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# **Users instruction**

This template is intended to give you the directives for writing a report on all your findings. At the same time most tables in this report can also be used to collect the data during each interview. By systematically collecting for each interview your data in the different tables you have already put all input of related data brought together. From this you need to make some summarizing steps (select, combine, order) to condense everything and to make a good summary. Part of the instructions below intend to give the directive to do this.

Before going on for an interview each time simply print this set. During the interview use this print to keep track of the answers of your respondent. And once back in the office, fill in the collected information in the report template. In this way in the end you have collected everything in just one document!

Lots of success.

# **Introduction**

The project is aimed at the development of quality assurance model for the higher education oriented on enhancement of interaction between universities and national labor markets, and at dissemination of this model in the Project member-countries (Croatia, the Russian Federation, Belarus). In enables to extend the European approaches to the quality assurance to countries participating in the Project.

To achieve the set objective of the Project the first task is adaptation of the CQAF concept to specifics of the Higher Education in Croatia, the Russian Federation, and Belarus. It demands to collect the information about future QM&CQAF model providers and parties concerned primary reaction QM&CQAF model application, QM&CQAF model components and typical bottle-necks advance, backgrounds and improvement resources. The information has been gathered by means of the internet-interviews and direct activities.

Basic stages of the study:

1. The Internet questionnaire design;
2. Interviewing the survey respondents;
3. Including the interview results and the Internet questionnaire;
4. The first stage of the analyzing the interview results;
5. Clarifying several replies;
6. The final analysis of the interview results;
7. Making-ready the report about the survey (national report).

Some respondents asked to let them fill in the Internet – questionnaire on their own with a following specification of the replies that are not full or not precise enough.

National report about this survey is a part and a source of the raw data for the consolidated report on the primary reaction QM&CQAF model application, QM&CQAF model components and typical bottle-necks advance, backgrounds and improvement resources.

# **National context**

The Croatian Agency for Science and Higher Education (ASHE) was modelled after the best European practices in quality assurance in science and higher education. Becoming a full member of [ENQA](http://www.enqa.eu/) (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education) and being listed in EQAR (European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education) in 2011, the Agency proved its reliability as a quality assurance agency working in the European Higher Education Area.   According to the Act on Quality Assurance in Science and Higher Education the Agency performs a part of the procedure of initial accreditation, procedures of reaccreditation, thematic evaluation and audit, collects and processes data on Croatian higher education, science and related systems, which serve as a basis for analyses necessary to establish standards and criteria of evaluations carried out by ASHE, as well as a basis for informed and evidence-based strategic decision-making of bodies in the system of higher education and science.  ASHE also provides information and unifies data on the conditions of enrolment to higher education institutions in the Republic of Croatia. ASHE carries out recognition of foreign higher education qualifications and provides information on foreign and Croatian higher education system. One of the ASHE tasks is to administer and support the activities of the National Council for Higher Education, National Council for Science, Council for Financing Scientific Activity and Higher Education, Ethics Committee in Science and Higher Education, Area Councils, Scientific Field Committees, Humanities and Arts Committees and expert panels.

ASHE is working on its inclusion in the international quality assurance system in science and higher education and is its recognized and active member. ASHE is actively involved in the activities of European and global networks fostering mobility and recognition of foreign higher education qualifications (ENIC and NARIC network) and is a member of [ENQA](http://www.enqa.eu/) (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education), INQAAHE (International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education), CEENQA (Network of Central and Eastern European Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education) and  OECD IMHE (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development – Programme for Institutional management in Higher Education), as well as listed in EQAR (European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education). ASHE is also a member of the European Consortium for Accreditation - ECA, a project-oriented association of European agencies for external quality assurance in higher education and has an observer status in the Asia-Pacific Quality Network ([APQN](http://www.apqn.org/)). From September 2012 ASHE is also a member of the CHEA International Quality Group. Since April 2015 ASHE has also been a full member of the IREG Observatory on Academic Ranking and Excellence, an international institutional non-profit association of ranking organizations, universities and other bodies interested in university rankings and academic excellence.

Approval of courses, qualifications, or diplomas from one (domestic or foreign) higher education institution by another for the purpose of student admission to further studies. Academic recognition can also be sought for an academic career at a second institution and in some cases for access to other employment activities on the labour market (academic recognition for professional purposes). As regards the European Higher Education Area, three main levels of recognition can be considered, as well as the instruments attached to them (as suggested by the Lisbon Convention and the Bologna Declaration): (i) recognition of qualifications, including prior learning and professional experience, allowing entry or re-entry into higher education; (ii) recognition of short study periods in relation to student mobility, having as the main instrument the ECTS(European Credit Transfer System); (iii) recognition of full degrees, having as the main instrument the Diploma Supplement.

Accreditation is the process by which a (non-) governmental or private body evaluates the quality of a higher education institution as a whole or of a specific educational programme in order to formally recognize it as having met certain predetermined minimal criteria or standards. The result of this process is usually the awarding of a status (a yes/no decision), of recognition, and sometimes of a license to operate within a time-limited validity. The process can imply initial and periodic self-study and evaluation by external peers. The accreditation process generally involves three steps with specific activities: accumulation of study credits,assesment.

Credit accumulation is the process of collecting credits for learning within degree programmes. In a credit accumulation system a specified number of credits must be obtained in order to complete successfully a study programme or part thereof, according to the requirements of the programme. Credits are awarded and accumulated only when the successful achievement of the required learning outcomes is confirmed by assessment. Learners can use the credit accumulation system to transfer or “cash in” credits achieved from work-based learning/different programmes within and between educational institutions.  Assesment is: the process of the systematic gathering, quantifying, and using of. information in view of judging the instructional effectiveness and the curricular adequacy of a higher education institution as a whole (institutional assessment) or of its educational programmes (programme assessment). It implies the evaluation of the core activities of the higher education institution (quantitative and qualitative evidence of educational activities and research outcomes). Assessment is necessary in order to validate a formal accreditation decision, but it does not necessarily lead to an accreditation outcome, and a technically designed process for evaluating student learning outcomes and for improving student learning and development as well as teaching effectiveness.

Audit is the process of reviewing an institution or a programme that is primarily focused on the accountability of the latter, evaluating/determining if the stated aims and objectives (in terms of curriculum, staff, infrastructure, etc.) are met.

Audit report/Assesment report/evaluation report is the document prepared following a quality assessment peer review team site visit that is generally focused on institutional quality, academic standards, learning infrastructure, and staffing. The report about an institution describes the quality assurance (QA) arrangements of the institution and the effects of these arrangements on the quality of its programmes.

The audit report is made available to the institution, first in draft form for initial comments, and then in its final, official form. It contains, among other things, the description of the method of the audit, the findings, the conclusions of the auditors, and various appendices listing the questions asked. In Europe, the document is often called an “[evaluation](https://www.azvo.hr/en/component/seoglossary/6-quality-assurance-and-accreditation-glossary-basic-terms-and/213-evaluation) report” or an “assessment report”. Such a report may also be prepared about an accreditation agency, describing its quality assurance arrangements and the effect of these arrangements on the quality of the programmes in the institutions for which it is responsible.

# **Target group the research aims at and definitions used**

The research target audience were employees of higher education institutions (5 institutions of higher education) that deal with quality of education in their professional life, including directly involved into QMS.

In the interview two definitions of a high quality education have been used.

The first definition is the definition suggested by a respondent himself/ herself. This definition has been used to encourage a respondent to speak judging from one’s own experience and concept of a quality education. Five different definitions have been received (adding their variations). The second definition is a standard definition that is being used by the European Commission as far as quality of education is concerned: “*Quality of any educational institute depends on the capacity to achieve prior set targets*”[[1]](#footnote-1).

# **Profile of respondents and respondents organisation**

5 respondents from 5 institutions of higher education have been interviewed. The interview has been conducted on Croatian territory. The interview participants represent in majority of state higher education institutions (4 institutions of higher education) and only one private. For the realization of the national report it was conducted five interviews involving managers of quality educational institutions. All institutions of higher education institutions that implement programs in line with the Bologna process and its programs are accredited by a national institution for evaluation and accreditation in Croatia. Interviewed institutions are different levels of implementation of educational programs. Three institutions perform professional undergraduate and graduate studies, while two institutions perform professional and university undergraduate and graduate studies. In addition to the regular program of studies, they also perform continuing education programs. According to the property one of the institutions is entirely privately owned. At all institutions in accordance with the law of the Croatian accreditation, audit is conducted according to the ESG standards by the national authorities, and on this basis, they have the license to work and performance of programs of study.

All respondents are already longer period working in field of quality as established professionals and managers of quality in their institutions.

# **Good quality of education: what does it mean?**

### **3.1 Respondent’s definition of good quality of education**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Respondent:** | **Definition / description given:** |
| **1** | Good quality of education is when all stakeholders are satisfied or delighted. |
| **1** | Completely fulfillment of requirements of all users: Internal (students, teachers, non-teaching staff) and external (future and current employers, parents, national authorities, the relevant ministry and others.) The good quality of education is to prepare students for the labor market and to gain the necessary knowledge, competencies and skills with the best possible conditions for study (quality educational processes, teachers, well-organized and effective professional practice and supporting activities of students) Simply put: to satisfy needs of users in all segments |
| **1** | Completely fulfillment of requirements of all users: students and their employers (present and future, therefore the labor market) and investors (mainly parents), employees, owners and management, national authorities (the competent ministry, ASHE) and society in general. In other words, that our graduates with their competencies, knowledge and skills correspond to the current and future needs of the labor market! |
| **1** | - |
| **1** | Good quality of education means achieving the best measurable results:% finished,% of employees% of students who continue education. |
| **5** |  |

**Conclusion:**

All participants share the same idea and opinion about the good quality of education and it is the fully meeting the requirements of all users: internal and external, as well as ensuring competence, knowledge and skills in ways that correspond to the current and future labor market needs.

### **3.2 Respondent’s most decisive criteria for good quality of education**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N- times mentioned**  **N- puta**  **spomenuti** | **Short description** | **Why chosen by respondents?** |
| Number of registered students | 1 |  | Talks about the interests of students for specific studies. 1 |
| The number of approved quotas for enrollment | 1 |  | Talks about the interests of students for specific studies. 1 |
| Number of graduates | 1 |  | Talks about student success in a defined period.1 |
| Number of enrolled students | 1 |  | Talks about student success in a defined period.  1 |
| Number of students | 1 |  | Talks about the quality of the lectures and exercises. Working with small groups ensures greater commitment to students. 1 |
| Number of teachers | 1 |  | Talks about the quality of the lectures and exercises. Working with small groups ensures greater commitment to students.  1 |
| Number of finished students who enrolled in further education | 1 |  | Shows a general interest for further studying. During the study, students are motivated for further education. 1 |
| The quality of teaching and teacher | 2 |  | That teachers know how to transfer the knowledge and experience to students with appropriate modern methods to achieve the learning outcomes for each module. The high level of interest of teachers for what they do.  1  Applicable knowledge and skills for ensuring the attainment of learning outcomes established for each subject in his syllabus 1 |
| Quality of study programs | 1 |  | A well-designed program of study that follows the changes and needs of the economy and the labor market and which will enable students to acquire the appropriate competencies required for their employment. 1 |
| Acquiring adequate competencies | 1 |  | Which will affect on the higher rate of employability 1 |
| Employability of graduates and the results of work in the profession | 2 |  | Employability of graduates in the labor market - in a shorter time after graduation and high rate of employability 1  Justify basic reason for the existence of colleges  1 |

**Conclusion:** Respondents most emphasize the importance of quality teaching and the quality of teachers, as well as the ratio of teachers and students as important criteria in quality assurance. Also consider that acquiring appropriate competencies through well-conceived study programs is a major factor later on employability in the labor market.

### **3.3 Existing measurements of quality**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator:** | **Way of measurement** | **Impact on what stakeholder (government, employer, student, parent?** |
| Number of applicants on the enrollment quota | Reports of professional services  QM report | Indicator of the attractiveness of the higher education institution |
| The number of students who regularly go into the next year of study | Reports of professional services  QM report | The positive impact on the cost of the study. |
| The number of students who have completed studies | Reports of professional services  QM report | A major impact on the cost of studying but talks about the general quality of study. |
| The average years of study | Reports of professional services  QM report | The positive impact on the cost of the study. |
| The average score of studying | Reports of professional services  QM report | The indicator of the general quality of studying. |
| The average score of course | Reports of professional services  QM report | The positive impact on teachers |
| Transience and score on the exam | Reports of professional services  QM report | The positive impact on teachers |
| Analysis of the success on examination | Collecting and analyzing data on the percentage of passing the exams in different modules | Students, educational institutions |
| Number of students enrolled in postgraduate studies | Reports of professional services  QM report | The positive impact on students |
| Number of students enrolled in graduate studies | Reports of professional services  QM report | The positive impact on students |
| The number of students employed in the profession | Reports of professional services  QM report | The positive impact on the government, students and parents |
| The evaluation of teachers and the teaching process | Surveys | Students, teachers, educational institutions (administration and management schools) |
| Self-evaluation of teachers | Questionnaire | Educational institutions, students, employees |
| Analysis of lifelong learning and training of teachers | The Report on the permanent training of teachers | Students, teachers, educational institutions, the responsible ministry |
| Evaluation of professional administrative services | Surveys | Students, staff, educational institutions |
| Analysis of the success of studying (2) | Collected and processed data on the number of,  first enrolled, repeaters, finished and unfinished per generations of students, the average length of of studying  Number of enrolled in the second year of study and more  Number of graduates  The average length of studying  The average score of studying.  Transience and score on the exam | Students, employers, educational institutions, the responsible ministry  Students, Employees,  parents |
| Students' satisfaction with the study program | Surveys | Students, employers |
| Satisfaction of employers with study program | Surveys | Employers and other social community |
| Analysis of data on employment of graduates | Questionnaire of Alumni and data of the employment office | Employment Office, employers, labor market |
| The high rate of employability of graduates | Reports of professional services  QM report | Employers, parents (financiers), students, society |
| The time from graduation to employment of students | Reports of professional services  QM report | Employers, society, parents (financiers), society, students |
| Student evaluation of lecturers | Reports of professional services  QM report | Employees, school management |
| Average grade of students | Reports of professional services  QM report | Students, employers |
| Title of our professors | Reports of professional services  QM report | Employees, management, society, the responsible ministry |
| Interest in the study | Number of interested in relation to the enrollment quota.  Enrollment rates in relation to the enrollment quota. | Students, parents,  employees |
| Employment (further education) | Number of employees in the profession  The total number of employed.  The number of students who continue education. | Students, Employees,  parents |

**Conclusion:** Respondents are most based on the number and interest students in certain studies, as well as a way of measuring success during the study, with emphasis on employability and measuring employability.

### **3.4.Respondents example of good practice in which these criteria are reflected / clearly respected**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Short description ( I or 2 lines!)** | **Indicators selected as part of the start?** | **How was effect established?** |
| Monitoring student satisfaction after each semester | Measuring student satisfaction after each semester | YES | A survey, committee for interviewing, reporting to teacher and head of the department |
| Monitoring satisfaction of employers with graduate students who are employed with them. | Measuring the satisfaction of employers with graduate students who are employed with them. | YES | Unit for quality carries out every two years and does an analysis and takes measures to improve customer satisfaction |
| networking | The formation and activity of the Alumni Club. | YES | Club in the process of forming and taking concrete measures. |
| The quality of teaching | Monitoring employee relations and the number of of students. | YES | Over the HR department and the person responsible for teaching is carried out the calculation of the set of relations. |
| Improving the quality after each academic year. | Monitoring quality indicators after each academic year. | YES | Conducted over the data in the Student Services and ISVU. |
| The quality of teachers and improvements | Calculation of average scores and reports for teachers with a critical review. | YES | Heads of departments carried out an analysis of data through the student services and ISVU and analyzes on council direction. |
| Improving the passing | Organization of supplementary classes | YES | It is carried out after calculating the passing on all courses and analysis, and in collaboration with teachers. |
| Employability | Monitoring employment of students in the profession | YES | This data are obtained by the Alumni. |
| Further education | Monitoring students who enrolled in further training | YES | This data are obtained by the Alumni. |
| The attractiveness of study programs | Monitoring of interest for studije- attractiveness of studying | YES | This data are obtained by the Alumni.. |
| Transience and score on the exam | Monitoring of transience on course | YES | Revised system of questions by weight and an adequate grade. Introduced group consultation and mentoring students of the first year. Continuous monitoring of the system Merlin.  Result> transience |

**CONCLUSION:** The respondents as examples of good practice referred to networking and alumni club that achieves an increase loyalty to the the institution, but also mutual respect between the past and present and future students. In addition it is essential to verify the quality of education through individual indicators in the process of teaching, but also validate the opinion of employers. This way allows monitoring and increasing the quality of teaching, but also achieves the overall quality of study and students.

# **EQAVET indicators in use**

### **4.1 Effective use of the EQAVET cycle**

Table 1:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent:** | **Attention area of then cycle:** | **Why / how? Zašto/kako?** |
| 5 | I'm not familiar with the use of EQAVET. For these reasons, I have no comments, suggestions. I think that this question should be considered and critically look back at its application. |  |

### 

### **Conclusion:** All respondents confirmed that they are not familiar with the EQAVET model and wanted to meet with the model. Regardless of this fact below the respondents gave their assessment regarding the EQAVET criteria in terms of their assessment needs importance of using such descriptors quality and applications in their institutions.

### **4.2 Use of EQAVET quality criteria/descriptors**

**Table 1. Planning descriptors**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning descriptors** | **Used: yes - no** | | | |
| **Used** | **Not in the proper amount** | **Not applicable** | **Difficult to answer** |
| Studies on process (teaching and pedagogics) and product (learning outcome). | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Focus on local needs and value added to the customer | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Transparency in the intake (criteria) | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Design of new courses adapted to market needs | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Plan the internal resources e.g. teachers to intended learning outcome and to student population | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |

**Conclusion:** Most of the proposed planned indicators are used among the respondents of which the last two indicators are not fully used.

**Table 2.: Implementation descriptors**

| **Implementation descriptors** | **Used yes - no** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Used** | **Not in the proper amount** | **Not applicable** | **Difficult to answer** |
| Run courses according to syllabus / set procedures | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Have internal standardized procedures for QA | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Have formulated indicators for success (completion rate, placement rate in related jobs, utilisation of acquired skills, % of drop-out, % of unemployment) | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Invest (appropriate) time and resources for the delivery | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Secure internal cooperation. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |

**Conclusion:** All the proposed implementation indicators are used among the respondents of which indicator of mutual security cooperationis underutilized in two subjects.

**Table 3.: Evaluation descriptors**

| **Evaluation descriptors** | **Used yes - no** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Used** | **Not in the proper amount** | **Not applicable** | **Difficult to answer** |
| Be willing to take criticism from both external and internal stakeholders | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Assess the activities and take the time for analysis | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Involve stakeholders in the analysis / evaluation | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Have regular meetings and evaluations | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

**Conclusion:** Regarding the evaluation indicators / descriptors of all respondents are willing to accept criticism of stakeholders, and take steps to analyze the results. Half of the respondents involves stakeholders in the analysis, while the other half does not do it in proper measure. The biggest problem are meetings that are regularly maintains by half of the respondents, while the others are not possible to carry out that or other do it reduced extent.

**Table 4.: Review descriptors**

| **Review descriptors** | **Used yes - no** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Used** | **Not in the proper amount** | **Not applicable** | **Difficult to answer** |
| Use the analysis and facts (of your indicators for success) | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Secure the follow-up. | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Give feedback to students and all stakeholders | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**Conclusion:** All respondents use all review indicators

**Table 5.: Actors / stakeholders descriptors**

| **Actors / stakeholders descriptors** | **Used yes - no** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Used** | **Not in the proper amount** | **Not applicable** | **Difficult to answer** |
| Listen to the market needs and meet the professionals here | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Listen to the students and support both strong students and students with personal problems | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Educate trainers even more | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Take all stakeholders seriously and involve them | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**Conclusion:** Indicators related to the stakeholders apply half in terms of application or lack of application, only the indicator „Take all stakeholders seriously and involve them“ is inapplicable to one respondent.

# **Indicators used in the EU provider model on quality of education**

Table 1:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** of CQAF VET model | **Relevance** (1 is not relevant, 5 very relevant): | **Usage:**  Yes – No |
| **Curriculum** |  |  |
| Taking account of learners experience | 3,5 | 3-1 |
| Arranging employers involvement in development and delivery of education | 4,25 | 3-1 |
| The status of your education programmes | 4,25 | 3-1 |
| **Learning methods** |  |  |
| The didactical approach | 4,25 | 3-1 |
| Teaching adapted to target group | 4,75 | 3-1 |
| **Intake and entry level** |  |  |
| Collecting of learner’s information | 4,75 | 3-1 |
| **Coaching, mentoring, tutoring** |  |  |
| Specification of tasks and roles within the learning process | 4,00 | 2-2 |
| Allocation as well as development of proper staff | 4,00 | 3-1 |
| **Leadership** |  |  |
| Shared vision on quality | 4,00 | 3-1 |
| Arranging for systematic evaluation | 4,00 | 3-1 |

Table 2:

| **Indicator** of CQAF VET model | **Relevance** (1 is not relevant, 5 very relevant): | **Usage:**  Yes – No |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome and accountability** |  |  |
| Transparency regarding results achieved | 4,75 | 3-1 |
| **Staff development and staff allocation** |  |  |
| Arranging for competence profile of teaching staff | 4,00 | 3-1 |
| **Social responsibility** |  |  |
| Incorporation of social responsibility in education | 4,00 | 3-1 |
| Demonstration of Institute’s social responsibility | 4,00 | 3-1 |
| **Accessibility** |  |  |
| Arranging for open access to all potential students | 4,00 | 3-1 |
| Arranging for equal opportunities for groups at risk | 4,3 | 2-2 |
| **Guidance and care** |  |  |
| Arrangement regarding guidance and care structure | 4,00 | 1-3 |
| Arrangements for rights and responsibilities of learners | 4,00 | 3-1 |
| **Apprenticeship work based learning** |  |  |
| Transparency of tasks and responsibilities in work based learning and similar forms of education | 4,00 | 2-2 |
| Achieving minimum level of entry requirements for work based earning and similar forms of education | 4,5 | 3-1 |
| **Examination** |  |  |
| Examination reflects demands of stakeholder (of government etc. as well as of employers) | 4,5 | 3-1 |
| Recognition of learning outcome by professionals (non-teachers) | 4,00 | 2-2 |

**Conclusion:** Given that the respondents are not familiar with the CQAF VET model, this answers were given on the basis of experience in the field of quality assurance in higher education institutions, so the analysis of the table shows that all respondents are relatively well informed about the EU indicators of quality assurance and a very high importance give to all the indicators in terms of their application.

# **Main challenges regarding improvement of the quality of education**

### **6.1 Main challenges and support needed**

Table 1.:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent** | **Main Challenge** | **Support** |
| **At the level of educational organization** | Improving quality of the exercises during the of studying | Equipping the adequate practicum, laboratories and hiring assistants and laboratory technicians. |
| **At the level of educational organization** | To ensure employment of graduates | Future employers |
| **At the level of educational organization** | Provide appropriate teacher knowledge, but also practical experience and approach to the performance classes (fully interactive) | Management - selection of teachers |
| **At the level of educational organization** | Starting a new course | Financial support |

**Conclusion**: Respondents in terms of the main challenges expect greater involvement of the organization itself in the whole education system in order to thus unable to provide adequate quality of education, in a way that organization ensures continuous training and education of teachers involved in the education process, ensuring adequate equipment and laboratories for teaching. They also considered necessary and important that higher education institutions in some way ensure later on employability of students, while the financial support from the government and private institutions is necessary for their normal functioning and maintenance of quality at a satisfactory level.

### **6.2 Main challenge regarding teachers involvement and support needed**

Table 2:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | Main Challenge | Support |
| 1 | Involving teachers in science and technology projects | Financial resources |
| 1 | Management and Administration  A better selection of teachers  The relevant ministry | The quality of teachers, practical experience that can be applied in teaching, interactive teaching |
| 1 | The relevant ministry  Employers | Programs must ensure the acquisition of appropriate competencies for future employment of students |
| 1 | Ensure continuous training of teachers | Management, the owner, the teachers themselves |
| 1 | - | - |

**Conclusion:** The findings of this study section are in common with the conclusions of the previous section (the necessary support measures). So, the main challenges associated with the involvement of teachers and the necessary support measures is to ensure teachers. The second significant group of challenges relates to the field of organization and management of the educational process and the educational organization, especially to quality management and resolution of quality problems, but also regading who is in charge to control the work of educational institution.

### **6.3 Remarks made by the interveiwers**

Given that the respondents are not familiar with the model, however, most of the answers are based on experience during the previous work in the field of quality, so it is necessary to put emphasis on the importance of education on the model before this extensive research to those who are not familiar with the model itself could give more precisely answers.

# **Conclusion on the use EQAVET indicators and CQAF VET indicators**

**7.1. Decisions and key indicators of the quality education at nation level in the Croatia**

According to the Act on Quality Assurance in Science and Higher Education (ASHE) the Agency performs a part of the procedure of initial accreditation, procedures of reaccreditation, thematic evaluation and audit, collects and processes data on Croatian higher education, science and related systems, which serve as a basis for analyses necessary to establish standards and criteria of evaluations carried out by ASHE, as well as a basis for informed and evidence-based strategic decision-making of bodies in the system of higher education and science. In Croatia ASHE does process of  accreditation, which is the process by which a (non-) governmental or private body evaluates the quality of a higher education institution as a whole or of a specific educational programme in order to formally recognize it as having met certain predetermined minimal criteria or standards. The result of this process is usually the awarding of a status (a yes/no decision), of recognition, and sometimes of a license to operate within a time-limited validity. The process can imply initial and periodic self-study and evaluation by external peers. The accreditation process generally involves three steps with specific activities: accumulation of study credits,assesment.

**7.2. The most important indicators for providing high quality education according to providers**

The respondents emphasise successful allumni’s employment, their achievements (since they have started to study) and employers’ satisfaction (as a key criterion for high quality education). Some indicate the importants of permanent education of teaching staff, employability of students, but also high significance is added to acquire adequate competencies for students so thej could be ready for the labor market, which is is similar to a national key indicator that qualification should be relevant to the professional standard. Some replies cover the importance of managing the quality of a learning process.

**7.3 Similarities / differences with EQAVET indicators**

In general respondents are not aware of EQAVET models and indicators.

**7.4. Similarities / differences with CQAF VET indicators**

The interview analysis shows that according to the respondents opinion all indicators are estimated quite high.

The basic challenges concerning faculty engagement and necessary support measures refer to the faculty qualification. The second significant group of challenges refers to managing the learning process and education institution as a whole, specifically to the quality management.

The respondents strongly emphasise government support for education institutions in general as well as for private people (faculty and trainers). They highligh the importance of supporting cooperation with employers and partners.

**7.5 Suggested amendments / replacement for the model**

# Given the lack of information regarding the model there is no informations from respondents regarding the improvement or replacement of models.

# **Annexes**

University North

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Representative for the quality |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 5-10 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | YES |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 50+ |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 50-299 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 3.500 |
| Drop-out %: ? | 70% |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Technical, economic and artistic |
| ISO certified? | ISO 9001 |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | YES |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | YES |
| If “yes” which one? | ESG |
| Reason for choosing this model? | Request of ASHE |

Mechanical engineering faculty

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item: Predmet:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Associate professor  The President of the Committee for Quality Assurance |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | <5 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | NO |
| Estimate average age of participants: |  |
| Amount of staff: Broj osoblja:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 50-299 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 1000 |
| Drop-out %: ? | 35 % |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.)  Područje obrazovanja (techničko, economsko etc.) | Technical |
| ISO certified? | Ne |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | - |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | - |
| If “yes” which one? | - |
| Reason for choosing this model? | - |

College of Agriculture

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item: | Respondents N= 10 to 15 |
| Role/position: | Senior Lecturer, Head of the Unit for quality |
| Years in this position:  Godine na poziciji  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 5-10 |
| Public or private? Javno ili privatno | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | YES |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 50+ |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 54 |
| Amount of students at institute: | oko 600 |
| Drop-out %: ? | 60% |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Agriculture, management in agriculture |
| ISO certified? | No |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | We are not able to implement the system due to financial constraints and the lack of people which would have done it. |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | YES |
| If “yes” which one? | ESG |
| Reason for choosing this model? | So far it is mandatory in Croatia, and if not we'll still use it and try to renew a certificate |

Polytechnic VERN

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | **Professor, quality manager** |
| Years in this position:  Godine na poziciji  < 5  5-10  > 10 | > 10 |
| Public or private? Javno ili privatno | public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | - |
| Pure AVET institute? | NO |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 40+ |
| Amount of staff: Broj osoblja:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> |  |
| Amount of students at institute: | 2300 active one |
| Drop-out %: ? | 90% |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.)  Područje obrazovanja (techničko, etc.) | Economy, technically management, tourism, IT, journalism, film art |
| ISO certified? | YES, since 2004. |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | Better and organized system, simpler and faster implementation of certain procedures and related activities |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | YES |
| If “yes” which one? | ESG |
| Reason for choosing this model? | The legal requirement in Croatia |

High technical school

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Representative for quality |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | <5 |
| Public or private? | Private |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | YES |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 60 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 35 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 695 |
| Drop-out %: ? | ~55% |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Technical and Biomedical |
| ISO certified? | ISO 9001:2008 do 2015 |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | Arrangement of system |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | YES |
| If “yes” which one? | ESG |
| Reason for choosing this model? | Refers to Higher Education |

## **Participant list**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Date**  **of interview/**  **Datum intervjua** | **Name / Ime** | **Organisation**  **Organizacija/Institucija** | **Signature /**  **Potpis** |
| **1** | **05.04.2016** | **Živko Kondić** | **University North** |  |
| **2** | **07.04.2016** | **Leon Maglić** | **Mechanical engineering faculty** |  |
| **3** | **08.04.2016.** | **Dušanka Gajdić** | **College of Agriculture** |  |
| **4** | **10.04.2016** | **Diana Plantić -Tadić** | **Polytechnic VERN** |  |
| **5** | **11.04.2016** | **Stjepan Golubić** | **High technical school** |  |
| **Itd.** |  |  |  |  |

1. A new European approach toward Quality Assurance in Vocational Education. With the support of the Life Long Learning Programme of the European Union. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)