Analysis of the current internal quality assurance systems at higher education institutions in the Republic of Moldova

CEENQA

Jan Philipp Engelmann, Nataša Kramar

Country workshop
11 March, 2022

General concepts of quality assurance

- Two crucial purposes of quality assurance: enhancement and accountability

- Accountability vs. mere responsibility

- Cyclical nature of quality assurance (e.g. PDCA cycle)

- Quality assurance systems must have specific goals and it must be checked whether the goals are achieved -> There is no ideal blueprint!

- Quality control vs. quality assurance vs. quality culture

QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY & IMPLEMENTATION

QA Strategy and Policy

- Not all HEIs could outline clear objectives and a coherent policy for their quality assurance system -> should have top priority

- Additional necessary steps:

    - Periodic review of quality assurance policy

    - Involvement of all relevant stakeholders, particularly students

Implementation

- Quality assurance systems are in place

- Room for improvement: involvement of students and non-academic staff, institutional self-evaluation, clear focus on quality enhancement

QUALITY ASSURANCE OF STUDY PROGRAMMES

ESG 1.2: Design and approval of programmes

- All HEIs have established formal processes to initiate new programmes

- Room for improvement: involvement of faculties and management level, participation of students and teaching staff besides full professors

ESG 1.9: On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes

- All institutions have periodic review processes, typically every five years. One institution mentions another small review every year (good practice)

- Room for improvement: involvement of graduates, matching between programme objectives and curricula

STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE

ESG 1.1. Policy for QA

- All HEIs include their students at the management level (departments and faculties?).

- The participation of students => mostly through surveys (alternative options?).

- General awareness of the benefits of including the students (negative feedback!).

ESG 1.3. Student-centred learning (+ teaching)

- The students are familiar with the learning outcomes and have an option to monitor those (+ teachers implement new concepts).

- Inclusion of students with special needs and physical disabilities.

STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE

ESG 1.6. Learning resources and students' support

- The issue of student representative and tutor /mentor system.

- Overusing of surveys.

- Accepting the suggestions.

ESG 1.8. Public information

- Are the websites enough?

ESG 1.5.

- General mixed answers in all fields.

- Sufficient amount of personnel - technical and administrative staff is slightly overlooked.

- Ensuring the sufficient qualification of staff members and continuous professional development.

- Who is involved in the curriculum design?

EQA & AUTHORITIES

HEIs` autonomy

- Different assessment of their autonomy (public vs. private).

- Too many regulations?

EQA procedures

- Favourable views of ANACEC`s EQA procedures, trainings, and support.

- More work needs to be done on groups of experts.

- Quality control vs. quality assurance & enhancement.

ANACEC and MECR

The issue of diminished independence:

1. Who is in charge of revising and changing the methodology of external evaluation?

2. Who takes the final decisions?

ESG 3.3!

+

Code of Education, Article 115. n) - EQAR

1. The systems and procedures of IQA are in place – the next step is to amplify an existing quality culture.

2. Compliance with standards vs. quality enhancement.

3. Strengthening existing models before introducing new ones. + Pilot accreditations.

4. Exchange of good practices and advice between institutions.

THANK YOU

Nataša Kramar, Jan Philipp Engelmann
Country workshop
11 March, 2022