

Organization and methodological issues of the audit and monitoring processes

József Temesi, CUB

Peer Learning Activity

Tempus Public Foundation, October 13-14, Budapest

SZÉCHENYI 2020



MAGYARORSZÁG
KORMÁNYA

Európai Unió
Európai Strukturális
és Beruházási Alapok



BEFEKTETÉS A JÖVŐBE

Audit with a focus on supporting the institutions in developing internationalization

Target groups:

- institutions which are in the early development phase of internationalization need support to find the right directions and methods to achieve visible results,
- institutions which want to make their internationalization activities more focused, more measurable and incorporate the internationalization activities into the overall institutional quality assurance system.

Experiences from the questionnaire

Improvement possibilities:

- Methodological handbook
- Data provision
- Preparation and completion of the institutional visit
- Final report
- Feedback, monitoring

Methodological handbook, self-assessment

- Stronger focus on helping the institutions to produce more descriptive self-evaluation – instruction manual vs. methodological handbook
- Template, electronic version of the self-assessment report
- Extending the self-assessment with web-information
- Annexes: list of recommended documents to be provided (electronically)

Data provision

- Need for a standard institutional database as source of a new statistical data-block on internationalization
- Integration to the quality assurance reporting system
- Standard format (Excel-template) of the self-assessment statistical tables
- Separation of strongly recommended and optional data

Preparation and completion of the institutional visit

Preparatory activities

Institutions: more time for collecting information and for the analysis, early coordination of determining the date of the visit and the invited focus groups

Experts: appointed team-leader, structured discussion of the main findings of the self-assessment report, time for requesting additional data and/or clarification, harmonized list of the major issues in advance

Completion of the visit

More time; more detailed scenario of the visit; more structured discussions

Final report

- Consultation with the institution at the end of the visit to clarify certain issues
- Need for formal requirements (template) of the final report
- Less general recommendations, more specific proposals
- Clear formulation of the recommendations

Feedback, monitoring

Action plan has to be a requirement

Publicity of the final report or a one-page summary (as in case of international accreditation reports)

Monitoring can be a two-stage process:

a) Report on the developments in each area of the recommendations using the institutional action plan as a guideline and demonstrating the results with data where it is possible. Indicate the priorities of the next two years (maximum five) with the expected results. Justify the targets and describe the necessary conditions.

b) Half-day visit of the expert team: meeting with key persons in the implementation of the action plan.

Other issues

Motivating the institutions to participate in the audit

Audit workshops: information, best practices, networking

Selection of auditing experts: pool of registered experts
(tender)

Collaboration with the Hungarian Accreditation Committee

Group discussion III:

Conceptual and organizational issues: assessment dilemmas

a) How to promote the internationalisation audit? How to select participating institutions?

b) Who are the ideal auditors? What kind of competences do they need, and what kind of training can improve the proficiency of the audit? How to ensure the objectivity of the audit team?

c) What are the central parts of the institutional visit? Apart from the self-assessment report is there a need for additional information channels (focus groups, questionnaires)?

d) What kind of monitoring activities could be realistic to follow the audit project in order to support the audited institutions' improvement?

Group focus

- GREEN** Selection and preparation of the institutions and the auditors.
- RED** Sources of the self-assessment report, challenges in acquiring information.
- BLUE** From preparation to the wrap-up session. Managing the institutional visit.
- YELLOW** Assessment report: iteration in order to share conclusions, action plan, follow-up activities. Relation to the monitoring process.

Group discussion III (cont.):

Methodological issues: assessment criteria, indicators, data provision

- a) Do the chapters of the self-assessment report fit the purpose? What is missing? What can be added? Is there a need for a detailed instruction manual?
- b) What could be the ideal degree of quantification? Are the data accessible and reliable? Recommendations for increasing / reducing the number of indicators in certain fields.
- c) Suggestion for the sources and techniques of data provision. Use of databases, interpretation of data. Transparency.
- d) How to change the format and content of the final assessment report?

Group focus

GREEN Assessment criteria, importance of criteria.

RED Challenges of information provision.

BLUE Quantitative vs. qualitative assessment.

YELLOW Final evaluation report: structure, context, agreement on the conclusions, improvement driven follow-up activities.