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Russia: Moscow, 6-7 June 2011

• University: MESI
• E-xcellence team: Jo Boon; Leo Wagemans
• Local coordinator: Irina Smirnova
• Programs:
  Institute of Management: Management (Bachelor program; Master program)
  Institute of Computer Technologies: Applied informatics (Bachelor program; Master program)
  Institute of Law and Humanities: Linguistics (Bachelor program)
  Institute of Economics and Finance: Economics (Bachelor program)
• VLE:
  Virtual Campus. The Virtual Campus is designed with the technology of Sharepoint
• National QA Agency:
  National Center of Public Accreditation (NCPA)
Lithuania: Kaunas, 26-27 October 2011

• University: Kaunas University of Technology
• E-xcellence team: Pekka Kess; Karen Kear
• Local coordinator: Vilma Rūta Mušankovienė
• Program: Master’s degree (MSc.) in Information Technologies of Distance Education
• VLE: Moodle and LearningSpace
• National QA Agency: Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (CQAHE)
Poland: Krakow, 14-15 December 2011

- University: Akademia Górniczo-Hutnicza (AGH)
  University of Science and Technology
- E-xcellence team: Jo Boon; Leo Wagemans
- Local coordinator: Karolina Grodecka
- Program:
  No specific program; Roadmap evaluation is done on the basis of the university by Centre of e-Learning and Faculty of Management
- VLE:
  Moodle LMS
  OpenMeetings (videoconferencing)
  Mahara (e-portfolio)
  Redmine (project management)
- National QA Agency:
  Quality Assurance Agency for Technical Universities
Cyprus: Nicosia, 6-7 March 2012

- University: Open University of Cyprus
- E-xcellence team: Karen Lear; George Ubachs; Andre Vyt
- Local coordinator: Erato-Ioanna Sarri
- Program:
  MA in Educational Studies
  BA in Studies in Hellenic Culture
  OUC General
- VLE:
  Eclass with a useful suite of tools: Moodle; Elluminate; video; anti-plagiarism software
- National QA Agency:
  Not mentioned in the Report
Latvia: Riga, 19-20 March 2012

- University: Riga Technical University
- E-xcellence team: Jon Rosewell; Pekka Kess
- Local coordinator: Ilmars Slaidins
- Program: Professional Master Program ‘Innovations and Entrepreneurship’
- VLE: Moodle
- National QA Agency: Higher Education Quality Evaluation Centre (HEQEC)
Portugal: Lisbon, 26-27 April 2012

• University: Universidade Aberta (UAb)
• E-xcellence team: Jo Boon; Leo Wagemans
• Local coordinator: João Caetano
• Program:
  Master on E-Learning Pedagogy (MPEL)
  Master on Administration and Educational Management (MAGE)
• VLE:
  Moodle with variety of tools to both students and tutors
  Makara (Digital Portfolio)
  Wiki for sharing information
• National QA Agency:
  Portuguese National Accreditation Agency
Greece: Patras, 16-17 May 2012

- University: Hellenic Open University
- E-xcellence team: Jon Rosewell; Keith Williams
- Local coordinator: Christos Katsanos
- Program: Masters in Business Administration
- VLE: Moodle
- National QA Agency: Hellenic Quality Assurance Agency (HQAA)
Evaluation of the E-xcellence project

- Feedback on the seminars and the results achieved
- Small survey (14 questions) sent on 2\textsuperscript{th} of August 2012
- Reflections also necessary for the Commission
- 9 reactions
### Satisfaction of local partners (n=9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how satisfied were you with the local seminar?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied were you with the communication and information provided before the local seminar?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied were you with the materials provided?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied were you with the organization of the local seminar?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your opinion about the length of the local seminar?

- Too long 0
- Just right 7
- Too short 2
What aspects did you like the most about the seminar?

• Open discussion, sharing views and experiences
• Opportunity to exchange experiences between local team and experts from other countries
• Sharing experience, revealing strengths and weaknesses, adjusting an improvement plan
• E-xcellence tool is extremely useful for quality improvement
• Commitment of participants: managers, teachers, students, representative of National accreditation agency
• Discussions that are relevant for future development
• It was an opportunity to revise our master degree program
• The process of completing the Quick Scan
What aspects did you like the least about the seminar?

- Lack of time to go deeply into all 33 benchmarks
- That the seminar was limited to only a small number of programs, not reaching enough people
- We expected to involve more teachers and more students
- Completing the Quick Scan focused on a specific program
- Recommendations might have been more detailed
Do you think that the workshop objectives have been met?

- Yes 8
- Mostly yes 1
- No 0
Has the project had any impact in your organisation so far?

- Discussion on some important issues was initiated, involving stakeholders not involved before
- We have identified issues for further e-learning development
- The participation in the project has already led to adjustments of the QA system of the university
- It has opened a dialogue between different stakeholders
- We are working on improvement along the road map
- Definitely, QA became more important
- Since the project teachers see how to improve their courses
- Too early for an official impact, but it enhances fruitful discussions
- E-xcellence framework is very useful in the process of designing an own QA system
- Not yet, some changes require decision making at the central level
In the light of what you have experienced and learned from the project so far, will you/your organisation contribute to further dissemination and sustainability of the project?

- Yes 9
- No 0
Will you use the E-xcellence benchmarks in future assessments?

• Yes 7
• No 1
• It is not our decision, we will propose and promote the use to the National Accreditation Agency
Please provide examples of such actions that you aim to undertake

- Dissemination to other programs and partners
- Improve existing quality tools and processes
- Implement better integration of online services
- Extend and improve communication using e-classroom tools
- Course development must be supported in a centralised way
- Workload of the staff is on the agenda
- More training of tutors
- Involvement of students in the assessment of their papers
- Encouragement of study groups and group projects
What role could QA agencies play in relation to QA in e-learning?

- Create an independent assessment of distance learning programmes
- They should regard e-learning as an indispensable element of modern education
- They should prepare recommendation in QA and e-learning
- Provide a more detailed implementation plan
- They should both play a constructive and an accreditive role in the development of a methodology to assess quality in e-learning
- Organise workshops on QA benchmarks
Further recommendations and suggestions

- Make the Quick Scan more apt to the level of programs or courses
- Assure sustainability of the project
- Instruct national assessors
- Strengthening and commitments of the projects’ main representatives in order to build relationships with National and European authorities
What have we learned? (1)

• Despite a clear planning, all Local seminars are different
• A positive experience: impressed by the work that was done in preparing the Quick Scan and the way the results were presented by the different participants
• The results of the Quick Scan show a lot of positive points and also an honest indication of weak points in e-learning
• It is important that self-evaluation includes consultation among a wide group of stakeholders, including teachers, students and education managers. Different people will have different views, so open discussion is a key part of the self-evaluation process.
• The systematic structure of the E-xcellence tool is a strong point
• Amount of work is mostly underestimated
What have we learned? (2)

• Wide range of the use of the benchmarks during the Local seminar: from a discussion about all the benchmarks where improvement was needed to a sample of three or four benchmarks
• A moment of reflection facilitated by external reviewers
• It is not an assessment, therefore more trust
• On-site vs At-a-distance requires different planning and preparation: agenda, chairing, technique
• Several Local seminars showed that the workload of the staff and the students in e-learning is very high
• The adoption of the framework by the National Agencies and their role stays unclear: on the one hand they seem to approve the initiatives, on the other hand they have their reservations
• For the review teams it was a pleasant atmosphere and useful experiences
Thank you for your attention