

**Assessment**

**and**

**Confidence in HE Qualifications included in the NFQ**

**Call for QQI Anniversary Funded Proposals**

**Closing date: 17:00 on Wednesday 30 November 2022**

**Deadline for eligible expenditure extended to 31 March 2024**

# Purpose

Much work has been done in Ireland on assessment in higher education in recent years. For example, the [2016-18 Enhancement Theme of the National Forum focused on Assessment OF/FOR/AS Learning](https://www.teachingandlearning.ie/our-priorities/student-success/assessment-of-for-as-learning/). The [National Academic Integrity Network](https://www.qqi.ie/what-we-do/engagement-insights-and-knowledge-sharing/national-academic-integrity-network) has been working on ways to tackle challenges that threaten the validity or reliability of assessment. The COVID-19 pandemic put assessment on the centre stage at all levels within institutions (see [The Impact of COVID-19 Modifications to Teaching, Learning and Assessment in Irish Further Education.pdf (qqi.ie)](https://www.qqi.ie/sites/default/files/media/file-uploads/The%20Impact%20of%20COVID-19%20Modifications%20to%20Teaching%2C%20Learning%20and%20Assessment%20in%20Irish%20Further%20Education.pdf)).

Nevertheless, much remains to be done and it is important to build momentum as there are many opportunities for improvement that can make a significant impact on teaching and learning.

In 2018 QQI published a discussion paper ([Green Paper Assessment of Learners and Learning March 2018.pdf (qqi.ie)](https://www.qqi.ie/sites/default/files/media/file-uploads/Green%20Paper%20Assessment%20of%20Learners%20and%20Learning%20March%202018.pdf)) focussing on the links between assessment, intended or expected learning outcomes, and trust in qualifications. It lays out a wide range of issues that relate to the validity and reliability of the assessment of learning and the signalling value of educational qualifications for employers and others.

Listening to students (following a series of focus groups in 2022) and staff in HE institutions (following a series of interviews in 2021-2022 (see [qqi-insight-on-assessment.pdf](https://www.qqi.ie/sites/default/files/2022-01/qqi-insight-on-assessment.pdf))) it is clear how important assessment and related matters are to them and that there is an appetite to rethink approaches to assessment.

Exceptionally, to mark its 10th Anniversary, QQI will invest €250k in total in **2022/2023** (the time range for projects has been extended to 31 March 2024) in projects that will help institutions to build the momentum of assessment scholarship and/or professional development relating to assessment in the context of the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ). In grant aiding projects in this area, we are interested not only in the discrete project outcomes but in fostering a growing community of practice in this area and in making an impact on the professional development of staff involved in assessment.

**Overall, we wish to help create a platform for enhancing assessment in the context of the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) and the reputation of Irish qualifications.**

The field of assessment is vast and to avoid diluting efforts we shall focus on the topics described in Section 4.

**The intended outputs of the grant-aided projects include scholarly publications as well as toolkits, strategies, models, literature reviews, recommendations and continuing professional development programmes.**

In addition to providing funding, QQI will arrange a set of masterclass events relevant to the topics described in Section 4 of this call for proposals. These will be opportunities for personnel from grant-aided projects to network. They will be open to all. Finally, QQI is planning an initial one-day conference in Q1 2023 to help build momentum around the topic of assessment.

# Competition

## Closing date and notice of award

The closing date for proposals is **17:00 on Wednesday 30 November 2022**.

It is intended that successful applicants will be notified by **31 December 2022**.

## Eligibility, assessment criteria and other decision-making criteria

QQI will invest **€250k** in total under this scheme during **2022/2023 (time range extended to 31 March 2024)**. The maximum value of grant aid available for any single project will be **€60k** and the minimum will be **€10k**. Grant aided projects, or sub projects, should aim to **complete by then end of 2023 (extended to 31 March 2024). The maximum amount of grant aid for any single institution shall be €60k.**

Projects will be principal-investigator-led unless they are exclusively concerned with continuing professional development, in which case a project leader must still be identified.

Collaborative proposals involving more than one higher education institution may be made in which case one institution must, for administrative purposes, be identified as the lead.

Project proposals must meet the following **eligibility criteria**:

1. Each project must be directly relevant to at least one of the topics in Section 4. As part of their proposals, applicants must clearly set out the relationship to the selected topic or topics, the intended project outcomes and transferrable added value to Irish HE (impact) among other things.
2. Each project must be led by a higher education institution offering programmes leading to awards included within the NFQ, a PSRB based in Ireland offering programmes at higher education levels, or the USI.
3. Each project must commit to sharing its findings within the Irish education sector, to networking with parties conducting other projects funded by QQI to avoid duplication, and to sending project personnel to masterclass events relevant to the topics in Section 4, which will be arranged by QQI in 2023.
4. Applicants must abide by the **terms and conditions** (Section 11) for this scheme.

The **quantitative** **criteria for the initial evaluation of project proposals** are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Maximum available score** |
| 1. Relevance to the topics in Section 4 | 100 |
| 1. Innovation | 100 |
| 1. Transferrable added value to Irish HE (impact) | 100 |
| 1. Methodology | 100 |
| 1. Expertise of the individual/team | 100 |
| 1. Project plan | 100 |
| 1. Value for money | 100 |
| 1. Plans for open access dissemination of research findings and or CPD programme details as applicable | 100 |

**Project proposals that score less than 40% of the maximum available score under one or more of the criteria will not be grant aided by QQI.**

**Additionally**, in making **grant-aid decisions,** proposals will be considered within the context of the set of funding requests received and the overall level of funding available.

See Section 2.4 for details on the **two-phase** **evaluation process to be used**.

## Application process

Applications must be made using the form in Section 5 and in accordance with the instructions provided.

## Decision making process

All applications to the Scheme will be evaluated on a competitive basis under a **two-phase** evaluation process within a **five-stage** process. **Phase 1** will comprise a quantitative initial evaluation against the criteria set down in Section 2.2. Quantitative scoring will be done by international peer reviewers.

A shortlist of applications will proceed to **Phase 2** and will be evaluated by **a Qualitative Evaluation Board (QEB)**. The Qualitative Evaluation Board will comprise international peer reviewers as well as QQI staff. The primary purpose of the **QEB** is to arrive at a qualitative ranking of the applications. The QEB will rank the applications based on the information supplied and will arrive at an overall judgement on the shortlisted applications that will be approved for grant aiding. Applications will follow a five-stage process:

1. Eligibility and adherence to Terms and Conditions
2. Quantitative evaluation for shortlisting
3. Pre-meeting evaluation of shortlisted applications by **QEB** members
4. **QEB** meeting (may be in-person or virtual) to qualitatively rank each application and determine suitability for funding
5. Quantitative feedback to eligible applicants.

QQI’s decision on whether to award a grant under this Scheme shall be final. Applicants will be informed of the outcome in writing and anonymised **quantitative feedback** will be provided to all eligible applicants upon request.

**The QQI Executive is precluded from discussing the results of the competition over the telephone. Qualitative feedback will not be provided to applicants under this scheme.**

## Queries

Queries about the call for proposals may be submitted by email to [**assessment.grants@qqi.ie**](mailto:assessment.grants@qqi.ie) **until 23 November 2022**. To maximise transparency, responses to any such queries will be published as part of a FAQ for that purpose on the QQI website.

# Policy context

Recent discussion papers that are relevant here include:

[Green Paper Assessment of Learners and Learning March 2018.pdf (qqi.ie)](https://www.qqi.ie/sites/default/files/media/file-uploads/Green%20Paper%20Assessment%20of%20Learners%20and%20Learning%20March%202018.pdf)

[Green Paper on the Qualifications System](https://www.qqi.ie/sites/default/files/2021-10/green-paper-on-the-qualifications-system.pdf)

[Technical Paper on the Qualifications System](https://www.qqi.ie/sites/default/files/2021-10/technical-paper-on-the-qualifications-system.pdf)

Feedback on the Green Paper on assessment is also relevant:

[Assessment of Learners and Learning – What you had to say | Quality and Qualifications Ireland (qqi.ie)](https://www.qqi.ie/news/Assessment-of-Learners-and-Learning---What-you-had-to-say)

For the purposes of this call, we take assessment of a student to mean

*inference (e.g. judgement or estimation or evaluation) of the student’s knowledge, skill or competence by comparison with an intended[[1]](#footnote-1) learning outcome based on appropriate evidence. For the purposes of this definition, to maximise its generality, the ‘intended learning outcome’ can be as narrow or broad as required and may be implicit or explicit. It can involve, knowledge, skill, competence or attitudes.*

The focus of this call is on the assessment of learning against intended learning outcomes and the related signalling value of, and trust in, educational qualifications. The quality of learning and feedback associated with an assessment process depend on, among other things, the validity and reliability of the assessment. Validity and reliability can be challenged in many different ways including, for example, by weaknesses in

* the articulation of intended learning outcomes,
* the design of the assessment process having regard to who is being assessed and the context for assessment,
* the implementation of the assessment process and
* academic integrity (on the staff or student sides).

# Topics

## Topic 1: Approaches that HE providers can effectively use to determine the validity, reliability and efficiency of their programme assessment strategies in the contexts of intended programme learning outcomes including intended graduate attributes, and their teaching and learning strategies

Major awards such as degrees are conferred by awarding bodies based on assessed student performance on programmes of several years’ duration. While all years must at least be passed, the major award classification (grade) often depends mainly on assessed performance in the final year. Most programmes and programme years comprise discrete modules that are discretely assessed, though some of these modules may be designed as capstones to provide an opportunity for learners to demonstrate integrated learning.

Programme modules that are initially designed to operate as a coherent set can decohere over time without an effective strategy to maintain coherence. This applies to all aspects including content, assumed prior learning, intended outcomes, teaching, learning and assessment. Here we are interested in the coherence, validity, reliability and efficiency of assessment at programme level in support of the *intended programme learning outcomes*, but we appreciate that this cannot be considered in isolation from other aspects of the programmes.

We are especially interested in integrative assessment techniques that have the potential to improve validity and efficiency.

**We are interested in proposals that advance scholarship or continuing professional development opportunities in this area.**

We note that the National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning has developed resources for programme approaches to assessment: [Enhancing Programme Approaches to Assessment and Feedback in Irish Higher Education: Case Studies, Commentaries and Tools – National Resource Hub (teachingandlearning.ie)](https://hub.teachingandlearning.ie/resource/enhancing-programme-approaches-to-assessment-and-feedback-in-irish-higher-education-case-studies-commentaries-and-tools/).

## Topic 2: How are degree classifications (grades) calculated and what are the qualitative reasons for the trends in degree classifications profiles?

Higher education degrees, diplomas and certificates are often classified. For example, honours bachelor’s degrees are classified as first class, upper second class, lower second class, and so forth. Practices may vary with awarding body. There have been quantitative analyses in the past of degree classification trends, their variation with institution or discipline, or CAO cut-off points for the relevant programme and such like. The data reported by the HEA on classifications of honours bachelor’s degrees, for example, demonstrate increasing trends in the proportion of higher classifications.[[2]](#footnote-2) This had promoted some to refer to ‘grade inflation’ and others to counter that better teaching, learning and assessment may explain some of the trends.[[3]](#footnote-3)

We don’t have a complete understanding of how institutions classify their degrees. Naturally we know or can easily find out how classifications are computed from module grades. Similarly, we have a broad understanding of how examination boards at different levels operate, how external examiners are involved, and how results are approved. But we lack an understanding of how all these groups operate collectively, what influences them and what precise criteria they use in practice.

This leaves us with questions such as:

* What is the real significance of having a first or upper-second-class honours degree?
* What are the criteria for these classifications?
* Are (why are) those criteria evolving?
* Do the criteria depend on discipline?
* Do the criteria depend on the programme?
* Do the criteria depend on the awarding body?
* Is it fair to use award classifications to compare candidates from different institutions?
* Is there a case for norm referencing degree classifications?

**We are interested in proposals that advance scholarship in this area.**

## Topic 3: Designing assessment that is robust against academic misconduct

For assessment results to be credible (whether for summative or formative purposes) the corresponding assessment (including the assessment tasks, the conduct of assessment, the rubrics and grading of submissions, the strategy for combining assessments, etc.) must be valid, reliable and efficient in the context of

1. the student being assessed
2. the intended learning outcomes the student is being assessed against
3. the programme including the learning opportunities it provides.

(1) recognises that a test may not be equally valid, reliable or efficient for all students. (2) reflects the fact that assessment as understood here is looking for evidence of specific learning achievements. (3) is included because, for example, validity and reliability can be compromised if the assessment results do not signify what they appear to signify on account of, for example, ‘teaching to the test’.

Being valid and reliable means, among other things, that assessments must be robust against cheating by students and academic malpractice by institutions or their staff. The point here is that robustness against academic malpractice must be demonstrated before an assessment can be considered valid or reliable.

Institutions will naturally wish to ensure their students and staff are fully aware of the requirements of academic integrity and have processes in place for detecting and dealing with breaches. However, this in and of itself is not sufficient, and it is also necessary to design assessments that are robust against academic malpractice by students or staff.

We invite HEIs to submit proposals for how institutions can effectively oversee the robustness[[4]](#footnote-4) of their assessments against academic malpractice threats.

**We are interested in proposals that advance scholarship or continuing professional development opportunities in this area.**

## Topic 4: McCabe-ICAI Academic Integrity Survey

Pilot in one institution or research the costs and benefits of implementing the [McCabe-ICAI Academic Integrity Survey](https://academicintegrity.org/programs/mccabe-icai-academic-integrity-survey) nationally in HE in Ireland.

**We are interested in proposals that advance scholarship or continuing professional development in this area.**

## Topic 5: Rethinking assessment following the COVID-19 experience

In 2021 we interviewed a range of providers and PSRBs about assessment and the following is a summary of the findings under the heading of ‘innovation and change’.

“The culture around assessment needs to change among staff and students in further and higher education. Only imaginative and forward-looking approaches to assessment can keep up with the changing teaching and learning environments, the increasing number and diversity of students requiring assessment, and evolving expectations such as giving students more choice in how they are assessed and assessing students using authentic tasks in authentic contexts by authentic experts.

Some see the scholarship of assessment in Ireland as lagging and suggest that really solid research into the future of assessment is required.

COVID-19 stimulated thinking on assessment at all levels within organisations. It dramatically expanded the use of remote assessment approaches and alternatives to on-campus invigilated written examinations. It has brought about changes, even if some are temporary, of a magnitude that previous initiatives on changing assessment culture had failed to do. It has led people to accept that you can assess people with rigour in alternative ways and that some of these alternatives may not be just as good but better that their antecedents.

Some feel that the COVID-19 experience should be leveraged to keep assessment reform high on people’s agendas. Leaders need to capitalise on the fact that people are asking questions about teaching, learning and assessment and try to persuade them to reflect more deeply on what they are doing; consider whether change is warranted; and commit to it if it is.

Innovating staff require back-up and support as they may face resistance to change on several fronts. Resistance can be due to conservatism, a lack of familiarity with the proposed alternatives, the opinion that current methods are good enough, or competing demands on human, physical or financial resources.

The difficulties of quantifying the efficacy of assessment and the success of assessment innovations add to these challenges.

In research intensive institutions it may be useful to establish academic teaching-track posts where the main emphasis is on contribution to teaching, the support of learning, and assessment.

In prompting change, it is important not to overwhelm people because the resulting fatigue can be an obstacle to innovation.

Policies, procedures, frameworks, and systems that are open and flexible create room for people to innovate. Excessively rigid infrastructure can be a barrier to innovation.

Taking a system level perspective can allow people to see things that would otherwise be invisible.”

**We invite proposals that will explore how to enhance the scholarship of assessment and related capacity for innovation in Ireland.**

## Topic 6: The influence of external examining on assessment

External examining is used widely in UK and Ireland in the contact of taught higher education programmes.

QQI has [guidelines on external examining](https://www.qqi.ie/sites/default/files/2021-10/effective-practice-guidelines-for-external-examining-revised-february-2015.pdf) for providers of programmes leading to its own higher education awards. It states that

*External examining is a quality assurance mechanism employed by providers that supports public confidence in academic qualifications.*

Recently the QAA, working with Universities UK, Guild HE and others, has completed a review of external examining in the UK and developed a set of principles for effective external examining[[5]](#footnote-5).

There are many questions about external examining and what it accomplishes. For example:

* We may know what external examining is supposed to do but what does it accomplish in practice? Does (how does) external examining support public confidence?
* How effectively does external examining challenge institutions when necessary and how do institutions respond?
* To what extent are external examiners vectors for policy influences from other countries and can this lead to conflicting influences?
* If external examiners are helping to uphold standards, precisely how are those standards determined and articulated by institutions and communicated to external examiners?
* If external examiners bring their own concept of standards, then where do these come from?
* If external examiners only uphold the threshold standards for a given NFQ qualification type, then what is their role in respect of the standards for classifications such as first-class honours?
* What role have external examiners played in the trends in classification profiles e.g. percentage of candidates getting first class honours?

**We are interested in proposals that advance scholarship or continuing professional development in this area.**

# Eligible expenditures[[6]](#footnote-6)

Maximum grant-aid to any one Principal Investigator is limited to €60,000 per project. This total is inclusive of overhead (to a maximum of **10%)**.

This grant aid must be used in 2022/2023 (time range extended to 31 March 2024. Eligible expenditures can be incurred anytime within this time range). **Expenditures after 31/12/2023 (extended to 31 March 2024) are ineligible.**

**Staff costs (including post-doctoral researchers) are eligible.**

**Postgraduate stipend and fees** **are eligible.**

However, please note that the limited duration of this QQI scheme makes it unsuitable for being the primary sole source of funding for any postgraduate student.

**Dissemination costs**

**Other direct Costs:**

* Training costs
* Conferences, workshops, webinars and such like
* Research supplies (Consumables)
* Travel where essential
* Books, journals and other sources of information.

**Overheads:**

Will be set at a maximum of **10%** of overall eligible direct costs (see above) less equipment. Overhead will offset institutional indirect costs including for example costs such as heating and air conditioning. These are incurred for common or joint objectives and cannot be identified readily and specifically with a particular sponsored programme or project. Other examples include:

* General technical support
* Accounting services
* General administration services
* Telecommunications
* Library & information services
* Central computing services
* Office support and secretarial services
* Office and laboratory space
* Student services

**Claims:**

Claims will be subject to audit. Supporting documentation will be required for eligible direct costs when **final** claims are being submitted.

# Reporting and peer review requirements

Each grant aided project is required to

* submit a narrative progress report and financial statement to QQI every three months.
* submit a substantive final report to QQI, **which will be subject to peer review**. The peer review process will be agreed with participating principal investigators and project leads.
* submit a short report on the outputs and outcomes of the grant aided work in a form that can be understood by the public and that will facilitate knowledge sharing within the higher education community. These reports will be published by QQI.

# Application form[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Full title of the proposed project** |  |
| **Short title** |  |
| **Principal investigator or project leader** |  |
| **Lead institution** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Types of expected outcome** | **Please answer each with yes or no.** |
| **Contribution to scholarship** |  |
| **Contribution to continuing professional development** |  |

**Outline of the project that can be understood by the public in up to 100 words.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Up to ten keywords that can be used to tag the project.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Project aims and objectives in up to 100 words.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Identify any project partners in up to 250 words.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Detailed description of the proposed project (inter alia addressing methodology and innovation) in up to 1000 words.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Does your project require ethical approval?** | **(Yes/No)** |
|  |

**Intended project activities/deliverables in up to 200 words.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Intended project outcomes and transferrable added value to Irish HE (impact) in up to 200 words.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Explain how the impact of the project will be captured in up to 100 words.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Relevance to the Topics set out on Section 4 of the Call for Proposals.**

How is your project relevant to Topic 1 if applicable in up to 200 words.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

How is your project relevant to Topic 2 if applicable in up to 200 words.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

How is your project relevant to Topic 3 if applicable in up to 200 words.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

How is your project relevant to Topic 4 if applicable in up to 200 words.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

How is your project relevant to Topic 5 if applicable in up to 200 words.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

How is your project relevant to Topic 6 if applicable in up to 200 words.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Project timeline (covering the duration of the grant aid)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project start date |  |
| Project end date |  |

Please provide a list of the key activities/outputs (including the dates upon which the progress reports to QQI required under Section 6 will be delivered) with start and end dates. Please add additional rows if needed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date | Activity/output |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Proposed budget for the project (for the duration of the grant)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Itemised breakdown of staff costs and reasons needed. |  |  |
| Total staff costs for the duration of the grant. | | € |
| Itemised breakdown of research student costs and reasons needed. |  |  |
| Total research student costs for the duration of the grant. | | € |
| Itemised breakdown of dissemination costs and reasons needed |  |  |
| Total requested dissemination costs for the duration of the grant. | | € |
| Itemised breakdown of other direct costs and reasons needed |  |  |
| Total other direct costs for the duration of the grant. | | € |
| Itemised breakdown of all other costs and reasons needed. |  |  |
| Total of all other costs for the duration of the grant. | | € |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total cost of the project for the duration of the grant. | € |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total amount requested from QQI | € |

If the project is co-funded from another external source indicate who is providing the funding and the amount of funding being provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Source of additional funding for this project for the duration of the grant aid. |  | |
| Total amount of additional funding for this project for the duration of the grant. | | € |

**References (up to 300 words).**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Endorsement by the higher education institution’s research office (or equivalent) where the project proposal involves a contribution to scholarship.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Applicant declarations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Declaration** | **Yes/No** |
| I hereby declare that the above particulars are correct and understand that the terms and conditions (as detailed within the call for proposals) apply. |  |
| I accept that failure to abide by those terms and conditions may disqualify me from this competition and scheme. |  |
| I authorise QQI to verify, should it consider it necessary, any of the information supplied in this application. |  |
| I agree that if I disclose Special Category Personal Data, I give explicit consent for these data to be processed and stored by QQI in accordance with QQI’s data protection policy[[8]](#footnote-8). |  |
| I confirm that the information supplied in this application is correct. |  |

Signed by:

Role:

Date:

**Note:** Should it become apparent that any of the information provided in the application is inaccurate or is not verifiable with appropriate documentation, it will result in the application automatically being deemed ineligible).

# Lodgement of applications

When you have completed your application document you should send it to QQI ([**assessment.grants@qqi.ie**](mailto:assessment.grants@qqi.ie)) by 17:00 on Wednesday 30 November 2022.

# Assessment of applications

QQI will assemble a team to assess applications. The team will include persons with expertise in the scholarship of assessment in higher education as well as persons who can assess the likely impact of the proposed projects.

# Notification and feedback

Once the assessment process is complete applicants will be informed of the outcome of their application by email. For reasons of transparency and fairness to all applicants, QQI will not enter into written or telephone correspondence with any individual about the assessment process or their eligibility to apply.

Numerical feedback will be provided to applicants on request.

# Terms and conditions

QQI adopts *mutatis mutandis* the Irish Research Council [GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR-LED AWARDS](https://research.ie/assets/uploads/2017/07/IRC-PI-TCs-Final-1.pdf) as the terms and conditions for grants made under this scheme.

1. This can be replaced with ‘expected’ where appropriate. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [Key Facts and Figures | Statistics | Higher Education Authority (hea.ie)](https://hea.ie/statistics/data-for-download-and-visualisations/key-facts-figures/) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For an international perspective see: [Quality Compass: International perspectives on degree classification profiles - is it an issue around the world? (qaa.ac.uk)](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/news/quality-compass-international-perspectives-on-degree-classification-profiles.pdf?sfvrsn=903ea381_19) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. We recognise that assessment design can never completely eliminate the risk of malpractice. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/external-examining-principles> (retrieved 21/09/2022) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This section is based on [Guidelines-for-IRC-Eligible-Direct-Costs-and-Overhead-Rates-2021.pdf (research.ie)](https://research.ie/assets/uploads/2017/05/Guidelines-for-IRC-Eligible-Direct-Costs-and-Overhead-Rates-2021.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. This application form is based on the [New-Foundations\_Guide-for-Applicants\_2022.pdf (research.ie)](https://research.ie/assets/uploads/2022/05/New-Foundations_Guide-for-Applicants_2022.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <https://www.qqi.ie/data-protection> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)