



Fiji Higher Education Commission



INQAAHE BIENNIAL FORUM REPORT

May 22 – 24, 2016

International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies
in Higher Education (INQAAHE) Forum report
Hosted by Fiji Higher Education Commission

Quality Assurance in Higher Education in
Challenging Times

International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education
INQAAHE Forum, 2016



Fiji Higher Education Commission



National Assessment and Accreditation



**Agència
per a la Qualitat
del Sistema Universitari
de Catalunya**



Note: These organizations only represent those giving presentations at the Forum

Quality Assurance in Higher Education in Challenging Times

Contents

INQAAHE FORUM – Day 1.....	1
Welcome and Opening Ceremony	1
Keynote Speech 1:	2
Benchmarking and peer review: Assuring Quality through Collaboration	2
Topic 1: What do we do differently because of changing landscapes of Higher Education?	3
Synopsis of Topic 1 group discussions:	4
Topic 2: The consistency of national Quality Assurance systems.....	6
Synopsis of Topic 2 group discussions:	6
INQAAHE FORUM – Day 2.....	9
Keynote Speech 2:	9
Quality Assurance in a changing environment: Facing diverse demands.....	9
Topic 3: Effectiveness of quality assurance – How can we prove it?	9
Synopsis of Topic 3 group discussions:	10
Network Members who Attended	13
Forum Programme	14

INQAAHE FORUM – DAY 1

Welcome and Opening Ceremony

Welcome by the Chair of the FHEC Board, **Dr. Milika Sobey**

Dr. Sobey warmly welcomed all with the formal Fijian salutation, ‘Ni sa Bula Vinaka’, Her sincere words expressed the privilege of welcoming honoured guests, INQAAHE board members and delegates to the Forum.

Opening Address by the President of the Republic of Fiji, His Excellency **Major General (Ret’d) Jioji Konousi Konrote**

General Konrote on behalf of the government of Fiji highlighted the importance of the conference and congratulated the INQAAHE Network President for advancing the course of higher education, now in its 25th year. He acknowledged FHEC commitment to HE and applauded their recent (2015) recognition by APQN and hoped that new skills, attitudes and values learnt would contribute to future national and regional development.

Address from the President of INQAAHE: **Dr. Jagannath Patil**, National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), India

Dr. Jagannath Patil set the scene for us to keenly anticipate keynote speakers and other presenters. Dr. Patil also thanked the hosts FHEC and Program Board members for arranging and facilitating the forum. Several challenges to QA in HE were highlighted, one key challenge is that over four million students worldwide are now studying from home. Sustainability of HE is at risk so this gives us the opportunity to holistically look at how to face these challenges as network credibility is considered.

The question was raised whether the time has come for QA to be recognised as a profession? Individuals have spent decades dedicated to QA in HE.

After 25 years as a Network the former President said the need still exists to relate more to people, both students and society. Two important factors influenced how we can be of help in this regard. Firstly, the impact of climate change, which is very relevant here in Fiji with cyclone Winston, and secondly, the UNESCO Incheon declaration (2015) which stated “...that education is a public good, a fundamental human right and a basis for guaranteeing the realization of other rights. It is essential for peace, tolerance, human fulfilment and sustainable development. We recognize education as key to achieving full employment and poverty eradication”

“Has the time come for Quality Assurance to be recognised as its own profession?”

Boards have a capacity to influence social reform. Institutions and QA bodies also have great capacity to make positive changes in education processes inducing social reforms. The quest for quality education across the boundaries of nations, religions and languages has the potential of transforming the world into a more tolerant, peace loving and progressive place.

Keynote Speech 1:

Benchmarking and peer review: Assuring Quality through Collaboration

Dr Sara Booth, Strategic Advisor- Quality (External) at the University of Tasmania and Director of Research and Quality of Private Higher Education(COPHE) in Australia

Papers:

- Booth, S and Beckett, J and Saunders, C, “Peer Review of Assessment Network: supporting comparability of standards”, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 24 (2) pp. 1-18. ISSN 0968-4883 (2016);
- “Good Practice Benchmarking”, *Higher Education Academy* (2012)
- Booth, S, “International Peer Review Benchmarking for Quality Higher Education”, (2015)

Dr Booth introduced her presentation by defining Benchmarking and Peer review of assessment in relation to Quality Assurance (QA) in Higher Education (HE). In highlighting her previous experience she observed there wasn't a common understanding of benchmarking as a 'structured learning process'. Application of benchmarking in HE started in early 1990's in USA, and the UK followed in the mid 90's. Quality assurance developed with the comparison of standards in 2000. Reasons were explained why HEI's are benchmarking today, namely:

1. For information gathering, usually through the internet
2. Ranking purposes
3. Quality improvement purposes
4. Educational research purposes

The issue was raised of benchmarking and peer review at the international level that involved collaboration. Several international support mechanisms for peer review were listed including networks, resources and policies. Examples were provided of individuals who appreciated the value and recognised the potential of such mechanisms. Other examples from Australian institutions and agencies highlighted national benchmarking of peers through networks and resources such as:

- Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency (TEQSA).
- Australian Higher Education Standards Framework (2015) imbedded benchmarking for learning outcomes, review of all accredited courses, review of assessment methods, and information systems
- University of Tasmania (UTAS), Education Services (ESA) Australia, Higher Ed Services (HES) network are working collaboratively to formalize a national benchmarking network, with panels and a college of peers process to meet challenges.

Since 2009, the network had undertaken 15 benchmarking projects with over 35 universities in four countries. The positive results were clearly seen after two AUQA audits and benchmarking priorities that had since been established including an online peer review benchmarking tool.

A Snapshot of four benchmarking projects highlighted common areas for improvement, processes and good practice, namely:

1. HEA Benchmarking Project.
2. Ako Aotearoa Benchmarking Project
3. International Student Employability & Mobility Benchmarking Project 2015-2016
4. Council of Higher Education Private Providers (COPHE).

Common areas for improvements for HE benchmarking processes included reducing the number of strategies, restructuring internships to work with business and creating opportunities for alumni to work with universities in mentoring arrangements. In conclusion Dr. Booth highlighted the cooperation and collaboration between networks, such as APQN and ECA and between government agencies such as NIAD-UE, HEEC and KCUE are essential. Feedback and conclusions from these examples indicated that the data collected was invaluable, emphasising the need for an evidence based approach. The collaborative nature of all participants also contributed greatly to the success of projects.

Topic 1: What do we do differently because of changing landscapes of Higher Education?

Introduction: **Dr. Yung-chi Hou** (Angela), Professor of Higher Education, Fu Jen Catholic University, Taiwan; Vice-President, APQN.

Papers:

- Hou, Angela Yung Chi. "Quality Assurance of Joint Degree Programs from the perspective of Quality Assurance Agencies: Experience in East Asia". *Higher Education Research & Development*. 35(3), pp. 473-487. (2016).

A Joint degree is becoming a popular approach, whereby one joint qualification is issued and signed jointly by all institutions. Statistics were provided in Europe and Asia. In 2012, almost all European countries had implemented the legislation needed for joint degrees, and the total number of joint degree programs had reached over 3000.

The question was raised as to how quality can be assured with a joint degree while being recognized nationally and internationally. Examples were provided from Asia while many of these countries had not yet developed evaluation or regulation procedures. For institutions to recognize they have 'jointness', as a minimum they should share:

- Joint faculty, joint curriculum, joint management and joint supervision.
- Program and learning objectives
- QA policy by all partners
- Student selection and assessment policy
- Awarding policy

Collaboration has commenced in Asia through APQN for joint degrees, but challenges to assure quality of these programs still exist.

Synopsis of Topic 1 group discussions:

Question 1: What is the best way to quality assure a joint degree program?

Summarised by Iring Wasser, ASIIN E V, Germany.

Mr Wasser started summarizing the feedback from several discussions groups with a definition of a 'joint program', as it often got used interchangeably with other terms like, 'franchising, and trans-national'. The approach and instruments used to assure quality will differ if the joint program is offered within a country by different institutions, or whether it is offered by different institutions with different legislations.

Joint programs are not viewed the same, within the political context, in the Asia Pacific region in comparison to Europe. In Europe, joint programs are prolific as they are seen as a central instrument for integration between European Union countries. In the Asia Pacific region very few countries had joint programs, apart from Malaysia and Hong Kong as the political agenda differed from Europe, however joint programs are becoming more popular.

Joint programs require instruments and decisions to be established, including:

- Joint glossary
- Discussion guidelines
- Criteria defined by an accreditation process
- Regional/Multinational Accreditation Frameworks
- Peer groups
- Report writing; should there be two reports, or an integrated report?
- Who makes the final decision on accreditation procedures? In the Asia Pacific region the dynamics are different and so maybe the regional QA agencies could be used. Although different from Europe, this could work.

As joint programs are quite new to this region, it is difficult to define conclusive best practice, with some pilots now in progress this can be determined in the future.

Question 2: What are the potential resources/information that the QA agencies could share at different stages of evaluation and beyond?

Summarised by Erika Soboleva, Director International Affairs Officer, AKKORK, Russia

Before identifying what QA agencies can share, one needs to establish what the levels of the joint programs are, and from where are they being offered, such as from the same disciplines and/or HEI's or from different ones. After this is established the potential resources/information that can be shared for this agreed purpose, include:

- The legal framework
- Standards requirements: from both the QA agencies and the labour market needs and expertise
- Consensus amongst delegates was given that the stages for joint programs and standard programs, the process should be the same
- A joint glossary which contains vocabulary that is agreed amongst institutions.

- Good practice that exist in their own institutions.
- Challenges that they may have had to overcome.
- Agreements, such as an MOU

Question 3: What are the opportunities and challenges for conducting an external review over a joint degree program?

Summarised by Pauline Tang, THE-ICE, Australia.

Challenges included:

- Legislative requirements.
- Quality Assurance Frameworks differ. For example, Malaysia has an established QA Framework, while Japan's is still being developed.
- The graduate outcomes, such as employability in the local region.
- Teaching and Learning assessment approaches
- Cost
- Student evaluation
- Possible language barriers
- Staff qualifications, including the ability to work with people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds
- Individual's willingness to share intellectual property with other countries
- How to align assessment of the joint program from a national context, institutional context and a professional context

Opportunities:

- To learn practice and processes from other QA agencies
- Networking opportunities from experts in other countries.
- Learning from different cultures
- Benchmarking
- Cost sharing of expenses
- Sharing survey instruments, e.g. UTAS peer review tool
- Increased credibility
- Understanding each other's labour mobility
- Definition of quality from the employers perspective

Although the challenges seemed extensive, the discussion groups felt confident that the opportunities and capacity to conduct external review for joint degree programs existed and was feasible.

Topic 2: The consistency of national Quality Assurance systems

Introduction: **Dr. Susanna Karakhanyan**, Chairperson of ANQA Accreditation Commission, INQAAHE Vice-President.

Dr. Karakhanyan introduced by emphasizing that academic quality is central to consistency of HEI's. The need for a holistic framework model was discussed which incorporated HEI, the program, students and QA agencies with the functions (initial assessment, monitoring, credibility, accountability, certification and public information) of a national quality assurance system. One model doesn't fit all so it needs to be carefully designed with the institution's specific needs in mind.

Comparing the theory versus the reality in developing a QA framework helps us to develop more robust systems. Theory says to be successful at national level, "While designing a QA system the issue of the validity and credibility measurement as well as the value added should be already pre-defined and respective tools are to be developed along with the EQA mechanisms." Also at the national level the governments should be ultimately responsible for QA evaluation of institutions and the HEI for the program. But in reality this is not always the practice.

"One model, surely does not fit all"

What about transnational providers? Who is responsible for them? If performance of HEI quality assurance is not timely addressed, the existing approaches risk becoming obsolete because of their inadequacy to fulfill their primary role set by governments.

Dr Karakhanyan discussed how the major QA networks/associations can be used to evaluate the evaluators. Full membership is growing in the major networks: INQAAHE (172 members), ENQA (48 members), CHEA (62 members), RIACES (18 members), APQN (37 members). [full members 2015-16]

Dr Karakhanyan concluded by reinforcing the need for a holistic approach to QA to help address a nation's socio-economic target and needs. One model, surely, does not fit all, so revision of approaches is crucial. To keep pace with the rapid changes the need exists to ensure a holistic and context driven national quality assurance framework.

Synopsis of Topic 2 group discussions:

Question 1: How to ensure there is a move from mere compliance to actual quality enhancement?

Summarised by Jane Gentle, THE-ICE, Australia

Jane commenced by summarizing the groups understanding of the question. There were two interpretations. The first revolved around building a quality culture internally, and secondly, the external quality assurance to enhance quality. Compliance was generally understood as meeting mandatory standards. Quality enhancement meant building culture, teamwork, resources, value added through employability of students, pathways and industry alliances.

Quality has to lead to self-evaluation and benchmarking, as these are essential for quality enhancement. Issues on benchmarking need to be addressed with

stakeholders both locally and in other countries. Countries took several approaches to ensure quality enhancement, some examples were provided:

Saudi Arabia: Self-evaluation, NQF, support through QA training, accreditation process which includes external reviewers.

Hong Kong: Questions on enhancement as part of QA process which encourage institutions to evaluate themselves.

Estonia: Evaluate program group levels rather than individual programs, for example they don't evaluate the programs within engineering they evaluate engineering as an entire program.

Philippines: Evaluations are cyclical, and different levels can be attained, but this is a voluntary process. The levels are based around quality enhancement standards such as administration and student services.

In summary, the need was identified when writing standings too have academics and industry representatives also involved in the process with QA agencies and governing bodies.

Question 2: How do you ensure consistency in external evaluations? What tools do you rely on?

Summarised by Riceli Mendoza, AACUP, Philippines

Any tools or instruments should be standardized, originating from a legal accredited body. They should also be published and calibrated.

To ensure consistency with external evaluations, evaluators should be involved in extensive ongoing training. Selection of evaluators is also important, so selection criteria should be used such as term of reference, conduct of ethic's, qualifications, experience and most importantly their attitude. Evaluators should also be periodically evaluated.

Question 3: How do you promote credibility of your agency/work? What are the possible types of corruption? What QA tools/mechanisms would prevent it?

Summarised by Franz Gertze, Namibia Qualifications Authority.

Is there an issue with credibility in QA? Yes, definitely. There exist disagreements, plagiarism, clever forms of advertising like 'we have applied for accreditation so come and enroll'.

QAA by their very nature are political. The decisions they make are both social, economic and political, therefore credibility can often be questioned.

How can credibility be measured and manifest itself? Some feedback from individuals on possible types of corruption included:

- Financial
- Conflict of interest

- Any person involved in the value train of QA could be corrupted
- Corruption could be monetary or non-monetary, tangible or intangible

What tools or mechanisms could be used to prevent it, and promote credibility?

- Clear communication systems
- QA agencies must be independent and be consistent in operation and decisions
- Process must be transparent, standards and decisions must be fair and ethical
- QA agencies must be inclusive in their nature and have an appeal process
- QA agencies should work together with other bodies either nationally or internationally
- Have sound and enabling legislation in place that all can reference
- Confidentiality clauses should be in place

INQAAHE FORUM – DAY 2

Keynote Speech 2:

Quality Assurance in a changing environment: Facing diverse demands.

Dr. Maarja Beerkens, Professor, Leiden University, The Netherlands

Dr. Beerkens, introduced by discussing globalization and how in our interconnecting world we need to coordinate. One of the most effective ways is through trans-national networks like INQAAHE. One challenge is the interactions and collaboration between national and trans-national accreditation systems. Another challenge is addressing QA with the increase of online modular learning like MOOC. Dr. Beerkens discussed not only how QA is defined but how it is perceived by many, as a ‘problem with our higher education system, not an absolute goal to strive for.’

With increased academic attrition rates in Netherlands and students taking too long to graduate due to changing their disciplines, funding became based on graduates, causing HEI's to become like ‘factories’. The nature and view of QA has changed since the 80's and 90's including the perception of QA systems as being transparent and offering reliable information for key stakeholders, such as the students. QA also needs to be perceived legitimately in the eyes of the government and consumer while managing trust versus control.

Currently stakeholder engagement is a strategic approach that many HEI's view as fundamental for success. Some benefits for engaging stakeholders include better decisions and functions and an indirect benefit towards compliance. The process of engaging stakeholders in itself affects the individuals understanding of its purpose.

Some of the obstacles to stakeholder engagement include:

- individuals or organisations not wanting to get involved;
- viewing it as someone else's responsibility;
- interest groups are not well organized or represented.

In terms of QA improvement, different stakeholders have different perspectives, but studies have found that after stakeholder engagement takes place, common interest and consensus is established.

Topic 3: Effectiveness of quality assurance – How can we prove it?

Introduction: **Dr. Martí Casadesús Fa**, Director of AQU Catalunya

Dr. Casadesús Fa introduced by discussing the objectives of external QA in HE and how the nature of HE systems and budget and political issues can all have an impact on the effectiveness of QA.

The balance of QAA to be ‘ambitious’ in improving quality versus being ‘modest’ in providing information to key stakeholders is difficult. The objectives of QA systems can fall into three categories:

1. Improving the Quality HE;
2. Improving the QA management; and
3. Providing relevant information to decision makers.

Dr. Casadesus compared finding a balance of meeting the objectives of their missions with having reasonable systems to measure their achievements. Examples were provided from AQU Catalunya which illustrated how a HEI can incorporate objectives into their QA mission.

Synopsis of Topic 3 group discussions:

Question 1: The QA can be designed to serve different purposes: control, accountability, enhancement. What is your agency’s purpose and what methods do you use to address the different approaches?

Summary by Raymond Simanga – National Council for Higher Education, Namibia

- *Australia:* Australia has a risk based assessment and is getting to the stage of understanding strategies; so they are more than just compliance based. In early stages statistics were made collegial and HEI’s just went along with that. In 2002 standards were set, then they were revised in 2014 to be more specific. As they developed so did the institutions quality. When we look at the impact studies and programs reflectively, there have been many different approaches. Some methods used to address different challenges include:
 - o How do you build a culture that is resilient to constant change?
 - o Whether HEI’s have resources or technical methods to keep pace?
 - o Internal QA needs to happen before external QA can.
 - o IQA & ECA need to be able to work hand in hand. This is one of the major things that need to be addressed
 - o Internal QA needs to reflect to ensure they are keeping up with external QA
 - o Huge call for employer input. Perception still exists that students aren’t graduating with their feet on the ground. Universities respond by saying they are training students to think critically, there’re not preparing them for their first job, but for their career
- *Hong Kong:* After the Qualification Framework was introduced in 2008, issues on control of the accreditation system exist. The Qualification Framework allows a threshold standard for more major institutions, allowing flexibility for growth, but also very controlled guidelines for newer institutions. A challenge with older institutions, often over 100 years old, is they don’t like being forced to work under the Qualification Framework. Although it is voluntary, for them to get government funding they must adhere to the framework.
- *Dubai:* Dubai has a unique model as they have branch campuses across many countries and thus have to be very adaptable. Their system to ensure control is a similar to other countries. Currently there is now less control and more collegial

methods being adopted through learning best practice. Dubai now has an event called 'what works' for knowledge sharing of best practice. With different campuses globally they work closely with agencies to develop standards, such as QAA, TESQA, with strategic partnerships in place and the goal of attracting more international students. Institutional accreditation requires engagement with professionals in industry.

- *Estonia*: Estonia has two cycles of program accreditation. It has over 40 years of history for universities. After discussion with stakeholders the methods were formed. They now have study groups for programs which is a new system that drives enhancement.
- *Fiji*: FHEC controls institutional accreditation. Government funding influences how institutions are run. Qualifications have been enhanced as the FHEC board involves industry. HEI's have 5 and 7 year reviews to determine outcomes.
- *New Zealand*: New Zealand's challenge is that on one hand they want to encourage self-assessment for HEI's, however it is done in a manner that gives control to ensure certain standards are maintained, with clear implications if standards are not met.
- *USP Fiji*: USP's current situation is they offer programs in 12 countries, and their QA systems differ depending on the country. Each system is influenced by satisfaction from external stakeholders. Some of the countries don't have QAA's and so struggle with pressures to deliver to certain standards.

Question 2: Which are the QAA activities that have more impact on academic performance? How do you know it?

Summary by Dr. Beerkins- Leiden University, Faafiti Tausisi- Samoan Qualifications Authority

What activities have the biggest impact on academic performance? A consensus amongst the groups found that:

- Self-evaluation has a strong impact on departments and programs. Preparation for self-evaluation also triggers beneficial QA processes within HEI
- Self-evaluation has to be challenged externally, with the possibility of programs being closed.
- Program level evaluation through meetings/visits with stakeholders.
- QA activity is integrated as part of the culture of the HEI.
- Instruments that make the results public and promote transparency are needed. HEI's can compare themselves with these public results, without impacting on their reputation.

The question, 'how do you know which QAA activities have greater impact?', was very difficult for the groups to answer despite insightful discussions.

Question 3: What can be the means to measure the impact of external QA?

Summary by Luis Jr Sorolla, AACUP, Philippines

Synopsis of the groups findings have been categorized into eight areas:

1. Student performance and teaching excellence, measured by:
 - board through surveys and licensed examinations
 - independent assessment
2. Employability, measured by:
 - Competitiveness in the job market
 - Learning outcomes that meet industry needs
 - Productivity of graduates. Tracer studies showing business ownership or being promoted internally
3. Increase in student enrolment, measured by:
 - local and international student intake
 - better quality of students
4. Status and recognition of the institution, measured by:
 - Is it regulated, de-regulated, semi-autonomous, or autonomous?
 - Ranking surveys both locally and internationally
 - Programs have accreditation status/level
 - Classification of the HEI's – possibly
 - Awards or other recognition by international bodies
 - 'Cleanness' of the system. Reputable. No 'fake' certifications
5. Academic reputation, measured by:
 - Student satisfaction
 - Stakeholder/employee satisfaction
 - Historical progress
 - International mobility
 - Feedback from stakeholders
6. Funding, measured by:
 - Government subsidies, private benefactor's/donors
 - Increased funding for research and special papers
 - Students willingness to pay higher fees
7. Increased partners and linkages, measured by:
 - Collaboration with other universities and organisations
 - Committed research for private/public institutions
 - Student exchange programs
8. More effective internal QA, measured by:
 - Comprehensive system
 - Restructuring of the program to meet ever changing education and work environment
 - Peer reviews and feedback mechanism
 - Assessment by a body to determine the impact of the programs
 - Sustainability of the 'culture of quality'

“It will never rain roses. If you want roses, then plant more roses. Likewise, if we want Academic Quality, then we must vigorously pursue Quality Assurance”

NETWORK MEMBERS WHO ATTENDED

1. Agencia Nacional de Evaluación y Acreditación de la Educación Superior (ANEAES) (ANEAES), National Agency for Accreditation of Higher Education (ANEAES)
2. Arab Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ANQAHE)
3. ASEAN Quality Assurance Network (AQAN)
4. Asia-Pacific Quality Network (APQN)
5. Association of Quality Assurance Agencies of the Islamic World (AQAAIW), Association of Quality Assurance Agencies of the Islamic World.
6. Augstākās izglītības kvalitātes aģentūra (AIKA), AIKA - Higher Education Quality Assurance Agency in Latvia
7. Balochistan University of Engineering & Technology, Khuzdar (BUETK),
8. Caribbean Area Network for Quality Assurance in Tertiary Education (CANQATE)
9. Central and Eastern European Network of Quality Assurance in Higher Education (CEENQA)
10. Central Asian Network for Quality Assurance and Accreditation (CANQA)
11. Conseil africain et malgache pour l'enseignement supérieur (CAMES), African and Malagasy Council for Higher Education
12. European Alliance for Subject-Specific and Professional Accreditation And Quality Assurance (EASPA)
13. European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)
14. European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA)
15. European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education (ENAE AISBL)
16. European Quality Assurance Network for Informatics Education (EQANIE)
17. International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE)
18. Quality Assurance Network for African Higher Education (AfriQAN)
19. Red Iberoamericana para la Acreditación de la Calidad de la Educación Superior (RIACES), Ibero-American Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
20. The Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA), The Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors

FORUM PROGRAMME

Day 1 - MONDAY 23rd MAY		
8.00 am – 8.45 am	Registration	Water Court
8.45 am - 9.00 am	Prayer	Natadola Ballroom
9.00 am – 9.15 am	Welcome Dr Milika Naqasima Sobey – Chair, FHEC Board	Natadola Ballroom
9.15 am – 9.35 am	Opening Address by His Excellency the President of Fiji Major General (Retired) Jioji Konousi Konrote	Natadola Ballroom
9.35 am - 10.00 am	Address by the President of the INQAAHE Dr. Jagannath Patil, National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), India	Natadola Ballroom
10.00 am - 10.15 am	Group Photo	Kama Beach Front Entrance
10.15 am – 10.35 am	Morning Tea	Water Court Veranda
10.40 am – 11.40 am	KEYNOTE SPEAKER <i>Benchmarking and peer review. Assuring Quality through Collaboration</i> Dr Sara Booth - University of Tasmania, Research and Quality of Private Higher Education (COPHE), Australia	Natadola Ballroom
11.40 am – 12.00 pm	TOPIC 1 <i>What do we do differently because of changing landscape of Higher Education?</i> <i>Introduction.</i> Dr Angela Yung Chi Hou - Fu Jen Catholic University, Taiwan and Vice President - APQN	Natadola Ballroom
12.00 pm – 1.00 pm	Breakout Session	Natadola ballroom
1.00 pm – 2.00 pm	Lunch	Sanasana Restaurant
2.00 pm – 3.30 pm	TOPIC 2 <i>The consistency of national QA systems</i> <i>Introduction.</i> Dr. Susanna Karakhanyan - ANQA Accreditation Commission and INQAAHE Vice President *Discussion in break-up groups	Natadola Ballroom
3.30 pm – 4.00 pm	Afternoon Tea	Water Court Veranda
4.00 pm – 5.00 pm	Wrap-up session: Topics 1 and 2	Natadola Ballroom
6.00 pm – 7.00 pm	Cocktail	Water Court Veranda
7.00 pm – 9.00 pm	Gala Dinner Buffet – Celebrating INQAAHE's 25 years! Theme: Fijian Affair	Natadola Ballroom

FORUM PROGRAMME

Day 2 - TUESDAY 24th MAY		
9.00 am – 10.00 am	KEYNOTE SPEAKER <i>Quality Assurance in a changing environment. Facing diverse demands</i> Dr Maarja Beerkens, Leiden University, Netherlands	Natadola Ballroom
10.00 am – 10.30 am	Morning Tea	Water Court Veranda
10.30 am – 11.30 am	TOPIC 3 <i>Effectiveness of Quality Assurance. How can we prove it?</i> <i>Introduction</i> Dr. Marti Casadesus Fa, Director of AQU Catalunya	Natadola Ballroom
12.00 pm – 1.00 pm	Lunch	Sanasana Restaurant
1.00 pm – 1.30 pm	Wrap-up session: Topics 3	Natadola Ballroom
1.30 pm – 3.00 pm	QA Network Workshop	Natadola Ballroom
3.00 pm – 3.30 pm	Afternoon Tea	Water Court Veranda
3.30 pm – 4.30 pm	INQAAHE General Assembly	Natadola Ballroom
4.30 pm – 5.00 pm	Closing Remarks. INQAAHE President, Chair of FHEC	Natadola Ballroom
5.00 pm – 6.00 pm	INQAAHE Board Meeting	Secretariat Room