



ITEps experience with the European Approach

Peter Elting

ITEps experience with the European approach

- organising the partners & characteristics
- justifying the European approach
- selecting the accreditation organisation
- suggesting and selecting panel members
- analysing the European framework & NVAO
- good practices in the implementation process
- challenges in the implementation process
- improvement recommendations / challenges



Organising the partners

- University College South-East Norway, NO
- NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences, NL
- University College Zealand, DK (associated partner)
- In the near future, universities from UK??, Germany, Southern Europe, India/Thailand/ Hong Kong (full or associated partners)
- Unfortunately not Charles University, CZ; Anadolu University, TU and Linnaeus University, SE
- Advisors and friends



Programme characteristics

- Intercultural and international competencies are integrated
- Language of instruction is English (C2-level at graduation)
- 4 curricula: local, English curriculum, IPC and IB-PYP
- Curriculum is deep instead of wide (making maximum use of transfer)
- Research is integrated into every subject
- Students must study abroad with one of the partners
- Students must do a placement abroad



Justifying the European approach & selecting the accreditation organisation

- All partners are accredited institutes
- Stenden needs external quality assurance at programme level
- National approach vs European approach
 - International programme
 - One process instead of 3 or more processes
 - Trustworthiness towards international consortia / schools
 - Expanding the consortium
 - Framework more tailored towards joint programmes
 - Workload comparable
- Selecting accreditation organisation (EQAR-registered): NVAO

Suggesting and selecting panel members

- The consortium suggested 3 members (1 from each country) to the NVAO. The members (independent from the Universities involved) were together experts in:
 - internationalisation of Teacher Education
 - the world of international schools
 - the HE system in their own country
 - quality assuranceAll the members were familiar with accreditation processes.
- The composition of the panel was also important for the consortium in connection with the Teaching Qualification
- The NVAO provided the student representative, certified secretary and process manager



Analysing the European framework & NVAO

- Developing a document stating what is needed per standard
 - ECTS users' guide 2015
 - ESG 2015 version document (standards and guidelines for QA in the EHEA)
 - ECA publications (e.g. joint programme checklist)
 - tailored towards the ITEps consortium
 - the outcomes from past reviews
 - the jointness of the programme (e.g. standard 1.2: joint delivery and design)
 - co-creation
- Meeting with NVAO about:
 - the meaning of some standards, especially when all partners are accredited (e.g. standard 9: Quality assurance)
 - which documents are needed
 - initial accreditation, what about standard 2.3: achievement and the Dutch standard: graduation guarantee and financial provisions



Good practices in the implementation process

- A project plan was developed (incl. financial paragraph)
- Transparency: It is a project from the consortium and very important is: all stakeholders and bodies were involved.
- The project organisation consisted of
 - writing group
 - organisational group → University level
 - resonance group
 - workgroupsAll partners were represented in each group

All the outcomes were discussed on consortium level in the programme council (coordinators and students), steering committee (deans, externals, coordinators, students) and subject groups and on University level in student meetings, staff meetings, if applicable: examination committees, programme advisory committees etc.

- Trial of the site-visit: to streamline expectations, also some criticism
- Start very early looking for good panel members



Challenges in the implementation process

- To keep ALL subject groups minds on the job
 - necessary is the support from the steering committee
- Shortage of TIME: 1 month before the deadline of submitting the necessary documents to the NVAO, the Danish partner withdraw from the accreditation process as a full partner.
 - implications according to the joint programme agreement
 - implications for all documents (NVAO)
 - implications for the site visit (NVAO)
- To convince one of the partners to be part of the implementation process (self-accrediting status)
 - quality improvement
 - partnership

After the good implementation process it will be in the future not an issue any more (despite the cost of the process)
- Definition of a joint programme: leading to double/multiple degrees of joint degrees. ITEPs is according to the consortium and visitation panel a joint programme leading to a single degree. The way to a double degree / joint degree was impossible: contradictory regulations or too artificial with no added value for graduates.

Improvement recommendations / challenges

- Maybe an addendum to the framework in case of an initial accreditation
- Maybe it is also possible to have a limited framework in case the consortium consist of all accredited institutions (by EQAR registered accreditation organisations)
- Is it possible to change the definition of a joint programme, leading to → can lead to
- The ITEps consortium wants to expand in Europe and outside Europe
 - what does this mean for new partners (not all countries in the EHEA implemented the approach yet)
 - what does this mean for not EU partners
- Teaching qualification for international schools (European, Dutch , ...)?



Expert panel: 'The ITEPS consortium wants to offer a recognised international teaching qualification, which as such does not yet exist. The panel considers that the programme contains all elements for such qualification and therefore endorses the ambition of the consortium to set a standard for an international teaching qualification in future.'

Thank you

Email: peter.elting@stenden.com

