a> link to arrange the exact date and time of	All Partners	<b>12<sup>th</sup> of April</b>



the meeting. In case if you want to address the whole consortium and would like to add any topic to the meeting agenda, please contact us no later than **12<sup>th</sup> of April**.

### Risks, Issues and Opportunities

Risk/Issue/Opportunity	Description	Action	Responsible	Deadline
Opportunity - WP 2.4. Workshop in the Netherlands	Suggested dates for the visit to Apeldoorn, the Netherlands (WP 2.4.) are <b>4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> of October 2021</b> .	Please let us know if these dates overlap with national/public holidays in your country. The factual planning of this trip is not expected earlier than in August and will depend on the pandemic situation and travel restrictions.	P1	<b>Ongoing</b>
Issue - WP 2.1. The study visit to Murcia	Due to pandemic the study visit to Murcia (WP 2.1) is to be rescheduled from July 2021 to January 2022.	The suggested dates for the visit are <b>17-21<sup>st</sup> of January 2022</b> .	P4	<b>Ongoing</b>



With the support of the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



## Annex C – Attendance list

Attendance List	
<b>Project:</b>	<b>Enhancement of internal quality assurance of education in teaching, learning and assessment in HEIs of Azerbaijan and Russia (IQainAR)</b>
<b>Project Ref.:</b>	<b>619477-EPP-1-2020-1-NL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP</b>
<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Peer Learning Seminar</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>10-11th of March 2021</b>
<b>Time:</b>	<b>9:30 – 12:30 CET</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Online via MS Teams</b>
<b>Day 1 - 10/03/2021</b>	
<b>Day 2 - 11/03/2021</b>	





With the support of the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



	<b>Name/Surname</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Name/Surname</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
1.	Maggie Feng	Project Manager	P1 WUAS	Maggie Feng	Project Manager	P1 WUAS
2.	Aydan Ismayilova	Project Coordinator	P1 WUAS	Aydan Ismayilova	Project Coordinator	P1 WUAS
3.	Rauf Abdul	Researcher	P1 WUAS	Rauf Abdul	Researcher	P1 WUAS
4.	Kriszta Kaspers	Researcher	P1 WUAS	Kriszta Kaspers	Researcher	P1 WUAS
5.				Peter Birdsall	Senior Researcher/Observer	P1 WUAS
6.				Mag.a Diane Freiberger, MBA	Managing Director	FIBAA
7.	Igor Koskov	Project Coordinator	P8 BelSU	Igor Koskov	Project Coordinator	P8 BelSU
8.	Alexey Kolesnikov	Researcher	P8 BelSU	Alexey Kolesnikov	Researcher	P8 BelSU
9.	Svetlana Kucheryavenko	Researcher	P8 BelSU	Svetlana Kucheryavenko	Researcher	P8 BelSU
10.	Olesya Serkina	Researcher	P8 BelSU	Olesya Serkina	Researcher	P8 BelSU
11.	Svetlana Stepanenko	Researcher	P8 BelSU	Svetlana Stepanenko	Researcher	P8 BelSU
12.	Anastasia Nazarova	Researcher	P8 BelSU	Anastasia Nazarova	Researcher	P8 BelSU
13.	Svetlana Stenyushkina	Researcher	P8 BelSU	Svetlana Stenyushkina	Researcher	P8 BelSU
14.						
15.	Manuel C. Ruiz González	Project Manager	P4 UCAM	Manuel C. Ruiz González	Project Manager	P4 UCAM
16.	Isabel M <sup>a</sup> Timón Pérez	Researcher	P4 UCAM	Isabel M <sup>a</sup> Timón Pérez	Researcher	P4 UCAM



With the support of the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



17.	Almudena Vicente Buendía	Researcher	P4 UCAM	Almudena Vicente Buendía	Researcher	P4 UCAM
18.	Sebastián Reverte Fernández	Researcher	P4 UCAM	Sebastián Reverte Fernández	Researcher	P4 UCAM
19.	Antonia Rosauro Caravaca	Researcher	P4 UCAM	Antonia Rosauro Caravaca	Researcher	P4 UCAM
20.	Andrés Muñoz Ortega	Researcher	P4 UCAM	Andrés Muñoz Ortega	Researcher	P4 UCAM
21.	Ramona Bucur	Administrative Support	P4 UCAM	Ramona Bucur	Administrative Support	P4 UCAM
22.	Andrey Belotserkovskiy	Project coordinator	P7 TvSU	Andrey Belotserkovskiy	Project coordinator	P7 TvSU
23.	Igor Lelchitskiy	researcher	P7 TvSU	Igor Lelchitskiy	researcher	P7 TvSU
24.	Tamara Golubeva	researcher	P7 TvSU	Tamara Golubeva	researcher	P7 TvSU
25.	Elena Astapenko	researcher	P7 TvSU	Elena Astapenko	researcher	P7 TvSU
26.	Lyudmila Katauskaite	researcher	P7 TvSU	Lyudmila Katauskaite	researcher	P7 TvSU
27.	Natalia Lekareva	Project Coordinator	456 International BV	Natalia Lekareva	Project Coordinator	456 International BV
28.	Elena Golubovskaya	Researcher	P6 RAE	Elena Golubovskaya	Researcher	P6 RAE
29.	Gunay Maharramova	Researcher	P10 ASPU			
30.	Nurangiz Mahmudova	Researcher	P10 ASPU			
31.	Galib Sharifov	Researcher	P10 ASPU			



## Annex D – Discussion Questions

### Discussion Question Input – All Partners

#### Peer Learning Seminar 10-11<sup>th</sup> March 2021

#### 1. Which national standards are important for IQA implementation and why?

##### P1 input (WUAS)

All national regulations related to HEIs set by the regional and/or national government are essential for both public and private sector HEIs. Some of the standards or regulations are obligatory and must be implemented effectively in order to continue offering degree programme. It is important to mention why they are important. In the Dutch context as might be the case elsewhere, government education bodies would like to ensure quality education and great learning experience for the young students. They would like to see all HEIs complying with some fundamental standards to fulfil the education provisions for their students effectively.

##### P2 input

Legislation is relevant for the implementation of IQA at German universities, in as much as they aspire to be granted Systems Accreditation. Systems Accreditation allows German universities to internally accredit their study programmes on behalf of the German Accreditation Council, thus allowing for speedier accreditation processes. The IQA in these cases is structured so as to fulfil formal external requirements as laid down in law.

##### P3 input

All standards applied in Dutch HEI we find essential to be applied in IQA as they form a continuous cycle of enhancement and revisions of the IQA. Specifically the reflective cycle used in Netherlands facilitates timely adjustments to IQA in a fast-changing environment.

##### P4 input

Higher education in our country is highly regulated, which always guarantees a high level. In Spain, the National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation (ANECA) and its regional counterparts in each region are responsible for the evaluation, certification and accreditation of teaching, teaching staff and universities, whether public or private. Their work is part of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), a project initiated in 1999 with the Bologna Process to harmonize the educational systems of the member countries.

##### P5 input

It is common knowledge that Russian national standards do not provide specific indicators for assuring and enhancing internal quality in HEIs, so, to answer this question, there is nothing much to choose from. The latest standards of higher education (3rd generation) – available at <http://fgosvo.ru/fgosvo/92/91/4> - were proposed by the Ministry of Education and approved by the Ministry of Justice in 2014-2015, depending on the profiles and majors and look more like



frameworks for Universities to adopt and further customize to their syllabi. The last edition of the Standards, however, is much more transparent against the previous documents in terms of active employment of the basic concepts, e.g. credits, focus on competences rather than knowledge etc. and thus better responds to the Bologna process. Basically, it goes without saying, the national standards should have pronounced indicators of IQAS to ensure a learning environment in which the content of programmes, learning opportunities and facilities are fit for their purpose. Alternatively, dedicated documents as guides to IQA should be introduced and adopted, similar to Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA).

### P7 input

National standards have to be unquestionably met. All state accreditation systems are based on them and any IQA is initially aimed at providing compliance with them. However, national standards set just a minimal sufficient limit for quality and we can (and should) work on moving above the limit, use additional dimensions of quality and their indicators.

### P8 input

In the Russian Federation, the important national standards are:

The federal state educational standards that define modern requirements for the education quality. The main result of education is the formation of a set of competencies in graduates that allow them to set and solve the most important life and professional tasks. The education quality when implementing the national standards is determined by the effectiveness of the educational institution performance and a high-level of education obtained by graduates.

Professional standards that ensure the improvement of the professional level of specialists, the competitiveness of employees in the labour market, set the bar for modern requirements and guidelines of employers, and ensure high efficiency of professional training.

### P9 input

The Rules for Accreditation of Educational Institutions - establish a legal basis for determining the status of an educational institution and a legal guarantee for an extension of its activity for the next 5 years. In accordance with the Rules for accreditation, an educational institution submits a self-assessment report and report on the HEI's internal quality assurance annual activities to the Education Quality Assurance Agency a month before the accreditation process.

### P10 input

An educational institution should have mechanisms for approving, periodically monitoring and reviewing educational programs.

Curricula need to be carefully planned, periodically monitored and updated to gain the trust of students and other stakeholders in higher education. The following is provided for quality assurance of educational programs:

Preparation of perfectly planned learning outcomes.

Precise design of curricula and programs.

Periodic checking of programs

Design, planning and implementation of the educational process

Monitoring of student development and achievements

Monitoring of students' opinions on the teaching process

Regular review of programs by relevant experts from similar educational institutions

Obtaining feedback from employers and other relevant bodies



## 2. How could accreditation standards facilitate the effective development of an IQA system?

### P1 input(WUAS)

There are different types of accreditations pursued by the HEIs these days. Some of them try to achieve national and relevant international accreditations. The requirements set in order to obtain these accreditations through certain key standards by these agencies are carefully designed to ensure that the students will achieve the necessary skills, knowledge and graduate with a set of final qualifications necessary for their future roles whether doing a job or starting their own business. These accreditation standards set certain quality benchmarks for the institutions to achieve in this regard. In doing so, directly and/or indirectly these standards influence the HEIs which eventually will have to design/develop an IQA system to fulfil such requirements effectively.

### P2 input

If, as is the case with IUBH, the number of accreditation procedures exceeds the amount that can be easily handled on a case-to-case basis, there will be a need to efficiently organise accreditation processes so as to minimise time and effort needed.

An IQA then can be designed along the lines of accreditation criteria that systematically produces the information output needed for accreditation processes.

### P3 input

The accreditation standards definitely facilitate the effective development of an IQA system as they assure that HEI provides students with the updated knowledge and experience applicable to the current and future needs of the professional world.

### P4 input

In addition to the official controls established at the national level, each university may have its own internal quality assurance systems. This is voluntary, but facilitates agency evaluations. The accreditation norms establish minimum standards for the development of quality assurance systems in HEIs that promote continuous improvement.

### P5 input

Accreditation standards and IQA go hand in hand. Perhaps the question should be put the other way round: how can IQA contribute to accreditation standards.

### P6 input

On the one hand, accreditation standards are the most important milestone in the effective implementation of IQA as the requirements to adhere to them for the University to stay onboard creates prerequisites for a particular level of quality at a HEI. On the other hand, these standards should definitely act as a living document and be updated to consider the newly arising trends in the labour market and review best practices in the field.

### P7 input

Accreditation standards set target indicators for the management system.



### P8 input

The national standards contribute to the effective development of the internal quality assurance system by the:

- 1) formation of a single national educational space;
- 2) continuity of educational programs;
- 3) variability of the content of educational programs, which allows creating educational programs of different levels of complexity and orientation, taking into account the requirements and expectations of the stakeholders.

### P9 input

Accreditation standards are organized by each level of education. They evaluate the material and technical basis of educational programs taught in HEI, the quality indicators of educators and the level of knowledge, skills and habits of students in accordance with the requirements of the labour market and program implementation. The standards ensure the compliance of the educational institution's activities with state educational standards, the creation of an effective and modern learning environment in the educational institution and provide a basis for self-analysis.

### P10 input

Assessment of students' knowledge and skills is one of the most important elements of higher education, an important element in determining their future careers, as well as provides important information about the effectiveness of education.

The following principles are followed in the assessment of students:

Evaluation criteria are developed to test the extent to which the intended learning outcomes and other program objectives have been achieved;

Principles are clear and stated (published) assessment methods are used;

Assessment methods determine whether students have the necessary knowledge and skills to achieve learning outcomes and vocational training;

During the assessment, knowledge and skills are assessed diagnostically, in formative (creatively) and summative ways (taking into account all the details);

Assessment is not judged solely by examination. The results of all measurement and evaluation methods used are summarized. The final grade consists of the sum of the students' exam grades, the results of the daily questionnaires (skills) assessment, independent work and attendance scores.

In other cases and conditions when a student is ill or unable to take the exam, re-examination is regulated by special Rules and brought to the attention of students;



### 3. How can student satisfaction and career success be enhanced through an IQA system?

#### P1 input (WUAS)

Yes, it is a process itself that can help in improving student satisfaction and enhance career success. If you survey students, you will start improving the study programmes. If you talk to the employers they will also help to improve the student learning. However, there is one problem, - nobody knows what competencies will be required in a few years. Only a few of the current employers can forecast the conditions effectively for the future. Everything is changing. The digital transformation is changing the world economies rapidly. An effective way to forecast or prognosis with low levels of error is essential for the career success of our students/graduates. The process of IQA is cyclical and self-strengthening regarding student satisfaction and career success.

#### P2 input

Student satisfaction and career success can be enhanced by integrating data on both aspects in the IQA. In many cases, this is achieved through regular evaluations by these stakeholders, and defining internal processes and responsibilities to ensure that the results are dealt with on a regular basis.

#### P3 input

Satisfaction level of students during and after the learning process, as well as their career growth helps to determine how much the content and format of educational programs meets the modern requirements of the professional world.

#### P4 input

UCAM has a process which guarantees that it has mechanisms that allow it to obtain information on the satisfaction of the different stakeholders (students, academic, administrative and service staff, employers, graduates...) in order to make decisions on the improvement of the quality of the courses offered.

Those responsible for the processes involved in the satisfaction of the stakeholders described in the Table: Processes- Stakeholder Satisfaction must provide all the information requested as well as the analysis of all its indicators in order to know the degree of satisfaction of the same.

Depending on the stakeholder group to be surveyed, the person in charge of the process establishes the most appropriate means available to collect information from each of them (web application, e-mail, telephone survey, etc.).

The data resulting from completing the surveys are collected and analysed by those responsible for each process, which prepares the report on the results of the satisfaction of its stakeholders and which also includes the value of the process indicators.

All process managers must send their reports on stakeholder satisfaction results to the ED/CCF so that they can study the results and identify areas for improvement and make the improvements they deem appropriate. The ED must prepare the improvement plan report for its degree.

Once the improvement proposals have been made by the ED/CCF, they are submitted to the Presidency/Governing Council for approval.

The improvements can be carried out by the GC, the DEs of each faculty and/or by those responsible for the processes themselves.

#### P5 input

IQA systems have a number of instruments to assess the students' satisfaction of teaching and learning, thus it can contribute quite directly to the students' performance. Other instruments are



developed to measure employers' satisfaction by the level of the students' theoretical and practical knowledge and skills. The more accurately IQA indicators are developed the better chances are to equip students with relevant skills in compliance with the labour market requirements.

### P6 input

There is obviously a positive correlation between the system of IQA and student satisfaction and career success, which works both ways. The satisfaction surveys reveal the way main stakeholders take the situation and evaluate both the process itself and outcomes. Graduate tracer studies and other tools of employability records provide the objective cross section of the HEIs efficacy as every University does not give any trainings for the sake of teaching and being taught as, for the majority of students, the ultimate goal of doing degrees is being employed and earning money to pay off the efforts and time invested. It sounds reasonable, but the things are not as simple as that, though. A striking example can be derived from the indicators recommended by IQAS policy-makers, with students' publication activities at the top. What we may miss out on that is, for example, the different needs of students majoring in different profiles. Those doing degrees in applied sciences may require absolutely different skills and competences rather than getting their papers published in high quartile magazines. A decent alternative to getting University students continuously writing academic papers would be running dual programmes, e.g. the practice our Spanish colleagues referred to. In this way the value added to life – the parameter our colleague from Tver identified quality in the eyes of students – is likely to increase multi-fold.

### P7 input

None.

### P8 input

The following activities help to increase student satisfaction and their career success:

- receiving feedback as part of the annual monitoring of customer satisfaction with educational services;
- conducting an independent qualification assessment procedure that ensures successful employment of graduates;
- international professional public accreditation of educational programs, ensuring the recognition of a received diploma at the international level;
- involvement of employers in the process of designing educational programs, taking into account their requests and expectations, to form the necessary set of competencies for students;
- ensuring the quality of educational programs in accordance with modern trends in the development of economy, science, and technology.

### P9 input

Effectiveness of the IQA system at high education institutions also rely on the degree of students' involvement in it. HEIs who gather student input/feedback/evaluation are able to modify their methodologies, academic planning, content of a course and improve study programmes.

Questionnaires and surveys completed by the students should embrace different aspects of study programmes, classes, support, etc.

Study programmes need to be aligned with labour market requirements. HEIs are able to revise academic programs in line with employment needs. For this, the outcomes of employer surveys have to be coordinated with academic staff and management.





### P10 input

IQA also motivated universities to strengthen their management information systems and improve their ability to make data-based decisions by collecting survey data from internal and external stakeholders.

The research data also revealed a number of common factors for success, although they largely depended on the context of each individual institution. Overall, the participating universities agreed that leadership support and stakeholder involvement were of tremendous importance. The effectiveness of the IQA system also relied heavily on the level to which students and staff were aware of and involved in its processes and tools. Students and staff felt that they did not receive enough feedback from certain IQA tools, such as course evaluations or student satisfaction surveys, the study found. Finally, the data from certain tools was not always used to maximum effect by the intended audience. For instance, the results of graduate tracer studies were predominantly used by management rather than academics who are in charge of the revision of study programmes. Therefore, IQA is most effective if it leads to a regular internal dialogue on quality. This dialogue fosters a quality culture that is also the ultimate purpose of IQA and will help pave the way to improved academic quality and graduate employability.

## 4. What are the key factors in monitoring the effective IQA system implementation?

### P1 input (WUAS)

Input from students feedback into how you will deliver and organise, the problem is long-term planning considering technological improvements in the coming years, and how can university forecast it? Having a dedicated office or department is important to develop a good IQA system. Develop a quality assurance system through the involvement of all stakeholders as it is essential when monitoring the education quality. It is important to set good standards to monitor the quality and assessing some precise factors which can enhance the quality of education delivery. Not all stakeholders can contribute equally, but should be able to decide on the competency of the stakeholders.

### P2 input

In our experience, key factors are a) regular internal reporting on the outcome of pre-defined processes; b) regular feedback by staff and c) regular audits of the IQA through external experts

### P3 input

The key factors in monitoring the effective implementation of the IQA system are, first of all, consistency with national and world regulations, as well as the cyclicity and interconnection of all processes of the IQA system in such a way that the system can be quickly adapted to changing circumstances.

### P4 input

UCAM has a procedure which establishes how to analyze the annual review of the Internal Quality Assurance System, and report on its development, carry out improvement actions and approve its update (Quality Manual and Process Manual). In the same way, the system to be applied in the periodic review and control (internal audits) of the official degrees is established.

With the Review and Improvement of the Internal Quality Assurance System of the Degree (Audit), which is carried out at least once a year, it is intended to:

Evaluate the degree of implementation of the IQAS in the degree.



Evaluate its effectiveness in meeting the proposed objectives.  
Identification of improvements to the efficiency of the system based on the indicators analysed.  
Planning and implementation of improvement actions resulting from the analysis of the satisfaction surveys of the degree itself.  
Facilitate the monitoring and accreditation processes established by ANECA.

#### P5 input

None.

#### P6 input

The key factors should be brought into strict compliance with the indicators pre-established by a HEI. The best solution here would be application of numerical matrices and statistics collection. Apart from those commonly used, e.g. *satisfaction and evaluation surveys, employability records, publication activities*, there is quite a range of points and areas to take into account. Just off the top of my head, referring to the German experience as presented by the spokesperson at the peer-learning seminar, the *ratio of full-time professors or number of research support offerings* would also serve as a thing to consider as it does make the difference, whether immediately or indirectly. Creating a special department or at least a working group is crucial here as continuous assessment and internal auditing is a must and should run along with accreditations panels' audits and check-ups. Not only should they evaluate, their ultimate goal is to monitor and adjust the syllabi, curricula, course programmes, resources etc. according to the weaknesses identified.

#### P7 input

None.

#### P8 input

The key factors in monitoring the effective IQA system implementation are:  
well-developed legal and methodological frameworks;  
availability of the specialized QA department and highly-qualified staff;  
involvement of stakeholders in the processes of internal assessment of the education quality;  
resource support of the educational process.

#### P9 input

The goals set by the IQA department are supposed to be feasible and expected learning outcomes should be achievable. An institution should have a monitoring system in place to collect information about the quality of its activities and a clear timetable for them. The monitoring system should include the follow-up of IQA activities in order to measure their impact:  
Student progress and student support progress should be recorded;  
Research performance improvement needs to be recorded;  
Improvement in the graduate employability opportunities should be measured

#### P10 input

The educational institution must provide students with appropriate resources and support mechanisms in the educational process.  
The university also provides students with other resources to help them learn (libraries, training centres, laboratories, computers, etc.).  
Student support mechanisms include human resource counsel and tutoring services.  
Learning resources and other student support services are planned according to the needs of the students and are available to each student.



The University periodically monitors, inspects and improves the effectiveness and availability of student support services.

## 5. Identify and discuss key strengths and how such factors can support in achieving better results in education delivery?

### P1 input

Involvement of all stakeholders in the quality assurance system to have a holistic view on education delivery.

Different committees and bodies are set-up to provide input, solicited and unsolicited advice to the Executive Board.

Policies and procedures in place to safeguard IQA processes

Clear definition of responsibilities regarding teaching, assessments and various processes and follow-up actions

Student centered IQA

Monitoring based on the PDCA cycle

Both internal and external controls monitor the IQAs.

### P2 input

In our view, key strengths of IQA are

regular provision of data,

definition and documentation of relevant processes,

identification of responsibilities.

Thus, a good IQA provides the data needed to evaluate the quality of all aspects relevant to the mission of an HEI, and defines the processes and responsibilities to enhance this quality.

As education is at the core of a HEI's mission, IQA provides information on its quality for example through

regular evaluations,

statistical analysis of exam results,

feedback from external peers.

Regular data gathering and reporting allows monitoring of the impact of measures on educational quality. Deciding measures through predefined processes ensures transparency and fosters staff support.

### P3 input

Involvement of all stakeholders: staff, students (and parents), alumni and professional field (Advisory Board) are part of the quality assurance system to have a holistic view.

Different committees and bodies are set-up to provide input, solicited and unsolicited advice to the Executive Board.

Clear definition of responsibilities and high level of transparency regarding teaching, assessments and various processes

Student centered IQA

Monitoring based on the PDCA cycle

Both internal and external controls monitor the IQAs.

Policies and procedures in place to safeguard IQA processes



#### P4 input

Among the main strengths of the IQAS, we believe that the following should be found:

Design and develop a structured and concrete IQAS, with delimited but connected strategic, key and support processes.

To have an institutional communication plan that allows the development of communication strategies based on transparency and quality.

To have an organizational structure capable of responding and adapting to changes in the academic scenario.

Promote the use of active teaching methodologies that function as connectors of theoretical knowledge and practical skills of students, so that they can respond to the demands of society in an adjusted and real way.

Personalized follow-up and student motivation, so as to favour the acquisition of knowledge and the achievement of better academic results.

Promote digital transformation in the academic field, so that better and greater technical resources are put at the service of active teaching methodologies.

#### P5 input

None.

#### P6 input

highly qualified staff (an extremely high ratio of PhD and Dr. hab. holders, Academics)

a wide experience in the areas of national / international expertise, accreditation and certification.

collaboration with a big number of leading Russian Universities acting as staff / students advisors, associates, counsellors, supervisors etc.

a comprehensive track record of acting as supervisors and argument consultants of student /PhD student theses and dissertations.

a high awareness of the top textbooks used in secondary, high and higher schools.

active participation in dissertation boards on a regular basis

All these and many others allow for deep knowledge of the best teaching / learning /assessment / research practices and create background for cross comparison, adoption and dissemination of insights and initiatives. The accumulated expertise, monitoring and reviewing gives room for improvement in education delivery on the national scale and contributes to decision making policy in the field of national accreditation and standardization.

#### P7 input

None.

#### P8 input

As the key strengths of the internal quality assurance system, we would like to mention the following:

- using project-based learning, modern educational environment and information technologies in the educational process;
- employing highly-qualified staff;
- carrying out regular monitoring of educational programs and monitoring stakeholders' satisfaction with the educational services provided by HEIs, which allows getting feedback about the educational process quality;
- running systematic self-examination of educational organizations in terms of IQAS;
- using project management and lean technologies at the university's management system.



### P9 input

IQA integrated into strategic planning - provides a framework for future orientations and goals. Special attention should be paid to strong mechanisms in place for periodic review and assessment of HEI's core activities: programs and degrees, research activities, etc. University needs continuously review their academic programs and ensure their relevance to the labor market.

Participation of internal and external stakeholders - Nowadays' life and science is in constant change and higher education institutions need to have a rapid response to the challenges of local market. Students are the customers of HEIs. Strongly designed IQA system in place, constantly revised IQA activities, close attention paid to students' needs, learning and teaching procedures, close links with local employers would serve as a consumer protection for students and a guarantor of acceptable standards of education. And a good reputation would attract more students to the university.

### P10 input

An educational institution must ensure the collection, analysis and use of relevant information for the effective management of educational programs and other activities.

University self-analysis, is the analysis of information about oneself, is the basis of effective quality assurance.

It is necessary for the university to have mechanisms for collecting and analyzing information about its activities.

Student progress and success indicators

Satisfaction of students with educational programs

Effectiveness of teaching

Student population profile

Acquisition of training resources and costs

Employment of graduates

The results of a comparison of the university with a similar university in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). This is a comparison designed to improve the performance of the university.

## 6. What are the most crucial areas within your institutional and/or national context for further improvements of the IQA?

### P1 input

Effective implementation of IQA systems

Actual implementation and output/results are important in benchmarking against national and/or international standards for continuous improvement.

An effective research assessment system (quantitative measurement)

Focus on research-based teaching

Evaluation of curriculum on continuous basis in developing job market specific skill sets.

### P2 input

- implementation of a regular internal audit

- optimising the internal availability of IQA documentation through customer-centric software approach, enhancing ease-of-use and flexibility



### P3 input

Effective implementation of such systems

Actual implementation and output/results are important in benchmarking against national and/or international standards for continuous improvement.

An effective research assessment system (quantitative measurement)

Focus on research-based teaching

Evaluation of curriculum on continuous basis in developing job market specific skill sets.

### P4 input

In the scope of our institution, among the areas of improvement detected under the IQAS UCAM Review and Improvement Process and recently implemented, we have detected the following:

The implementation of a centralized document management system, which allows the digitized storage of documents through a unified process and software accessible to all UCAM staff.

Strategic training plan for employees, which allows training and functional recycling in the use of new information and communication technologies, as well as language training.

DUAL Training Programs, based on parallel training coordinated between academia and business, which favors the acquisition of practical skills by the student and the transfer of knowledge to society.

### P5 input

None.

### P6 input

The important internal factors for effective functioning of IQA include:

- inclusive systems with leadership commitment and all stakeholders involvement (students, graduates, business leaders, administration, authorities, alumni)
- appropriate national frameworks for external quality assurance
- balance of academic- and employability-related IQA tools to avoid excessive specialisation of graduates, student-centred approach
- flexible usage of qualitative tools for IQA that work in an integrated manner with quantitative tools in order to avoid information overload.
- continuous evidence-based dialogue on quality improvement among all actors and stakeholders and further implementations and revisions of existing practices

### P7 input

None.

### P8 input

The main directions of improvement of the internal quality assurance system are:

- ensuring the quality of e-learning, and teachers' work quality in the mixed format of training, using distance technologies, which requires to update the policy, strategy and goals in the field of quality, and to regulate all e-learning procedures;
- using the best practices of other universities in the educational process at our university;
- identifying indicators for monitoring the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance system;
- creating soft-skills laboratories, which allows developing students' competences in demanded in the labour market. In terms of evaluating hard skills, we have many effective procedures, and use them regularly, but we need to improve the tools to develop soft-skills competences.



### P9 input

- detailed national framework for internal quality assurance in HEIs;
- centralized system to be able to observe the teaching, learning and assessment process whenever management needs;
- official document support for IQAS monitoring;
- detailed assessment methods/criteria aligned with program learning outcomes.

### P10 input

An educational institution must have certain ways and means to provide itself with professional and competent teaching staff.

As a source of learning accessible to all students, the teacher must have excellent knowledge and skills in the field he / she teaches, be able to teach them to students, and evaluate the knowledge and skills acquired by students.

#### 7. Which indicators do you consider the most influential for IQA? Why?

Home internationalisation, i. e. incorporating global perspective in educational goals, content of the programmes, teaching methods and assessment systems

Abroad internationalisation, i. e. students/staff/credit/degree mobility, university branches/overseas campuses, franchise of academic programs, virtual/e-mobility of programmes

### P1 input

Student Satisfaction

Student workplacement rate after graduation

Graduates Competitiveness on the job market

Research output

Internationalisation

### P2 input

Following the arguments put forth by P6, there is no clear cut deciding between the two aspects, as this very much depends on the profile of the HEI. However, having knowledge of international good practice and considering internationally recognised criteria when designing to IQA ensures comparability and facilitates exchange (and for some HEIs: business) on all levels.

### P3 input

Student Satisfaction

Student Work Placement after graduation

Tools and techniques for monitoring IQA

Implementation of IQA

Outcome/effects of IQA

International Rankings

Internationalization

### P4 input

UCAM has procedures in place to ensure that academic and learning results are measured, analyzed and used. In addition, there is the Stakeholder Satisfaction Analysis, PM01 and the Revision and Improvement of the SGIC, PCA01, which provide very relevant information regarding academic and learning results.

The results to be measured and analysed are the following:

Results of the adequacy of the offer.



Results of the fulfillment of the students' learning objectives (academic results).

Graduation rate.

Dropout rate.

Efficiency rate.

Performance rate.

Results of labour market insertion.

Stakeholder satisfaction results

Context data:

Labour market (results of survey to companies).

Measurement and analysis of the adequacy of Human and Material Resources.

Improvement proposals.

### P5 input

None.

### P6 input

Neither of them can fully reflect the characteristics of all types and sizes of higher education institutions, so they should all be balanced and flexibility should be applied. Generally, whether home or abroad internationalization must be targeted and reported for heavily depends on the type of University. For instance, a higher education institution with many faculties and departments might ensure high academic mobility, whereas for small-scale Universities main focus should be on internal learning, teaching and assessment, at least at the first stage, as abroad internationalization activities seem to measure the input, process, and output rather than the outcome and impact of the educational system.

### P7 input

I would say it is a value added to students by study program (though it is the hardest to measure). For bachelors I would suggest something like the following. You measure a percentile in a national standardized test of high school graduate who is entrant to study program at university (say, for instance, P. is of 24 percentile of all passed national standardized test in math) and measure his national percentile at graduation of the program (for instance, P. has 20th percentile in GRE Subject test on math) . The difference, which is +4 percentile ( might be both positive or negative) is a measure of added value of the program.

### P8 input

The most influential indicators for IQA are:

- Educational activity performance and quality.
- Research and innovation.
- Internationalization and international acclaim.
- Human resource development.
- Competitiveness of graduates in the labour market.

### P9 input

*Student Satisfaction* - student feedback will have effects on content coverage, syllabus and curriculum, the assessment system and the teaching and learning methods and would increase employment orientation. University needs to take into account student complaints and appeals. Student satisfaction surveys lead to the creation of an atmosphere conducive to improved teaching and learning process for students. Their feedback helps to choose future focus for IQA as well.





*Student Progression* - conclusions to be drawn from this indicator would lead to the enhancement of teaching and learning and quality of curriculum. This process results in regular systematic monitoring of educational programmes, curricula and university disciplines. It helps to promote building of learning facilities and resources.

*Research* – links tightly with the learning, teaching and assessment strategies and promotes international collaboration.

*Graduate Employment* - Employer satisfaction surveys and graduate feedback- asking supervisors to provide feedback about the skills of the graduate employed in their workplace. If we consider the students and employers as stakeholders of IQA processes, without the full participation of stakeholders in the quality assurance processes, they risk remaining a futile bureaucratic practice. HEIs need to incorporate stakeholders' requirements and graduate outcomes in study programs to make them modern and appealing for students.

*International Ranking* - fosters HEI's academic reputation.

### P10 input

HEIs have implemented systematic and formalized quality assurance processes to achieve greater efficiency and accountability. Institutional and national quality models and performance indicators are vital components to raise the standard of HEIs. Quantitative performance indicators are used to provide international comparisons. There can be some types of indicators such as

Professional development

Appointment and Promotion Criteria

Review of Academic Staff-performance

Recognition of Excellence in Teaching and Enhancing Student Learning Experience

8. Can you identify which international rankings can be used as IQA tools and which indicators are better reflected by each ranking?

### P1 input

None.

### P2 input

This very much depends on which aspects a HEI considers relevant to its mission. Rankings differ considerably in scope, criteria and reliability. The most influential international ranking in this regard likely is The Times Higher Education Ranking.

However, rankings are first and foremost marketing tools for enhancing a HEI's position in the educational *market*. As such, we consider them not central to IQA.

### P3 input

THE World University Rankings ranks institutions worldwide based on 5 metrics:

teaching

research

scientific publication citations

industrial budget

international perspective

This Ranking will help to evaluate the teaching and research aspects on international perspective

QS Rating evaluate HEI according to the following six metrics:

Academic Reputation



Employer Reputation

Faculty/Student Ratio

Citations per faculty

International Faculty Ratio

International Student Ratio

This Ranking will help to evaluate the teaching and research aspects on international perspective as well as recognition of the HEI worldwide

U-Multirank compares the performance of institutions in five directions of university activity:

teaching and learning

research

knowledge transfer

international orientation

regional engagement

This Ranking will help to define the strengths of HEI

#### P4 input

**THE World University Rankings** prepared by Times Higher Education is one of the 3 most valued academic rankings worldwide. It ranks institutions worldwide based on 5 fundamental pillars: teaching, research, scientific publication citations, industrial budget and international perspective.

**THE World University Rankings By Subject** compiled by Times Higher Education cover 11 subject areas, including Education, Computer Science, Clinical and Health or Business and Economics.

**THE Europe Teaching Rankings** is compiled by Times Higher Education and evaluates the teaching and learning environment for students.

**U-Multirank** is a multidimensional ranking of higher education institutions promoted by the European Commission through an independent consortium of several European universities and foundations, including the CYD Foundation. It compares the performance of institutions in five dimensions of university activity: teaching and learning, research, knowledge transfer, international orientation and regional engagement.

**The Ranking Web of Universities** (known as **Webometrics**) is carried out by the Cybermetrics Laboratory of the Spanish National Research Council (CSIC) and measures the activity and visibility of universities as indicators of their impact and prestige.

**StuDocu World University Ranking** is a university ranking based on the experience of 100,000 students from 1,500 universities around the world. Organized by the StuDocu website, which facilitates the exchange of notes between students, it evaluates universities using 15 indicators that assess, among others, academic reputation, quality of subjects, safety or sports facilities.

**Other classifications: QS Stars Rating**, managed by the prestigious British company Quacquarelli Symonds (QS), specialized in the analysis of higher education institutions worldwide.

#### P5 input

None.

#### P6 input

The top-of-the-line international University ranking widely recognized in Russia is definitely QS based on the Scopus and WoS scientometrics. All the national support programmes initiated by the government of the Russian Federation (Top 5-100, Priority 2030 etc.) are to a great degree related to the QS requirements. As a consequence, its impact in guiding study choices for both national and international applicants is growing immensely. Though it has caught a lot of attention, it is found to be a research-only ranking which does not intend to move into the direction of “multi-tracking”.



That is the reason why many do not agree that this sort of ranking measures quality of higher education in a fair and comprehensive manner, the proposition I would rather agree with. The right approach here would be to shift towards multi-dimensional rankings, such as U-Multirank – whose name speaks for itself, which takes a new view on existing global rankings of universities. In other words, it is not confined to research but takes into account different aspects and dimensions of the performance of universities: teaching and learning, research, knowledge transfer, international orientation and regional engagement. Another big advantage of such rankings lies in the focus on the users' needs. In particular, the performance indicators this ranking underlines vary depending on the focus groups. Thus, U-Multirank provides metrics which collect data relevant for decision making by many different parties: students, administrators, academics, employers etc.

### P7 input

I would rather support a system that collects the same various measurable data normalized per student for various study programs of universities in certain directions of quality dimensions (we agreed that educational quality is multidimensional). Such a system is the best to show changes over time. Then actual ranking would depend on weight coefficients to assign to various dimensions to sum them up to get different rankings that could be different for different stakeholders. The most important thing is that indicators should be informative in a mathematical statistical sense. For instance, a body temperature might be an informative indicator to tell whether one sick or not but not informative to tell whether one drunk or sober. The best system I have known so far is the every year monitoring of HEIs by the Ministry of science and education of the Russian Federation. All the data are stored and freely available online <https://monitoring.miccedu.ru/?m=vpo>. That gives a multidimensional picture without actual ranking but any ranking can use the data.

### P8 input

The major international rankings are:

Times Higher Education (THE), QS – can be used to assess IQA in various fields of university performance:

- to assess teaching quality: Academic Reputation; Student – Faculty ratio;
- to assess research: Research Reputation, Citation, Research income to faculty, International collaboration;
- to assess internationalization (Share of international students, Share of international faculty, International collaboration);
- to assess innovation: Technology transfer.

The major drawback of these rankings, especially, QS, is heavy dependence on subjective surveys concerning teaching and research quality at a particular university. Obviously, the IQA system should not be based on any subjective opinions.

Though THE looks more objective, as it focuses more on citations, it still does not necessarily provide a really trustworthy view on the quality of research done at the university, to say nothing about teaching reputation, for which THE also uses surveys. Besides, THE is trying to look at the facilities the university has by assessing its campus and infrastructure (quality of educational environment).

A good attempt to provide a more objective view at the performance quality of educational institutions is a new Moscow International University Ranking (MosIUR), which has been published twice and claims to be absolutely objective and to use only data from official open and accessible resources. It looks at the three missions of a modern university:

**Teaching:**



Wins in International Student Contests;  
Percentage of international students;  
University budget to student ratio;  
Student to academic staff ratio;

#### **Research**

Number of awards on the IREG Observatory List won by academic staff and by university graduates;  
Field-Weighted Citation Impact (global level), according to Scopus;  
Normalised Citation Impact (global level), according to Web of Science;  
Field-Weighted Citation Impact (national level), according to Scopus;  
Normalised Citation Impact (national level), according to Web of Science;  
Research income per academic staff member;  
Field-weighted views impact (according to Scopus);

#### **University and Society**

University's online courses published on the biggest global online platforms;  
University's share in its country's total academic publications;  
Total pages of a university's website indexed by leading search engines;  
Views of the university's Wikipedia page;  
University's followers in social media;  
University graduates with an individual Wikipedia page  
University website reach.

Unfortunately, the third mission, though intended to be a unique feature of MosIUR, seems to be its weak point at the moment, as it is focused primarily on the internet performance of the university, which is not enough for the category "University and Society" – it should look at broader issues, e.g. long-life learning opportunities, volunteer projects the university initiates or participates, etc.

3. Another ranking which specializes in assessing web performance of a university is Webometrics.

### **P10 input**

Global university rankings are a recent phenomenon in the history of higher education and a controversial indicator of quality in higher education since it first appeared in 2003. Many do not agree that rankings are measuring or indicating quality of higher education in a fair and comprehensive manner. The simplicity of rankings and the global publicity of the annual rankings results have, however, served a general purpose of putting public and international attention on the role and importance of higher education – to societies and to individuals. They have put higher education performance on the policy agenda, and underpinned the necessity for continuous investment in higher education. Very different sets of indicators are used by global rankings and national rankings to measure higher education quality. Global rankings use a smaller set of indicators than national rankings because of access to data and issues raised above. National rankings use a larger variety of teaching/student-related indicators which are much less standardised than research indicators. This is because there is no single internationally agreed definition of what constitutes quality, especially in teaching and learning quality. The choice of ranking indicators therefore seems to be dependent on existing data, in particular international academic publication data that are readily available through a few global data brokers, or other national data drawn from national surveys. University quality indicators: As a result, global rankings effectively emphasize the importance of measurable research outputs indexed to selected databases. It is unclear whether such indicators actually tell us meaningful information with respect to the measurement and comparison of higher education performance and quality. What is clear now is that these are the measurable and internationally comparable indicators that are easy to obtain today. There are of course many other meaningful indicators, particularly indicators that reflect the teaching and learning quality and the third mission ("service to the community and



With the support of the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



society”) of higher education. However, it is costly, if not impossible, to obtain internationally comparable data for meaningful indicators that fully reflect the context and complexity of higher education systems worldwide.

Global rankings, with a few exceptions, such as U-Multirank, tend to mainly focus on an institution’s demonstrated quality in research. Therefore, publications and citations in peer-reviewed journals published in the English language are key indicators, although most global rankings have at least a small share of teaching-related indicators.