EDUCATION & SKILLS

Session 4 – National standards, guidelines and associated indicators for the quality assurance of digital higher education in Hungary



Professor Mark Brown

Director, National Institute for Digital Learning Dublin City University, Ireland

Tuesday 4 October 2022, Budapest, Hungary





What shall I propose for your consideration?



Potential indicators and methods for the quality assurance of digital higher education

1. Potential standards and indicators to integrate in accreditation procedures

- 1. Minimum operating requirements for higher education institutions
- 2. Cyclical review for institutional accreditation
- 3. Ex-ante programme registration
- 4. *Ex-post* cyclical programme review
- 5. Potential requirements for *self-accreditation* status



What shall I propose for your consideration?

¥ ¥ ¥ ¥ ¥ ¥

1. Potential standards and indicators to integrate in accreditation procedures

Potential indicators and methods for the quality assurance of digital higher education

- 1. Minimum operating requirements for higher education institutions
- 2. Cyclical review for institutional accreditation
- 3. Ex-ante programme registration
- 4. *Ex-post* cyclical programme review
- 5. Potential requirements for *self-accreditation* status

Current institutional supports are insufficient to foster a wider scope of responsibility for quality

- 2. Promoting institutional self-assessment of digital higher education
 - 6. A Hungarian self-assessment tool for digital higher education?

EDUCATION & SKILLS

Potential standards and indicators to integrate in accreditation processes







Recommendation 2

Option 2 – Integrate digital indicators in existing frameworks









Adding several important new indictors aligned to ESG for quality considerations specific to digital higher education



One additional requirement

	LEVEL	Assessment
STANDARDS	Institution/Programme/ Course/Individual	Compulsory/ Optional
Part I: Minimum requirements for initial operating authorisation of	institutions	
1. Minimum requirements for universities		
1.1 Min. eight BA and six MA programmes	Programme	Compulsory
1.2 Min. 60% of teaching staff with academic qualification	Individual (academic staff)	Compulsory
1.3 Capacity to deliver some programmes in foreign languages	Individual (academic staff)	Compulsory
1.4 Capacity for digital delivery and study flexibility	Institution	Compulsory
1.5 Has student research societies	Programme	Compulsory
TOTAL	Mix	Compulsory





One additional requirement

STANDARDS	REQUIREMENT				
Part I: Minimum requiremer	nts for initial operating authorisation of inst	itutions			
1. Minimum requirements	for universities				
1.4 Capacity for digital del	ivery and study flexibility	Why	What		
1.4a Digital Delivery	Digital learning resources and virtual learning environments are employed in teaching, learning and assessment, they are reliably available, and instructors and learners are supported with their use	All instruction will be blended in the future	 Institution-wide Learning Management System (LMS) Electronic access to digital library resources Dedicated professional development for instructors 		
1.4b Study Flexibility	The delivery modes and study intensity of the institution's programmes are adapted to meet the flexible needs of learners and the programmes they serve	To promote learning innovation and learner flexibility	 Analysis of learner needs Adoption of common learning design framework Dedicated professional development for instructors 		

2. Cyclical review for institutional accreditation

EUROPEAN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

EUROPEAN FRAMEWORKS FOR DIGITAL HIGHER EDUCATION

HUNGARIAN QA AND ACCREDITATION FRAMEWORKS





CONSIDERATIONS FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE OF E-LEARNING PROVISION

Quidance

Questions to Inform a Toolkit for Enhancing Quality in a Digital Environment







embed

European Maturity Model for Blended Education

STANDARDS AND INDICATORS

Part I: The general situation of the institution, its management, and the actions taken following the previous institutional accreditation

 Describe how the self-evaluation was prepared: preparation, the process of selfevaluation, which bodies gave their opinion and approval.

Describe the general situation of the institution at the time of preparing the institutional report.

 Participation in the management of the institution, including student and doctoral student representative bodies, the conditions provided for the operation and tasks of the student, student and faculty representatives, e.g., funding, infrastructure, staff

 Provide evidence of management commitment to quality and excellence. Also describe the specific tools (management and analysis of indicators) used in the management processes.

5. Summarise the main features, principles and indicators of the institution's management. Describe the trends in changes in external and internal resources

6. Describe the quality improvement measures taken according to the ESG 2015 standards based on the recommendations of the previous institutional accreditation report and their impact. /Can be in tabular form, institutional measures can be listed if they are explained in the institutional report for the given standard. In this case, please provide the reference here. If the measure does not appear in the rest of the report, please provide more details here.

TOTAL for PART I

2. Part II: Compliance with Part I of the ESG (2015)

ESG 1.1: Policy for quality assurance

1. Describe the quality assurance system of the institution, and its main actors (powers, responsibilities).

2. Briefly summarise the institution's quality policy and quality strategy quality objectives, how they are supported by the mission statement and strategic documents and strategic objectives? Specify the quality policy, quality strategy, quality objectives document(s) containing the quality objectives and targets.

 How (according to processes and procedures) are strategic and quality policy documents developed, <u>approved</u> and reviewed throughout the institution? System (both educational and non-educational), and internal stakeholders (students, faculty, non-teaching staff)?



Updating Part 1: The general situation

Looking at universities but also applicable to doctoral schools...

STANDARDS AND INDICATORS

Part I: The general situation of the institution, its management, and the actions taken following the previous institutional accreditation

1. Describe how the self-evaluation was prepared: preparation, the process of self-evaluation, which bodies gave their opinion and approval.

2. Describe the general situation of the institution at the time of preparing the institutional report.

3. Participation in the management of the institution, including student and doctoral student representative bodies, the conditions provided for the operation and tasks of the student, student and faculty representatives, e.g., funding, infrastructure, staff

4. Provide evidence of **management commitment to quality and excellence**. Also describe the specific tools (management and analysis of indicators) used in the management processes.

5. Summarise the main features, principles and indicators of the institution's management. Describe the trends in changes in external and internal resources
6. Describe the quality improvement measures taken according to the ESG 2015 standards based on the recommendations of the previous institutional

accreditation report and their impact. /Can be in tabular form, institutional measures can be listed if they are explained in the institutional report for the given

ENQA 2018



development

standard. In this case, please provide the reference here. If the measure does not appear in the rest of the report, please provide more details here.
7. Describe how digital delivery and study flexibility are part of the institution's mission and overall strategy for

8. Leadership and management actively support the realisation of quality blended, hybrid and online learning by developing **strategic plans, creating performance indicators,** and by influencing the culture of quality within the institution



Mapped to ESG...

Policy for Quality Assurance	Teaching, Learning and Assessment	Learning Resources and Infrastructure	Support for Instructors and Students	Feedback, Review and Performance Monitoring
 Policies for quality assurance (ESG 1.1) 	 Design and approval of programmes (ESG 1.2) Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3) Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6) 	 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3) Student admission, progression, recognition and certification (ESG 1.4) Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6) 	 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3) Student admission, progression, recognition and certification (ESG 1.4) Teaching staff (ESG 1.5) Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6) 	 Programme design, approval, monitoring and review (ESG 1.2 and 1.9) Information management (ESG 1.7) Public information (ESG 1.8) Cyclical external quality assurance (ESG 1.10)



Mapped to ESG...

Policy for Quality Assurance	Teaching, Learning and Assessment	Learning Resources and Infrastructure	Support for Instructors and Students	Feedback, Review and Performance Monitoring
 Policies for quality assurance (ESG 1.1) 	 Design and approval of programmes (ESG 1.2) Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3) Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6) 	 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3) Student admission, progression, recognition and certification (ESG 1.4) Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6) 	 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3) Student admission, progression, recognition and certification (ESG 1.4) Teaching staff (ESG 1.5) Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6) 	 Programme design, approval, monitoring and review (ESG 1.2 and 1.9) Information management (ESG 1.7) Public information (ESG 1.8) Cyclical external quality assurance (ESG 1.10)



Standard

Part II: Compliance with Part I of the ESG (2015)	Additional Indicator	Revised Indicator	
ESG 1.2 Design and approval of programmes	What models or approaches to learning design inform the development, delivery and evaluation of programmes?	 During the latest strategic review of the HEI, was the number, provision [and delivery mode] of courses examined? If yes, which courses? 	
ESG 1.3: Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment	To what extent are students engaged in active learning through their use of digital tools and resources?		
	How does digital innovation support assessment for learning and student feedback?		
	How is teaching, learning and assessment informed by best practice in digital higher education?	Adapted from EADTU 2020	

Part II: Teaching, Learning and Assessment

Ways of Measuring and Reporting

INDICATOR	EVIDENCE	ТҮРЕ
 What models or approaches to learning design inform the development, delivery and evaluation of programmes? To what extent are students 	 An explicit model of learning design is adopted for programme development. Student evaluation data and results from national surgery of learner. 	 Input Resource Qualitative Output
 engaged in active learning through their use of digital tools and resources? How does digital innovation support assessment for learning and student feedback? 	 Mapping of programme assessment and range and variety of digital tools 	 > Quantitative > Process > Qualitative
 How is teaching, learning and assessment informed by best practice in digital higher education? 	 Programme development plans implement key lessons from contemporary theory, research and practice 	ProcessQualitative



Standard

Part II: Compliance with Part I of the ESG (2015)	Additional Indicator	Revised Indicator
ESG 1.6: Learning resources and student support	The institution's Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) is regularly updated and supports a variety of digital tools and learning resources.	
	Students can access electronic library resources and digital textbooks from wherever they choose to study.	ENQA 2018
	Digital media and Open Educational Resources (OER) are embedded in the curriculum to enhance the student learning experience.	
	Students have increasing access to simulations, virtual labs and other forms of augmented reality to support their study.	Horizon Indicator

Part II: Resources and Infrastructure

Ways of Measuring and Reporting

INDICATOR

- The institution's Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) is regularly updated and supports a variety of digital tools and learning resources.
- Students can access electronic library resources and digital textbooks from wherever they choose to study.
- Digital media and Open Educational Resources (OER) are embedded in the curriculum to enhance the student learning experience.

 Explicit VLE development plan and learning analytics data on instructors' and students' use of digital tools.

Student evaluation data and results from national surveys of learner engagement.

EVIDENCE

 Mapping the integration of digital media and resources across the curriculum and learning data analytics on instructors' and students' level of use.

• Process | Output • Qualitative | Quantitative

- > Process |Output
- > Qualitative | Quantitative
- > Process |Output
- > Qualitative | Quantitative



Standard

Part II: Compliance with Part I of the ESG (2015)	Additional Indicator	Revised Indicator
ESG 1.5: Teaching staff	Do staff engaged in teaching have the appropriate qualifications, knowledge and skills required to promote digital innovation and study flexibility?	Models, criteria, [and competencies] for professional development for teaching staff
Crucial Importance of training and	What training and professional development activities are available to new instructors and existing staff to harness the potential of digital innovation and the provision of study flexibility?	skills]. Adapted from ENQA 2018
professional development	What expert professional support staff and internal service units are available for digitally enhanced course design, pedagogy and assessment?	Adapted from EADTU 2020

Part II: Support for Instructors

Ways of Measuring and Reporting



Part II: Feedback, Review and Performance Monitoring

Standard		
Part II: Compliance with Part I of the ESG (2015)	Additional Indicator	Revised Indicator
ESG 1.9 Monitoring and periodic review of programmes	What student satisfaction and programme evaluation data are available on the quality of digital teaching, maturity of infrastructure and the provision of study flexibility?	Addresses gap in
	What data is available on student retention, time to completion and learner success?	quality outputs
	What data is available on graduate destination and employer satisfaction?	
	What institutional self-assessment and benchmarking takes place specific to the quality of digital teaching, maturity of infrastructure and the provision of study flexibility?	
ESG 1.10: Cyclical external quality assurance	What efforts are made to ensure that external quality assurance includes specialist expertise in digital higher education?	Desirable

Part II: Feedback, Review and Performance Monitoring

Ways of Measuring and Reporting

INDICATOR		EVIDENCE		ТҮРЕ
> What student satisfaction and programme evaluation data are available on the quality of digital teaching, maturity of infrastructure and the provision of study flexibility?	, ,	Student course and programme evaluation data and benchmarking results from relevant national surveys.		 > Output > Quantitative
> What data is available on student retention, time to completion and learner success?	► ×	Data analytics from institutional IT systems and self-report data from student surveys.		 > Output > Quantitative Qualitative
 What data is available on graduate destination and employer satisfaction? 	►,	Graduate destination surveys and data from employer surveys and focus groups.		 > Output > Quantitative Qualitative



Recommendation 3

Option 2 – Introduce simple *ex-ante* registration and cyclical *ex-post* programme review

Recommendation 4

Option 2 – Responsibility for expost programme review is *shared* between institutions and MAB

Recommendation 5

Option 3 – HEIs are allowed to launch new study programmes based on their *performance*



Base programme accreditation templates on the ESG

The current *Ex-ante* programme accreditation templates do not align to ESG and this should be addressed for *Ex-post* cyclical programme review

7 Alignment between programme and institutional accreditation templates

While the institutional accreditation template is structured around ESG there is limited alignment to the current *Ex-ante* programme accreditation templates

2 Major rewrite of programme accreditation templates is needed...

The current *Ex-ante* programme accreditation templates are not fit-for-purpose to adopt for *Ex-post* cyclical programme review



KEY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS	ESG	\checkmark
Part I: Sufficiently compelling reasons for establishing a new discipline		
1. Difference from other existing programmes	1.2	
2. Evidence of industry demand for the new programme	1.2	
3. Evidence of student demand for the proposed study mode	1.2	
Part II: The discipline's planned education requirements and outcomes		
4. The name of the programme is consistent with the discipline and learning outcomes	1.8	
5. Instructors delivering the programme have appropriate skills, knowledge, and research experience of the discipline	1.5	
 There is adequate expertise in course design for active learning and support for instructors in digital delivery in the chosen study mode 	1.3	
7. Those teaching the programme have regular opportunities for professional development and adequate skills, knowledge, and experience for the chosen study mode	1.5	
8. There are adequate library resources and digital learning media to support the programme and study mode	1.6	
 There are adequate learning support and development services for the study mode to ensure student success 	1.6	
10. The infrastructure and Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) can support the programme and study mode	1.6	



STANDARDS AND INDICATORS

PART VI: SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR DISTANCE LEARNING

1. Clearly defined and adapted academic model, including key study outcomes and allotted study timeframes.

2. Guaranteed access to sufficient teaching resources (printed or electronic).

3. Clearly defined regulations on grading and student evaluation.

4. Opportunities to consult with teaching and academic staff.

5. A FT or PT employee dedicated to overseeing course content

6. A manager of tutors to oversee the activities of participating teaching staff. This person has to have at least 5 years' experience with online distance learning.

7. Tutors must not be responsible for 1) more than 50 students or 2) more than 3 subjects per semester.

8. A clear distance-education framework plan is in place for the infrastructure

9. Conditions for methodological development of infrastructure

10. Local consultation centres must provide access to IT, study materials and practical teaching facilities.



4. *Ex-post* cyclical programme review

Recommendation 6

Option 1 – Revise Part VI to introduce special provisions for hybrid and online learning

Advantages

- Light touch and less work for MAB
- Relatively easy to update the current indicators for the provision distance learning

> Disadvantages

- Fails to integrate digital delivery and study flexibility in programme review
- Hybrid and Online study provision are presented as 'bolt-on' delivery modes rather than a key feature of the higher education landscape
- Potential duplication as many of the indicators are common to those included under Part I-V of the current template.

Option 2 – Develop new indicators for digital higher education integrated in a new template

Advantages

- Integrates digital higher education across new standards for *Ex-post* review
- Requires institutions to consider quality considerations for digital higher education in all programme reviews
- Mainstreams Hybrid and Online provision as a normal feature of the Hungarian higher education landscape
- Raises the awareness of new digital innovation and study flexibility models in promoting quality enhancement

Disadvantages

Involves more work to develop and integrate in a new review template

Example of new indicators integrated in current standards

STANDARDS AND INDICATORS	EVIDENCE
PART I: PROGRAMME CONTENT	
1. Educational plan	
1.1 All core elements of the discipline are present in the programme plan's compulsory modules	
1.2 The educational plan allows for the acquisition of core competences	
1.3 The plan for study flexibility is appropriate for the targeted student cohort and achieving the learning outcomes	 Student satisfaction data Programme completion data
2. Core/Discipline-specific subjects and competences	
2.1 Presence of core subjects it the educational plan	
2.2 The proposed teaching plan allows for the acquisition of core competencies and subject knowledge	



Example of new indicators integrated in current standards

STANDARDS AND INDICATORS	Evidence
PART I: PROGRAMME CONTENT	
3. Pedagogical Methodology	
3.1 Effective and varied institutional teaching practices	
3.2 Provision of high-quality digital teaching even during external practical learning elements (e.g. internships)	
3.3 Contemporary approaches to assessment and feedback take advantage of the potential of new digital technologies	 Mapping of programme assessment and range of digital tools used by students
3.4 Suitable student evaluation practices	

Addresses a significant gap in current indicators



Example of new indicators integrated in current standards

STANDARDS AND INDICATORS	Evidence
PART II: PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROGRAMME	
1. Academic tutors in charge of the discipline and sub-disciplines	
1.1 Professional requirements and regulations for Programme Heads	
1.2. Regulations for maximum student numbers and course delivery	
2. Teaching personnel	
2.1 Regulations for maximum student numbers and course delivery per teaching staff	
2.2 Instructors have the appropriate qualifications, knowledge and skills required to promote digital innovation and study flexibility	Skills profile of instructors and those who support teaching demonstrating level of digital skills for course design and delivery
2.3 Training and professional development activities are available to new instructors and existing staff to harness the potential of digital innovation and the provision of study flexibility	Number of instructors participating in training and continuing professional development with a focus on digital innovation and the provision of study flexibility
3. Personal and professional information of the teaching personnel	
3.1 Professional requirements and regulations for teaching staff	
3.2 Annual staff performance appraisal is completed with development plans for areas of improvement including digital skills for course design and delivery	Percentage of instructors completing performance appraisal and related development plans

5. Potential requirements for *self-accreditation* status?

	MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR SELF-ACCREDITATION STATUS	ESG	
1.	Clear vision, mission and strategy for digital innovation and study flexibility	1.2	
2.	Mature quality assurance systems	1.1	
3.	Strong institutional commitment to quality improvement	1.1	
4.	Dedicated personnel capable of managing accreditation process	1.1	
5.	Robust design, regulations, and programme approval processes	1.2	
6.	Increasing expertise in student-centred and digitally enhanced teaching, learning and assessment	1.3	
7.	Mature student admission, progression, recognition, and certification processes	1.4	
8.	All staff have regular opportunities for professional development including building digital skills	1.5	
9.	Mature infrastructure for digital delivery and the provision of study flexibility	1.6	
10.	Strong learning support and development services and commitment to promoting student success	1.6	
11.	Demonstrates the effective management of programmes over several years	1.7	
12.	Clear information is published about the institution's activities and programmes	1.8	
13.	Strong commitment to ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes	1.9	
14.	Clear evidence of cyclical quality assurance through professional bodies and/or institutional self-assessment	1.10	

EDUCATION & SKILLS

Promoting institutional self-assessment of digital higher education

2







Institutions are encouraged to undertake cyclic self-assessment of their provision of digital higher education

Institutions work with MAB to complete focused quality reviews on a cyclical basis with digital higher education an initial priority focus



6. A Hungarian self-assessment tool for digital higher education

Option 1 – Higher education institutions select an existing self-assessment and QA framework this is most appropriate to their context

> Advantages

- Already many frameworks available
- Relatively quick to implement as no delay in developing a new framework
- Institutions can choose the QA framework most appropriate to their context

Disadvantages

- Little or no consideration of the Hungarian context
- Few existing frameworks align to ESGs
- Choosing from a plethora of existing frameworks will require considerable time and knowledge

Recommendation 7

Option 2 – A new Hungarian institutional selfassessment and QA framework is developed to align with other indicators and ESGs

> Advantages

- Opportunity to align with ESGs and revised national quality standards and indicators
- Ensures the use of consistent indicators across all Hungarian higher education institutions
- Enables national benchmarking and potentially sharing of strengths and weaknesses for networking and capacity development
- > Disadvantages
 - Less institutional autonomy, although selfassessment framework could be designed around core and custom indicators

Example from Ireland of QA Guidelines for Blended and Online Delivery



Topic Specific Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines

FOR PROVIDERS OF BLENDED LEARNING PROGRAMMES

	Section	Title	Page
	Section 1:	Introduction and Context	3
	1	Introduction	3
	1.1	To whom do these guidelines apply?	3
	1.2	Purpose, scope and relevance	4
	2	Context	6
	Section 2:	Guidelines	7
\rangle	3	Organisational Context	8
	3.1	Strategy and planning for blended learning	8
	3.2	Infrastructure and resources	10
	3.3	Published expectations on blended learning	12
	3.4	Learners outside Ireland	12
	3.5	Collaboration and other partners	14
	4 (Programme Context	15
	4.1	Programme outcomes	15
	4.2	Learning resources, materials and delivery mechanisms	16
	4.3	Approval and programme validation processes	17
\rangle	5 🤇	Learner Experience Context	20
	5.1	Support avaitable to learners	20
	5.2	Equality of opportunity	22

The DCU experience of institutional self-assessment



Peer Review Group Report for the Thematic Review of Digital Learning

1.1 Overview of the Objectives of the DCU Thematic Review

In undertaking this thematic review, DCU has adopted a broad and inclusive approach to considering the perspectives and understanding of key stakeholders. This approach recognises the importance of formal, non-formal and informal digital learning experiences, and is inclusive of hybrid and blended models of delivery for DCU's on-campus students along with fully online models for students studying off-campus through distance education. DCU has a long history of online distance education, initially through the distance learning unit Oscail (now Open Education), and now also in a number of academic Schools in the University.

Consistent with an inclusive approach, the review chose not to limit its scope to particular units, services or particular student cohorts, but rather reflect on the digital learning experience for both staff and students across the entire institution. Accordingly, in undertaking a cross institutional self-assessment, this review seeks to consider,

- To what extent are DCU delivering on their strategic intent in relation to Digital Learning, as envisaged in the 2012-2017 and 2017-2022 strategies?
- How is (and how can) digital learning contribute to transforming both formal and informal learning at DCU?
- To what extent are DCU staff and students prepared to embrace digital approaches to learning, and to what extent are these approaches effective as part of the DCU learning experience?
- How is DCU's approach to supporting and developing digital learning aligned to national and international best practice and research?
- What aspirations should the University have for digital learning over the next 5 years?

2 Approach to Self-Assessment

2.1 Digital Learning Steering Group

The self-assessment phase of the Quality Review was led by an internal Digital Learning Steering Group. Steering group membership was as follows:

Area	Member
Deputy Registrar/Dean of Teaching & Learning (Chair)	Mr. Billy Kelly
Director, National Institute for Digital Learning	Prof. Mark Brown
Director, Quality Promotion and Institutional Research	Ms. Aisling McKenna
Head, Teaching Enhancement Unit	Dr. Mark Glynn
Head, Open Education Unit	Dr. Eamon Costello
Head, The Ideas Lab	Dr. Mairéad Nic Giolla Mhichíl
Academic Faculty Representatives (One Representative from Each Faculty)	Dr Blanaid White (FSH)
	Dr Monica Ward (FEC)
	Dr Ken McDonagh (FHSS)
	Dr Enda Donlon (IoE)
	Dr Robert Gillanders (DCUBS)
Central Professional Support Areas	Mr. Justin Doyle (ISS)
	Ms Orla Nic Aodha (Library, Public Services and Outreach)
	Ms Ellen Breen (Library, Research and Teaching)
	Ms. Helena McCanney (HR)
Student Representation (2)	Mr. Lucien Waugh Daly, DCUSU VP Academic Affairs
	Mr. Dylan Mangan, DCUSU VP Engagement and Development
Quality Promotion Officer	Ms. Celine Heffernan
Student Support and Development	Mr Cillian Murphy
Registry	Ms Niamh McMahon
Recording Secretary	Ms. Fiona Dywer

https://www.dcu.ie/sites/default/files/inline-files/prg-report-final-09-02-21.pdf



Domains for self-assessment of digital higher education

PLAN & ADJUST IMPLEMENT EVALUATE Institutional strategy, quality culture Implementation of quality assurance Evaluation and continuous and infrastructure for digital teaching processes and supports for digital improvement of digital teaching and and learning teaching and learning learning **Common guality domains: Common quality domains: Common quality domains:** 1. Vision, mission and strategy for Digital course content, design, Monitoring and evaluating the 4. 7. digitalisation and innovation delivery and assessment quality of digital learning Organisational quality culture for 5. Supporting and incentivising Strengthening monitoring and 2. 8. digitalisation, innovation and staff professional development evaluation practices collaboration Preparing and supporting 6. Digital education infrastructure 3.



students for digital learning



-		_
	Ξž	
	■	



Establish Hungarian working group



A representative working group drawing on OECD advice is tasked with designing an institutional self-assessment tool

7 Alignment with new ENQA initiatives in digital higher education

Engage with the new ENQA working group that has the task of updating the 2018 Quality Considerations for eLearning Framework

Apply lessons from the current QQI initiative in Ireland



Liaise with QQI in Ireland to learn lessons arising from the revisions to the National Statutory Guidelines for Blended and Online Learning Programmes



Do you SUPPORT revising existing indicators and adding several new ones specific to blended, hybrid and online learning for cyclic review of higher education institutions?

Do you **agree** with the proposal to replace the current distance learning indicators and integrate new indicators specific to digital higher education for *Ex-ante* programme review?

3

What are **your thoughts** about the benefits and feasibility of developing a Hungarian institutional self-assessment framework for the quality enhancement of digital higher education?