



QQI

Quality and Qualifications Ireland  
Dearbhú Cáilíochta agus Cáilíochtaí Éireann

## QQI COMPREHENSIVE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

# FEEDBACK REPORT

FOLLOWING CONSULTATION PROCESS ON

## A SERIES OF DRAFT QUALITY ASSURANCE GUIDELINES WHITE PAPERS

*including:*

1. Policy on Quality Assurance Guidelines, April 2016
2. Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines, April 2016
3. Sector-Specific Quality Assurance Guidelines for Independent/Private Providers, April 2016

MAY 2016

## CONTENTS

---

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Consultation process	4
3.	Sources of feedback	5
4.	Core Quality Assurance Guidelines	7
4.1	Overall architecture of the QA Guidelines [7]	
4.2	Timing of the consultation process [9]	
4.3	Status of the QA Guidelines and use of the word ‘statutory’ [10]	
4.4	Implementation and impact of the QA Guidelines [11]	
4.5	Quality assurance and quality enhancement [12]	
4.6	Feedback on type of content and detail [13]	
4.7	An overview of positive comments on the core guidelines [14]	
5.	Sector-Specific QA Guidelines for Private and Independent Providers	15
6.	Policy on QA Guidelines	16
7.	Amendments made to the QA Guidelines	16
8.	Next steps	17
9.	Resources	17
10.	Communication	17
	Appendix 1	18
	Table of events on consultations with QQI stakeholders – QA Guidelines and Validation Policy	

---

# 1 INTRODUCTION

In December 2015 and January 2016, QQI published a series of draft quality assurance (QA) guidelines (White Papers) for public consultation. These statutory QA guidelines set out those elements which providers will have regard to when establishing or updating their own QA procedures, in order to have such procedures approved by QQI (with the exception of the previously established universities). The White Papers contained proposed policy for Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines which would be applicable to all providers, as well as sector-specific and topic-specific guidelines (see list below).

## Circulated in December 2015

- » Policy on QA Guidelines
- » Core Statutory QA Guidelines
- » Sector-Specific Statutory QA Guidelines for Independent/Private Providers
- » Topic-Specific Statutory QA Guidelines for Flexible and Distributed Learning

## Circulated in January 2016

- » Sector-Specific Statutory QA Guidelines for Designated awarding bodies\*
- » Sector-Specific Statutory QA Guidelines for Institutes of Technology\*
- » Sector-Specific Statutory QA Guidelines for Education and Training Boards\*
- » Topic-Specific Statutory QA Guidelines for Apprenticeship

(\*Towards a white Paper and not published – circulated for direct engagement with Providers in the sector, DES and funding bodies).

This report presents a summary of the consultation process on the Quality Assurance Guidelines policy itself and on the following three specific White Papers which are moving towards final versions:

1. Policy on QA Guidelines, April 2016
2. Core Statutory QA Guidelines
3. Sector-Specific Statutory QA Guidelines for Independent/Private Providers

This report also sets out the response of QQI to the feedback received and describes the next steps in the finalisation of the QA policy and guidelines. While it has not been feasible to capture the full extent of every comment made by each contributor in the consultation process, this report tries to capture the most salient points and the areas for action by QQI. The feedback on the White Paper will be used to inform the final QA policy and guidelines and other relevant QQI policies and procedures. It will also help inform QQI communications and engagements with institutions and other stakeholders in the future.

## 2 CONSULTATION PROCESS

QQI sought feedback from institutions and other interested stakeholders on the proposed guidelines contained in these White Papers. Institutions, representative bodies and other stakeholders were invited to email submissions to QQI on the range of draft QA guidelines out for consultation.

In parallel, QQI held a number of dedicated meetings and large consultation seminars with principal stakeholders including those bodies that QQI is obliged to consult with as stated in the 2012 Act. Consultation events held with institutions, representative bodies and other stakeholders are detailed in Appendix 1.

In keeping with the QQI consultation framework, all submissions received through the formal public consultation processes will be published, unless otherwise requested. Please note that some submissions made by a particular provider/stakeholder covered one or more different sets of QA guidelines, and in some cases the feedback also covered the QQI Validation Policy. In other cases, providers chose to make individual submissions for each of the different sets of QA guidelines.

### 3 SOURCES OF FEEDBACK

Feedback on the White Papers was received from a range of institutions, representative bodies and other stakeholders, as indicated in the table below.

INSTITUTION/REPRESENTATIVE BODY/ INDIVIDUAL	CORE	POLICY	PRIVATE/ INDEPENDENT	APPRENTICESHIP
Adult Education Officers Association	Y			
AONTAS	Y			
Athlone Institute of Technology	Y			
Bridge Mills Galway Language Centre		Y		
Career Path College		Y		
Cavan and Monaghan Education and Training Board	Y			
Cavan Institute	Y			
City of Dublin Education and Training Board	Y			Y
Clanwilliam Institute	Y			
Cpl Institute		Y		
Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation	Y	Y		
Dublin City University	Y			
Dublin Institute of Technology	Y			
ETBI	Y			Y
Griffith College	Y		Y	
Hibernia College	Y	Y	Y	
IADT	Y			
IBEC (IMDA endorsement of response)				Y
Institutes of Technology Ireland (IOTI)	Y		Y	Y
Institute of Technology Sligo				Y

INSTITUTION/REPRESENTATIVE BODY/ INDIVIDUAL	CORE	POLICY	PRIVATE/ INDEPENDENT	APPRENTICESHIP
Irish National Organisation of the Unemployed	Y			
Irish Universities Association	Y			
ISME				Y
JMB and ACCS	Y			
Letterkenny Institute of Technology	Y			
Longford Women's Link	Y			
Mary Immaculate College	Y			
Maynooth University	Y			
National Adult Literacy Agency	Y			Y
National Association of Principals and Deputy Principals (NAPD)	Y			Y
National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education	Y			
National University of Ireland	Y			
NCU Training		Y		
QED Training	Y			
Teachers' Union of Ireland	Y			
Trinity College	Y		Y	
University College Dublin	Y			
University of Limerick	Y			
Warrenmount Community Education Centre	Y			

Additional feedback was received by providers and stakeholders during routine meetings with QQI staff. This feedback may not all be captured in the table above.

# 4 CORE QUALITY ASSURANCE GUIDELINES

## Overall summary of feedback

The formal written feedback provided within the responses was extensive, fulsome and diverse. Given the size of the education and training sector and the range of stakeholders QQI deals with, the number of responses received was relatively low. However, many providers and core stakeholders also took the opportunity to provide feedback at the direct consultation events indicated in Appendix 1.

In the main, QQI stakeholders and providers expressed support for the balanced reasonable approach within the content and welcomed the rationale for the Core QA Guidelines. Other respondents were critical of the proposals, and some respondents were critical of some proposals but supportive of others. Across the education and training providers some of the feedback was consistent, including some of the more critical responses, but in other cases responses provided by different contributors were mutually irreconcilable. While it is practically impossible to note all of the responses, the following themes set out in this section capture the majority of the overall responses, all of which will be published unless otherwise requested by the respondent.

The feedback is limited to the guidelines being progressed at this time:

- » Core Statutory QA Guidelines
- » Sector-Specific QA Guidelines for Independent/Private Providers
- » Policy on QA Guidelines

## 4.1 OVERALL ARCHITECTURE OF THE QA GUIDELINES

### Summary of feedback

Many providers at the organised consultation events referred to the clarity and accessibility of the overall architecture of the guidelines. This architecture is based on the provision of **core guidelines** as the main platform for all providers, and in addition to this:

- » **Sector specific guidelines** to capture the small number of focused sector-specific requirements that do not apply to all providers; and
- » **Topic-specific guidelines** that may or may not apply to individual providers.

The Core applies to all providers and the sector and topic specific are additional requirements to the core.

The interpretation of the core guidelines in a context-specific way and in proportion to the complexity of the provision was welcomed by almost all providers, whether attending events or providing written feedback. It was noted however that the rationale for having one set of core guidelines could have been communicated more clearly in the documentation.

Some providers indicated a preference to have their own set of Core QA Guidelines without any additional sector-specific guidelines. This request was owing to their independent and autonomous status, the uniqueness or difficulty of their operating circumstances and/or the potential for confusion around their perception of a “multi-layered” approach towards having so many sets of guidelines. Some responses pointed to the benefits of the former approach of QA guidelines being tailored for discrete sectors and expressed a preference for that type of model.

Some further education providers indicated that the guidelines were dominated by the higher education model/approach towards establishing internal QA procedures and systems.

Feedback from other stakeholders on the overall architecture of the guidelines was very positive.

### QQI response

QQI is satisfied that any perceived downfalls indicated in feedback from providers and stakeholders, in particular on the overall architecture of the guidelines, are outweighed by the overall gains. The model adopted in the Core QA Guidelines is one which has a discrete bias towards an institutional based model, with the institution considered to be central to the internal QA system as opposed to any perceived bias towards a higher or further education and training model.

The rationale for the Core QA Guidelines will be communicated more clearly henceforth. Some key points highlighted during the consultation process include the following:

- » The significant overlap in the principles and implicit criteria/expectations evident in the legacy quality assurance guidelines.
- » The emerging diversity in the level and type of provision that private and public providers are now involved in, such as higher and further education and training and English language training, with some providers involved in all three.

- » An opportunity to enhance closer proximity between further and higher education and training.
- » A common core QA platform to facilitate the many common stakeholders and audiences that all providers engage with including learners; government agencies; government departments, funding and regulatory bodies.
- » An opportunity to enhance national and local policy of coordination on system funding.
- » Facilitating and encouraging provider networks mentioned in all the feedback, public private partnerships; consortiums, mergers and provider collaboration in general.
- » The enhanced clarity for providers to embrace their own focused sector-specific guidelines.

## 4.2 TIMING OF THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

### Summary of feedback

Many providers commented on the limited time allowed for consultation on the suite of quality assurance guidelines and the holiday period that coincided with it. In many instances this feedback was linked to a concern on the part of some providers that an expedient implementation plan would follow in rapid succession and without due regard to the many other demands on the practicalities of the provider operating environment.

### QQI response

QQI is always mindful of the consultation methods, formats, and in particular the time available to stakeholders to provide insightful feedback. On this occasion the approach of direct engagement with providers and key stakeholders at consultation events, in addition to the opportunity for providing online formal feedback, made a valuable contribution towards the development of the guidelines. Direct consultation provided an opportunity for more direct clarification by QQI on any aspects that were perhaps misinterpreted and required further work by QQI.

The suite of draft QA guidelines issued in December and January were not green field productions. QA guidelines have been the subject of much direct engagement with providers over the past three years. The general plans for the development of QA guidelines was highlighted with the adoption of legacy QA guidelines; the new QQI QA guidelines published to facilitate initial access to new providers in 2013; publication and adoption of the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG, May 2015); publication of the QQI Policy on QA Guidelines indicating the approach

towards the development of QA guidelines (2014) and; the many other legislative requirements that required the support of QA guidelines. All of which provided adequate content for a set of core quality assurance guidelines.

The timeline associated with some guidelines, for example, the topic-specific guidelines for apprenticeship programmes is unfortunately not always within the gift of QQI to extend. This is due to the national timing imperative supporting the commencement of the new apprenticeship programmes by this coming September. A separate report indicating feedback on these guidelines will be published when the guidelines are finalised shortly.

However, QQI acknowledges that more time should be afforded to providers and stakeholders with additional dedicated engagements facilitated as part of the consultation process for the following QA guidelines:

- » Sector-specific Guidelines for IOTs; DABs and ETBs
- » Topic-specific Guidelines on Flexible Distributed Learning

**QQI is committed to monitoring and reviewing all statutory quality assurance guidelines periodically in collaboration with providers, learners and other stakeholders.**

### 4.3 STATUS OF THE QA GUIDELINES AND USE OF THE WORD 'STATUTORY'

#### Summary of feedback

One set of providers queried the use of the word “statutory” in the title of the QA guidelines. Other feedback made reference to obligations to “have regard to” in the context of the compulsory nature of the guidelines.

#### QQI response

Guidelines created by statute would typically be described as “statutory”, and a guideline created **under** an Act would also be described as “statutory”. In general usage, a “Statutory Guideline”, meaning that the guideline itself was created directly **by** legislation, would be rare. In general usage, a “Statutory Guideline”, meaning that the guideline was made by someone empowered to make guidelines by a statute. QQI understand that this approach would be quite common.

The term “have regard to” is in the context of section 28 of the 2012 Act. It has its ordinary meaning, which is that they must be considered by those establishing procedures in writing. Guidelines are often framed in advisory and assisting language. Section 28 obliges consideration of the guidelines. Section 30 provides QQI with a discretionary power to refuse, refuse with recommendations or approve the written procedures submitted to it by those providers who are obliged to do so. It would be expected that in exercising that discretion, QQI will have regard to its own guidelines. There is a right to refuse on the basis of failure to comply with the guidelines (so long as the guidelines themselves reflect the legislation).

#### 4.4 IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPACT OF THE QA GUIDELINES

##### Summary of feedback

Many providers were concerned about the lack of reference to the timing of the implementation, methodology and impact of the QA guidelines. In addition, feedback referred to the lack of communication from QQI and understanding of the linkage between the QA guidelines and the approval or notification process; the QQI reengagement process; and the implementation of the new *Core Policy on the Validation of Education and Training Programmes*, also out for consultation at present. Many responses indicated that providers were frustrated and overwhelmed at the implicit consequences of the impact of the QA guidelines in the absence of any detail on the timing of implementation.

Some providers interpreted the QA guidelines as the main criteria for institutional review and considered the “level of prescription” and detail as worrying in this particular context.

##### QQI response

Implementation of the quality assurance guidelines in all contexts will be the subject of advance notice, careful planning and consultation. While mindful of the disruptive nature of any significant change to providers and existing QA procedures, QQI is also mindful of the time required for the successful planning, implementation and embedding of new and updated QA procedures in a dynamic education and training operating environment.

The quality assurance guidelines provide the backdrop for institutional QA procedures, although there is a relationship between the QA guidelines and the expectations of the cyclical institutional review model. This relationship is set within the overall objectives of the QQI review model. QA guidelines

are not in themselves the criteria for institutional review. This is evidenced by the objectives set out in the new Higher Education Institutional Review Model that has undergone significant consultation. Any expectations as to the stage of implementation of the new QA guidelines on internal procedures will also be managed within this context. The model of review for further education and training providers has not been established to date and will require consultation.

The QA guidelines do not attempt in any way to impact upon, repeat or undermine the requirements of national, international and local legislative requirements with providers, their legal status, or their operating environment beyond the remit of the statutory QA guidelines.

## 4.5 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

### Summary of feedback

Some feedback acknowledged the reference to enhancement in the suite of QA documents and the fact that “QA is also used to describe the enhancement of education provision” (Policy on QA Guidelines). Other feedback indicated too much of a slant towards compliance rather than enhancement throughout the guidelines.

### QQI response

QQI is in agreement with providers that enhancement is an important focus when it comes to QA and that enhancement is not incompatible with accountability which is also required. The traditional sequence of accountability preceding enhancement remains to be the sequence set out in the new suite of QA guidelines. However, this is not without deference to the significant role of enhancement and improvement. In the interest of clarity, it is not always appropriate to fold enhancement into QA guidelines when dealing with a diverse range of evolving and mature internal QA systems.

The role of enhancement is evolving in our national understanding and reference to the enhancement of quality has taken on a very distinct strand of QQI’s work through the engagement with providers as set out in the QQI Strategy Statement<sup>1</sup>. The core objective of enhancement in the QQI review model for higher education; establishment of the QQI enhancement unit; and the enhancement programme under

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.qqi.ie/Pages/QQI-Strategy-Statement-2014---2016-07.aspx>

development for all providers is a step in this evolving process. QQI has taken on the lead facilitating role in the IHEQN network with enhancement as a core purpose and outcome. QQI looks forward to further engagement and clarity on the role of enhancement in collaboration with all providers and is mindful that this interpretation may take on different emphasis in different sectors. Providers can elaborate their own QA systems beyond what is put forward in the guidelines with a view to even greater enhancement of quality.

## 4.6 FEEDBACK ON TYPE OF CONTENT AND DETAIL

### Summary of feedback

Feedback on the level of detail was considered to be overly prescriptive by some stakeholders while others requested more detail and guidance on processes and appropriate procedures. Others requested that the content reflect some of the precise practices, tools/methodologies and attributes that represent current practice that is particular to certain, but not all teaching and learning environments. Additional requests for the inclusion of detail and content, expressed in the feedback received, also extended to national legislative requirements, such as equality law and other matters that apply to the legal status of a provider as an employer.

### QQI response

The development of the Core QA Guidelines was and remains to be a challenging exercise. Finding the balance between an acceptable level of detail for an appropriate level of guidance while embedding a level of challenge for continuous self-improvement and future proofing is understated as difficult.

The core guidelines represent a generic approach towards developing (and in some cases establishing) quality assurance procedures within the context of the provider. They are not intended to document all possible variations in place by individual providers to satisfy a particular section of provider or type of learner. Providers' internal QA procedures will reflect their own particular context while having regard to QA guidelines.

It is implicit in the governance and management of all organisations that national and international legislation will be adhered to and implemented as appropriate.

The level of detail in the Core QA Guidelines has been reduced considerably following consultation. What remains is intended to convey to providers a clear expression of national expectations of their QA systems. This is with a view to maintaining public confidence in the quality of education and training and create an understanding of the processes in place to maintain that confidence.

#### 4.7 AN OVERVIEW OF POSITIVE COMMENTS ON THE CORE GUIDELINES

The sections above highlight the (mostly critical) feedback received which challenged features of the White Papers and the QQI response to this challenge including, where warranted, changes to the proposed policy and guidelines.

Some of the comments received were very supportive and welcoming of the publication of the draft Quality Assurance guidelines (White Papers) for consultation. QQI is extremely grateful to *all* providers for taking the time and effort to provide feedback.

##### *Samples of positive feedback received during the consultation process:*

- » 'The College welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the consultation process and compliments the work done in the preparation of the draft documents.' [GCD response email]
- » 'We as a training provider feel that the proposed policy documents on QA Guidelines are very clear. It is proposed at a good time taking into consideration the validation process and re engagement. As all providers are in different sectors they address specific requirements relevant to their industry and organisation and allows flexibility.' [Career Path College]
- » 'The National Forum welcomes the development of the draft quality assurance guidelines which represents a substantial body of work in bringing convergence to arrangements for educational quality assurance leading to awards on the National Framework of Qualifications as well as emergent and more flexible forms of educational provision across the sector.' [National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning]
- » 'More positively IOTI is of the view that the core quality assurance guidelines – which are the essential guidelines with regard to establishing QA processes to underpin the quality of the learning environment, both at undergraduate and postgraduate levels – are comprehensive, balanced and well written.' [IOTI response]
- » Department of Jobs Enterprise and Innovation in support of the core guidelines: 'The guidelines should apply to all providers, both public and private. Failures in the private sector will be as detrimental to the national brand as failures in the in the public sector. All providers should be held to the same standard.' [Eamonn Cahill, DJEI]

- » ‘The purpose of the core guidelines is stated to be “to assist providers in the development of quality assurance systems which are appropriate to individual provider contexts” ..... and “to guide providers through their legal responsibilities for the development of QA procedures...” (p.5). We welcome the developmental emphasis of this statement of purpose and the clarity provided in the text and Appendices in relation to the statutory obligations. We also welcome the clarification that “A provider’s scale and scope of activity will determine the level of complexity of their QA procedures, which should be fit-for-purpose and context” and that “these guidelines do not prescribe the manner in which providers must implement their QA procedures” and that they are “not intended as a ‘how to’ manual for providers on the establishment of their QA procedures.” In our view it is essential that the acknowledgment of differentiation between providers, and that all of the boundaries specified above will be fully adhered to in the implementation of QA Reviews in the future.’ [National University of Ireland Maynooth]

## 5 SECTOR-SPECIFIC QA GUIDELINES FOR PRIVATE AND INDEPENDENT PROVIDERS

### Summary of feedback

Feedback from the private independent sector and public providers appeared to be extremely positive towards the QA guidelines, with much praise for the organisation of the guidelines in general and clarity of the Core QA Guidelines in particular. Feedback was received from both public and private/independent providers and other stakeholders.

### QQI response

In the main, minor amendments were applied to these guidelines.

## 6 POLICY ON QA GUIDELINES

### Summary of Feedback

The feedback received on the *Policy on Quality Assurance Guidelines* is very encouraging and many of the positive comments on the overall approach and architecture of the quality assurance guidelines are captured in the section providing feedback on the Core QA Guidelines below.

Much of the detailed feedback supports the principles set out in the document and in particular those principles which assist providers in developing internal QA procedures. One response indicated that the principle on externality which refers to “*appropriate use of external personnel who are independent of the provider and who are expertly qualified to make national and international comparisons*” is not feasible for a provider to implement.

### QQI response

QQI propose to make some minor editorial changes to this document to take on board some of the detailed feedback suggested by stakeholders and providers in an effort to strengthen the principles in the policy document. It is also intended to insert a new principle to assist providers in the development of their QA procedures to refer to the development of a quality culture.

## 7 AMENDMENTS MADE TO THE QA GUIDELINES

Summary amendments to the core guidelines include:

- » Cutting out overlap and inconsistent language in the introductory chapters.
- » Cutting down on the level of detail in some sections which were considered to be prescriptive and out of proportion with the detail in other sections, for example assessment.
- » Deleting or replacing examples that were causing confusion or concern by misinterpretation.
- » Deleting references to sections that could be found in other policies.

## 8 NEXT STEPS

Following the publication of this feedback document, and some further pieces of consultation, QQI will move to the finalisation and publication of the Core, sector-specific guidelines for independent/private providers incorporating the changes set out in this document.

## 9 RESOURCES

QQI will publish a **set of resources** considered to be useful to providers including European and other effective practice tools and methodology to provide more detailed optional guidance.

Further Engagement – Seminars will be held on the development of the sector-specific QA guidelines.

Explanation seminars will be held by QQI on the implementation plans and rollout with advance notice to providers.

## 10 COMMUNICATION

QQI intend to establish a series of brief communication **pamphlet-type publications** for the QA guidelines for each of the different audiences including the general public, learners and other core stakeholders.

QQI is in the process of designing a **web-based integrated** (in so far as possible) online version of the guidelines that will support the modular but integrated approach towards linking the Core with topic and sector-specific guidelines and also facilitating access to specific units of the Core QA Guidelines.

**APPENDIX 1**

**TABLE OF EVENTS ON CONSULTATIONS WITH QQI STAKEHOLDERS  
– QUALITY ASSURANCE GUIDELINES AND VALIDATION POLICY**

CONSULTATION EVENT WITH:	DATE/LOCATION/QQI:	PARTICIPANTS:
<b>ELT Providers</b> Information & consultation session – all day	<b>Wednesday 16 December 2015</b> Fitzwilliam Hotel, Dublin	Approx. 110 attending over the 3 consecutive sessions from approx. 70 colleges
<b>University QA officers</b> On (Core, Sector Specific and Topic FDL/apprenticeship)	<b>Monday 25 January 2016</b> University of Limerick	University Quality Officers
<b>DES (HE &amp; FE)/SOLAS/HEA</b> on all QA Guidelines/Validation Policy – Impact and expectations	<b>Wednesday 27 January</b> QQI offices Behan	A number of representatives from SOLAS, One from the HEA and four representatives from the Dept. of Education and Skills – FE and HE
Prospective providers/ stakeholders for <b>apprenticeship</b> (core/apprenticeship)	<b>Thursday 28 January</b>	Approx. 76 attendees approx. 80% were from Further (including ETB’s, community etc.) approx. 20% were from Higher
<b>Private/Independent Providers</b> Validation Policy Core/ Private Specific/Topic FDL and Apprenticeship	<b>Friday 29 January</b> Ashling Hotel, Dublin	Approx. 80 attendees approx. 65% were from Further approx. 35% were from Higher
<b>Linked Providers (in parallel)</b> Core/ Sector Specific/Topic FDL and Apprenticeship	<b>Friday 29 January</b> Half day	Approx. 29 attendees approx. 55% were from a DAB (Uni/ RCSI etc.) approx. 45% were linked providers (IMI, IPA, IOB, RIAM, CDET, BIMM, Defence Forces, Marino Institute etc.)
<b>HECA</b> <b>On QA suite; Validation</b>	<b>Monday 1 February</b> QQI Boardroom	Six representative of Private Higher Education Providers
<b>USI</b> <b>QA suite and Validation</b>	<b>Friday 5 February</b> USI offices in Ringsend	Meeting with the President of USI and the VP Education

CONSULTATION EVENT WITH:	DATE/LOCATION/QQI:	PARTICIPANTS:
<b>NUI/Linked provider consultation – and for linked provider of NUI</b>	<b>Monday 8 &amp; Tuesday 9 February</b> Meeting in NUI	Meeting with NUI representatives and then combined meeting with their linked provider - University
<b>DIT QA Suite</b>	<b>Wednesday 10 February</b>	Three representatives from the QA office of DIT including the Registrar
<b>ETB Group under ETBI (core &amp; suite of QA guidelines)</b>	<b>Wednesday 17 February</b> Pipers Hill - NAAS	6 representatives of the ETBs and the ETBI rep.
<b>Student Focus Group</b> Part-time, mature students doing a level 8 teaching degree	<b>15 February</b> <b>6pm to 8pm</b> Dublin City University	6 student representative in part-time higher education representing further education and training