

Minutes - IBAR Project, Seminar 5-7 February 2012, Porto, Portugal

Participants: Alberto Amaral, Alberts Prikulis, Alena Haskova , Amélia Veiga, Cláudia Sarrico, Cristina Sin, Elisabeth Epping , Ewa Chmielecka, Heather Eggins, Helena Sebkova, Jakub Brdulak, Jan Kohoutek, Lubor Pilarik , Ludvika Leisyte, Maria J. Rosa, Orlanda Tavares, Pedro Teixeira, Ray Land

6th February

WP 7

Presentation of comparative analysis results by Jan Kohoutek.

Ray: Pointed that Bologna is about student centeredness, but that is lacking when it comes to assessment of students.

Cláudia: Suggested having space for reflection apart from presenting evidence from case studies.

Alberts: Question 7, why should procedures be different?

Jan: If there are core secondary institutions where the students come from, maybe there should be some relationship with those students especially for 1st year students.

Pedro: In the conclusions of the comparative studies distinguish general and special issues, what are general issues about policy implementation, the 2nd general type of issues is the Europeanisation, detect issues that have been found in other studies, and separate these from more specific issues: ESG, student assessment; distinguish between the points for WP7 but what are general issues that we want to retain for the whole project conclusions.

Jan: Make recommendations for the European, system, and institutional levels.

Pedro: Agree on points we will pay attention across the WPs.

Maria João: student satisfaction with their programme is already in ESG 1.6.

Ludvika: The ESU wants to broaden the ESG (refer to her later presentation).

Ray: Be quite careful what we mean by student evaluation of tuition, the national student survey in the UK shows that they are not happy with assessment; national student engagement in the US is more useful in deciding what is effective; pay attention to transition from secondary to higher education, in terms of Europeanisation; if we want to be competitive, students need to deal with messy problems, interdisciplinary work, working with others; is secondary school assessment producing the kind of learning that promotes learning of the sort we want?; it almost takes a year preparing students to do that at university.

Jan: Discuss this at WP12.

Ludvika: Barrier about the awareness of ESG; how are ESG translated into national regulations?; the fact that people don't know the ESG is not a problem (in the NL) if they know national regulations that mimic them.

Jan: The 13th February is the deadline for sending all the teams the WP7 comparative report for comments. The national teams should try to keep to the deadline of sending comments by the 20th or the end of February, so the CZ team can finish the WP7 without much time delay.

Ray: We will generate an enormous amount of data. Will the EU official read it? We should focus on the comparative report – give issues to the commission. We should pay more attention to this in the comparative reports.

Jan: There should be an end report as well for the whole project.

Heather: Be aware of moving things like legislation nationally, but also what is happening to the ESG.

Pedro: Have different levels of recommendations, we are targeting different audiences, academics, European commission, and national level; how can we identify a message for each of these audiences.

WP8

Cláudia presented the preliminary results for WP8 for Portugal. A proposal for presenting each national report was discussed and agreed upon. The idea is to retain data from each case study and follow the same analytical framework in order to facilitate the comparative analysis.

Cláudia presented a second presentation regarding the comparative report structure and a proposal for deadlines regarding the work of WP8. These deadlines were agreed.

The PT team will circulate the preliminary report of the Portuguese case and the two presentations.

WP9

Ludvika presented the plans for the next seminar in Enschede (NL). Seminar will take place 6-8 May, instead. She will circulate the presentations.

The data collection protocol was discussed and agreed upon. The final version will be send to everybody by the end of February.

WP10

It was agreed that WP10 seminar will take place **13-15 September** instead.

Ewa presented the WP10 data collection protocol. She pointed that she could not integrate all feedback received because often it was contradictory. National situations are very different.

Ray: National framework for professional standards, interesting to know what is happening in other countries regarding this.

Ray: Preparation for teaching can be about development, but it can also be about probation, what are the arrangements?

The protocol was discussed and agreed upon. **The final version will be sent to everybody by the end of February.**

WP11

Alena presented the protocol for data collection for WP11. A discussion on the subject followed. **The SK team will send a revised version of WP11 to everybody by the first week of March.**

The protocol will still be discussed further in the NL seminar in May.

WP12

Ray presented the discussion on the development of a data collection protocol for WP12. A discussion followed. The UK team will circulate the presentation.

The UK team will send a revised protocol to other project partners for comments by the end of February.

WP6

Ray presented the findings of the comparative report of WP6.

Catherine will get back to us with the final report.

Tuesday, 7th February

Organizational and financial matters

Helena presented further details on organisational and financial matters and reminded all teams about regulations and deadlines regarding progress and financial reports. All doubts should be sent to her and she will try to get firm answers from the funding agency.

All should provide reporting regarding the period July-December 2011 as soon as possible.

For those that cannot recover VAT, an official report on the matter should be sent to the coordinating team.

The understanding is that indirect expenses are 7%, thus report 93% of expenses. However, Helena will ask if 7% is within the 100% or on top of the 100%. Also, Helena will ask the Agency if we can pay from our 25% contribution the fieldwork.

We can shift money between headings if it is up to 10%, for more than 10% we need to get clearing from the Agency.

Helena will send her presentation to everybody.

Helena will send by email a proposal for a flier about the project that we can distribute at events we go to disseminate the project.

Regarding planning of forthcoming WPs and deadlines

The revised protocol for WP11 will be sent to everybody by the first week of March. We will give feedback by the end of March. There will be a dialogue by email and the final version will be agreed in the NL seminar in May.

The revised protocol for WP12 will be sent by the end of February, feedback and discussion will occur in March, again the final version will be agreed in the NL.

The final versions following the NL seminar will have to be sent to everybody at the latest by the 15th of May.

It was agreed to move WP9 deadlines, so that the field work of several remaining WPs can be combined.

The deadline for the national case studies was moved from 16th of July to 16th of September.

The deadline for the comparative study was moved from the 28th of September to 30th of October.

It is not necessary to change the deadlines of the other WPs.

Ray Land moved to Durham and his new email is ray.land@durham.ac.uk. All should change their mailing lists accordingly.

Feedback from MAP-ESG

Ludvika presented the results of the MAP-ESG project, which has some affinities to ours. She will be sending the presentations.

Cláudia agreed to report for the NL seminar on the workshop on quality culture, organised by the EUA in Edinburgh.

Ray also mentioned the work of Catherine and George on quality culture in Scotland as another source of material for our project.

Comments:

There is a lot of macro-level analysis, and use of secondary data. Our project has the benefits of going to institutions and not just talking to managers, but also to teachers and students.

Often there is no loop in the quality systems, i.e. bottom-up, institution-based feedback.

Dissemination

The SK team is going to send a call for a special issue they are organising.

It was agreed that we should coordinate our dissemination efforts so that everybody knows what everybody is doing in this regard.

The next CHER symposium on our project is a good start at joint dissemination.

It was agreed that:

- Each national team will publish based on research work on their national cases;
- Each national team will publish based on the comparative work they did on their WP, acknowledging the IBAR project