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1 INTRODUCTION AND SCHEDULE

1.1 Introduction

The European University Association offers a number of services to its members such as conferences and workshops, management and leadership seminars, a range of relevant publications and the opportunity to participate in various projects on higher education and research in Europe.

The EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) is a membership service that has been designed to ensure that higher education institutions gain maximum benefit from a comprehensive evaluation conducted by a team of experienced European higher education leaders and that the procedures and processes in place in these institutions can be reviewed against best practices internationally. The intention is that these evaluations will support the participating institutions in the continuing development of their strategic management and internal quality culture.

The distinctive features of the Institutional Evaluation Programme are:

- A strong emphasis on self-evaluation
- That it is undertaken from a European and international perspective
- That it is undertaken by peers
- That it is independent from national agencies and government evaluation programmes
- Its non-profit approach, being geared solely towards the interests of the university

1.2 Evaluation process

EUA aims to strengthen institutional autonomy and support institutional change in universities. In keeping with this approach, the evaluations have a formative orientation, i.e. they aim at contributing to the development and enhancement of the institution. The IEP is not geared towards passing judgements, ranking or comparing institutions against others.

The focus of the EUA evaluation is the institution as a whole, and not individual study programmes or units. Therefore, the following areas will be considered:

- Decision-making processes and institutional structures and effectiveness of strategic planning
- Relevance of internal quality processes and the degree to which their outcomes are used in decision-making and strategic planning as well as perceived gaps in these internal mechanisms.

In addition, universities\(^1\) have the possibility to select a special focus for more in-depth analysis and recommendations. This focus will be evaluated within the institutional context and constitute a separate heading in the evaluation report.

1.3 Evaluation teams

EUA evaluation teams consist of highly experienced and knowledgeable higher education leaders. Team members are selected by the Steering Committee of the Institutional Evaluation Programme with a view to providing the evaluated institution with an appropriate mix of knowledge, skills, objectivity and international perspective. The number of team members is determined by the size of

\(^1\) Please note that the terms university and institution are used interchangeably in these guidelines to refer to any type of higher education institution.
the participating institution. Teams for institutions with 2000 students or more consist of four members; otherwise, the team will have only three members.

The teams consist of rectors or vice rectors (present or former) with a university professor or other higher education professional acting as the academic secretary. Each team member comes from a different country, and all team members come from a country other than that of the institution.

As a general rule, the teams will consist of Europeans, but institutions may select to have a non-European university leader on their evaluation team. Moreover, institutions may opt to have a student included in the team as the fifth (or fourth, respectively) member. Please contact EUA if you are interested in these options.

1.4 Indicative timeframe

The schedule below reflects the indicative timeframe for the institutions that registered for the IEP during the regular registration period in the spring. The EUA secretariat is prepared to work with each participating university to adapt this timeframe to specific circumstances and requirements.

**Stage 1: July-October 2007**
- The Institution applies for participation in the Institutional Evaluation Programme
- EUA establishes an evaluation team for each participating institution during the IEP annual seminar that is attended by all members of evaluation teams
- The participating universities have the option of attending a seminar organised by EUA to discuss the proposed objectives of the evaluation and to receive guidance on planning the process

**Stage 2: October 2007 - March 2008**
- Self-evaluation phase: the participating universities undergo a self-evaluation process and provide EUA with a self-evaluation report on the basis of the IEP guidelines. (Please note: the self-evaluation report has to be finalised by the institution four weeks prior to the preliminary site visit.)
- External evaluation phase begins: the evaluation team conducts a preliminary site visit to the institution and requests any additional information as appropriate

**Stage 3: April - May 2008**
- The institution submits any follow-up information as requested by the evaluation team

**Stage 4: May - July 2008**
- The evaluation team makes a second (main) site visit to the institution

**Stage 5: July – October 2009**
- EUA presents the written report to the institution for comments on factual errors
- EUA sends the finalised report to the institution

---

*The term rector is used throughout this text to denote the head of a higher education institution.*
2 SELF-EVALUATION: PROCESS AND REPORT

After registering in the EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme, the first step for an institution is to prepare the self-evaluation. When we talk about this phase in the programme, it is important to distinguish the process of self-evaluation from the self-evaluation report:

- The self-evaluation process is a collective institutional reflection and an opportunity for quality enhancement of any aspect of the institution that is analysed as part of the self-evaluation.
- The self-evaluation report is one outcome of the self-evaluation process; it provides information to the evaluation team, with emphasis on the institution's strategic and quality management activities.

The goal of both the process and the report is to enhance the institutional capacity for improvement and change through self-reflection. This is a crucial phase in which careful consideration should be given by the participating institution to maximise the engagement of the whole university community.

As soon as the institution has received the guidelines it should begin the self-evaluation process by setting up the self-evaluation group (2.1). Based on the checklist provided in 2.2, the self-evaluation group will write the self-evaluation report (2.3).

2.1 The self-evaluation group

To ensure the success of the self-evaluation, the institution will set up a self-evaluation group that represents a broad view of the institution rather than a partial view of its management. The self-evaluation group should have the following characteristics:

- Its members are in a good position to judge strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats;
- The group is small (no more than 10) to ensure that it is efficient;
- It represents the major constituencies in the institution (academic and administrative staff and students) to maximise involvement of all major stakeholders;
- It selects an academic secretary to write the report under the chairperson's responsibility (cf. below).

The self-evaluation group will be led by a chairperson whose responsibilities include:

- Planning and co-ordinating the work of the self-evaluation group: e.g. tailoring the checklist (cf. 2.2) to the national context and the particular institution, gathering and analysing the data, co-ordinating the work of any sub-group;
- Providing opportunities for a broad discussion of the self-evaluation within the institution to promote a broad identification with the report;
- Acting as a contact person to the evaluation team and the EUA secretariat;
- Acting as or appointing a liaison person responsible for arranging the site visits.

The institutional leadership will:

- Clarify the responsibility of the self-evaluation group towards staff members who are not on the team, i.e. the self-evaluation group should not work in isolation but seek, through institution-wide discussions, to present as broad a view as possible of the institution;
- Support and encourage the process along the way by explaining its purpose across the institution.
The self-evaluation will result in a report submitted to the external evaluation team under the responsibility of the rector. This does not mean that the rector or all actors in the institution necessarily agree with all statements in the self-evaluation report. But the head of the institution must accept responsibility for both the self-evaluation process as well as the report.

It is essential for the success of the self-evaluation that information is circulated widely in the institution about the procedures, goals and benefits of the Institutional Evaluation Programme. Annex 1 of these guidelines contains a sample handout that may be used or adapted by the institution for this purpose.

2.2 Preparing the self-evaluation report: What kind of information to collect and analyse?

This section outlines the type of information to collect and analyse in preparation for the self-evaluation report. As a starting point it should be stressed that the self-evaluation report is the main vehicle for the institution to present itself. Equally, and perhaps more importantly, it is an opportunity for the institution to reflect critically upon the way it is managed and handles quality as a central process in its strategic decision-making.

Therefore, the self-evaluation report should not be simply descriptive, but analytical, evaluative and synthetic as well. It should assess strengths and weaknesses, identify threats and opportunities and show how the various elements of strategic thinking and quality management are interconnected. In addition, the analysis should take into account changes that have taken place in the recent past as well as those that are anticipated for the future.

Given the purpose of the evaluation process, a total assessment of all activities of the institution is not necessary. In addition, if the results of other evaluation procedures of the institution's activities are available, these can also be used.

As an important step in the evaluation exercise, the self-evaluation report has three major purposes:

- To present a succinct but analytical and comprehensive statement of the institution's view of quality management and strategic planning
- To analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the institution, identify the opportunities and threats it faces and propose specific actions to address them
- To provide a framework against which the institution will be evaluated by the EUA team

The general context for the evaluation, both at the self-evaluation and at the external evaluation stages, will be the extent to which the institution's mission and goals are being met. Specifically, the evaluation is intended to address four central questions that should be constantly kept in mind during both the self-evaluation and the external evaluation phases:

- What is the institution trying to do?
- How is the institution trying to do it?
- How does the institution know it works?
- How does the institution change in order to improve?

These strategic questions are closely connected to the SWOT, an analytical tool that is used in the self-evaluation process in order to identify the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats that the institution is facing.

The following section provides a checklist to guide the data collection and analysis in preparation of the self-evaluation report. Since this provides a basis for the self-evaluation report (which in turn will be the basis for the external evaluation by the EUA team), it is important that all the bullet points on the list are addressed by the self-evaluation group but, since each institution operates within its own specific context, the self-evaluation group may want to tailor the checklist before starting its work. If some questions are not relevant or if specific pieces of information are impossible to provide, this should be noted in relation to the questions.
The checklist is structured into four major sections that reflect the four central questions mentioned above (i.e. What is the institution trying to do? How is the institution trying to do it? How does it know it works? How does the institution change in order to improve?). These four questions will be picked up again in the structure of the self-evaluation report (2.3) and the external evaluation report written by the EUA team.

I. The starting point of the checklist is a discussion of norms and values, i.e. the institution’s mission and goals or “What is the institution trying to do”?

II. This is followed by an account of the actual organisation and activities designed to meet the norms and values stated in the first section, i.e. the institution’s strategy or “How is the institution trying to do it”?

III. The third section asks how the institution knows whether its activities are actually meeting the university’s objectives, i.e. it looks at the institution’s quality processes or “How does the institution know it works?”

IV. The last section of the checklist considers the capacity for change in the context of its strategic objectives and with the goal of engaging the university in a discussion of gaps in its management processes or “How does the institution change in order to improve?"

A fifth – optional – section considers a special focus for the evaluation, which may be selected by the university for more in-depth consideration.

---

I. Norms and values: What is the institution trying to do?

This section discusses institutional norms and values. It analyses the mission and goals the institution has set for itself. The EUA evaluation team will be particularly interested in the strategic choices the institution has made with regard to the scope and profile of the institution.

- Governance and management
  - What is the degree of centralisation and decentralisation that the institution aims for?
  - Does the institution have human resources and gender policies in place?

- Academic profile
  - What balance is the institution aiming to achieve among its teaching, research and other services?
  - What are the institution’s academic priorities, i.e. which teaching programmes and areas of research are emphasised?
  - Does the institution have a policy or preferences regarding certain didactic approaches?

- Academically-related activities: What are the institution’s goals for its relationship to society (external partners, local and regional government) and its involvement in public debate?

- Funding: What should be the institution’s relationship to its funding agencies (public and others, such as research contractors)?

- What balance is the institution aiming to achieve in terms of its local, regional, national, and international positioning?

- Any other institutional goals?

---

II. Organisation and activities: How is the institution trying to do it?

In practice, the institution manages its activities (teaching, research, and service to society) so as to embody its mission and goals, while taking account of the specific opportunities and constraints it faces. The inevitable discrepancy between what ought to be (norms and values) and what actually exists (organisation and activities) is an indicator of the institution’s strengths and weaknesses. It is the analysis of strengths and weaknesses that constitutes the next phase of the self-evaluation.
The issues addressed in Section I should be re-visited, but rather than stating objectives, Section II will reflect upon the institution’s strategy in terms of each of these issues, how they are achieved, and will reflect on the extent to which the institution takes full advantage of its autonomy. Moreover, each subheading in this section should also contain concrete proposals on how identified weaknesses could be remedied and strengths could be further enhanced.

- Governance and management: Re-visit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
  - Analysis of management practice: what are the respective roles of central-level administrators, offices and faculties/institutes? Does co-ordination among faculties/institutes take place, and if so how? What does the institutional leadership control and decide? What do the deans of faculty control and decide with respect to:
    - The selection and promotion of academic and administrative staff
    - The selection of students
    - Funding issues
    - Academic activities (teaching and learning, research)
    - Development of entrepreneurial activities
    - Research policies
  - How does the institution involve students and external stakeholders in institutional governance?
  - How adequate are the university’s human resources, human resource policy and practice to current and future needs (e.g. age profile, recruitment, promotion, redeployment and staff development);
  - Does the institution have a gender policy? To what extent is it successfully implemented?
  - How does the institution’s involvement in inter-institutional cooperation (at regional, national or international level) reflect its positioning as identified in Section I
  - How do the actual management policies reflect the institution’s mission and goals, and how could discrepancies between the goals and reality be amended and strengths be reinforced?

- Academic profile: Re-visit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
  - Analysis of research and educational approaches. This can be brief unless some programmes or approaches, teaching or research units deserve specific mention because they reflect the institution’s academic profile (e.g. special didactic approaches, a unique and/or very large research institute, e-learning etc.)
  - Analysis of educational programme design and organisation of research activities
  - How do the study programmes and research activities reflect the mission and goals, and how could discrepancies between the goals and reality be amended and identified strengths be reinforced?
  - Does the institution have a language policy?

- Academically-related activities: Re-visit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
  - Analysis of research and technology transfer, continuing education, regional and community service, etc. This can be brief, unless some programmes deserve specific mention
  - Analysis of student support services: How do the various academically-related activities reflect the institution’s mission and goals, and how could discrepancies between the goals and reality be amended and strengths be reinforced?

- Funding: Revisit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
✓ What is the total budget of the university, including salaries, contracts etc.?
✓ What percentage is allotted by the state or other public authorities, by student fees, by private sources (research contracts, foundations etc.)?
✓ Is the state allocation a lump sum, or, if not, what percentage of this allocation is earmarked?
✓ What part of the budget is controlled centrally?
✓ What are the amounts allotted to faculties and departments, and according to which criteria are they distributed? Are these amounts decided by the university?
✓ What are the allocation procedures within the university? Who decides what and how?
✓ What percentage of the budget could be used by the university leadership to implement new initiatives?
✓ Is the institution able to calculate the full costs of research and teaching activities?
✓ What does the institution perceive as strengths and weaknesses in terms of its funding, and how could weaknesses be remedied and strengths be further enhanced?

III. Quality practices: How does the institution know it works?

The question “How does the institution know it works?” refers to the internal quality processes and practices available and operative in the institution.

The European standards for internal quality processes have been collected in the “Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area”, which were adopted by ministers in Bergen (2005) and are available on the following website: http://www.enqa.eu/pubs.lasso. To what extent has the institution used these European Guidelines?

These quality processes include data gathering and an evaluative judgement concerning the institution’s activities.

- How are responsibilities for internal quality shared across the institution (e.g. specific structures, specific staff in charge of this area, reporting lines)?
- Are internal quality processes based on explicit quality standards? Are these quality standards widely known and accepted in the institution? Have they been widely discussed in the institutions: Is there a shared culture of quality?
- How adequate are the resources available to support internal quality processes (e.g. financial resources, staff development frameworks)?
- What are the available internal quality processes with respect to:
  ✓ Teaching activities
  ✓ Research activities
  ✓ Student performance, including analysis of drop-out rate and time-to-graduation
  ✓ Administrative processes
  ✓ Entrepreneurial activities
  ✓ External relations (local, regional, national and international)
- How regularly are activities evaluated?
- How extensive are the collected data?
- To what extent are the outcomes of internal quality processes used in decision-making and strategic development? For instance, if student course evaluations are carried out, how does the unit concerned (programme, department, etc.) handle the results from these evaluations if
they fall outside norms set by the unit? Or what are the consequences, for example, of external evaluations of research units?

Note that the EUA evaluation team is not as interested in the existence of extensive policy documents regarding internal quality processes as it is in the actual practice of bringing about change as a result of quality practices. In other words, the focus is on the activity and practice of quality improvement, their effectiveness and relevance, as well as the identification of gaps, and less on elaborate quality handbooks and quality mechanisms.

IV. Strategic management and capacity for change: How does the institution change in order to improve?

Once the self-evaluation group has gone through all the above questions, it will come up with a SWOT analysis that will assess the capacity of the institution to change in order to improve:

- How responsive is the institution to the demands, threats and opportunities present in its external environment?
- How are representatives from the external environment involved in the institution’s strategic management?
- To what extent does the institution take full advantage of its autonomy?
- Which changes can be expected to be made towards the institution’s aims?
- How can a better match be attained between the current and future mission and goals and the activities (study programmes, research, service to society)?
- What role do quality monitoring and quality management play in these developments?

V. Special focus

Universities have the option of selecting a special focus for the evaluation. This can be on such topics as research strategy, teaching and learning, implementing Bologna etc. The special focus will be investigated on its own ground. It will be examined within the institutional context and will receive an in-depth treatment in the evaluation report, including specific recommendations. Annex 2 presents background information on such special foci.

2.3 The structure of the self-evaluation report

Once the self-evaluation group has collected and analysed the data as outlined above, its task will be to synthesise all the information gathered and present its findings in the self-evaluation report. The following proposes a structure for this report. At this stage, it is important to keep in mind that the report should be fairly short and be reflective and critical.

Introduction

Brief analysis of the self-evaluation process:
- Who are the self-evaluation team members?
- With whom did they collaborate?
- To what extent was the report discussed across the institution?
- What were the positive aspects, as well as the difficulties, encountered in the self-evaluation process?

Institutional context

Brief presentation of the institution in its context:
- Brief historical overview
- Geographical position of the university (e.g. in a capital city, major regional centre, concentrated on one campus, dispersed across a city)
- A brief analysis of the current regional and national labour-market situation
- Number of faculties, research institutes/laboratories, academic and administrative staff and students
- Autonomy with respect to:
  - Human and financial resources
  - Capacity to set its own profile for teaching, research and innovation
  - Capacity to set its own governing structures

Body of the report
The body of the self-evaluation report strives to strike a balance between description and critical analysis (i.e. identify the strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats) and should have the following sections, which follow the four sections in the checklist:

- Section I: Norms and values: What is the institution trying to do?
- Section II: Organisation and activities: How is the institution trying to do it?
- Section III: Quality practices: How does the institution know it works?
- Section IV: Strategic management and capacity for change: How does the institution change in order to improve?

Optional section: Analysis of the special focus chosen by the institution
As mentioned in 2.2 above, the body of the self-evaluation report should not be simply descriptive, but *analytical, evaluative and synthetic* as well. It should assess strengths and weaknesses, identify threats and opportunities and show how the various elements of strategic thinking and quality management are interconnected. In addition, the analysis should take into account changes that have taken place in the recent past as well as those that are anticipated in the future.

Conclusion
The conclusion summarises the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and offers a specific action plan to remedy weaknesses and to develop strengths further.

A useful conclusion has the following characteristics:

- Since the goal of the evaluation is to promote ongoing quality and strategic development, it is advantageous to be as open and as self-reflective as possible. Therefore, strengths and weaknesses need to be stated explicitly; specifically, it is best to avoid playing down or hiding weaknesses.

- Strengths and weaknesses that are not discussed in the body of the report should not appear in the conclusion since they would be unsubstantiated.

- Strengths and weaknesses that are discussed in the main part of the report are summarised again in the conclusion.

- Plans to remedy weaknesses are offered in the conclusion in the form of a specific action plan.

Appendices
Annexes will include the following:

- An organisational chart of the institution’s faculties (or any other relevant units of teaching/research)
- An organisational chart of the central administration and support services (rector’s office staff, campus maintenance, libraries etc.)
- An organisational chart of the management structure (rector, council/senate, faculty\(^3\) deans and councils, major committees etc.)

- Student numbers for the whole institution, with a breakdown by faculty, over the last three to five years; student/staff ratio (lowest, highest and mean ratios); time-to-graduation; drop-out rates; gender distribution by faculty; demographic trends in the wider target population.

- Academic staff numbers (by academic rank and faculty) for the whole institution, over the last three to five years, with a breakdown by level, discipline, gender and age

- Funding: government funding (amount and percentage of total budget), other funding sources (type and percentage of total budget) and research funding (percentage within total budget); amount of institutional funding for teaching and research per faculty over the last three to five years

- Infrastructure in relation to the number of students and staff: number and size of buildings, facilities, laboratories, and libraries; their location (e.g. dispersed over a large geographical area or concentrated on a single campus); age and condition of the facilities

Beyond this, the institution is free to add any other information, but is asked to limit the number and length of appendices to what is strictly necessary to understand the statements and argumentation in the self-evaluation report. These data are significant only if they are interpreted in the national and institutional context.

### Practical aspects

- The maximum length of the self-evaluation report is 20 - 25 pages, excluding the appendices. The reason for this relatively short report is to maintain a focus on institutional management without probing too deeply into the specifics of all faculties and all activities. Institutions are encouraged to make use of any existing data and documents.

- The self-evaluation report is written partly for an internal audience (the institution’s staff members and students) and partly for the evaluation team. The evaluation team is knowledgeable about higher education in general but, as internationals, they may lack in-depth knowledge of specific national situations. The self-evaluation group should keep this in mind when writing its report.

- EUA and the evaluation team will consider the self-evaluation report as confidential and will not provide any information regarding this report to third parties. The institution is therefore encouraged to take as open and self-critical an approach as possible in the self-evaluation process in order to make maximum use of the overall evaluation.

- The self-evaluation report should be read and signed by the rector before being sent to EUA and the evaluation team. This ensures that the institutional leadership is informed appropriately.

- The self-evaluation report should be made available to all institutional members who are to meet the evaluation team during the site visits.

- The report should be sent to the EUA Secretariat and to each individual team member at least four weeks prior to the first site visit.

It is of the utmost importance to the running of the project and especially the site visits that deadlines are respected. To ensure this, the self-evaluation group is advised to plan to meet weekly for a couple of hours to ensure progress. Conducting the self-evaluation process and writing the report is an ambitious task which will require a substantial time investment of approximately three months.

---

\(^3\) Please note that the term faculty is used in this text in a generic sense to denote the main structural sub-unit of an institution.
3 SITE VISITS

3.1 Preparing for the site visits

We have stressed that the EUA process is intended to act as a support to develop further the universities’ capacity to change. The evaluators are experienced university leaders and administrators and have wide international experience in evaluating universities. Please view the visits as occasions to use the team’s expertise for the institution’s benefit. The guidelines and sample programmes for the visits should therefore be seen as suggestions that should be adapted to the institution’s special needs and circumstances. Please discuss the proposed programme for the visits with the team secretary well in advance. Each institution will be visited twice, as detailed below.

3.2 Preliminary visit: agenda and suggested schedule

For the participating university, the preliminary visit serves the following purposes:

- To get a better understanding of the purpose and procedure of the evaluation process: to enhance the university’s strategic development and management for change through an examination of its internal quality arrangements
- To identify the topics for the main site visit and to set the appropriate tone. An open and self-critical approach is much more helpful for all concerned, most of all to the participating university, than a “public-relations” approach
- To draw the attention of the university community to the evaluation. This may lead to better mobilisation and co-operation for the follow-up process throughout the institution

From the point of view of the evaluation team, the preliminary visit has the following aims:

- To obtain a broad understanding of the national higher education context
- To develop an understanding of institutional operations in terms of students, staff, finance, facilities and location
- To develop an understanding of the structures and processes of strategic decision-making within the university (planning, teaching and research, financial flows and personnel policy)
- To develop an understanding of the university’s existing procedures for quality assurance
- To develop a sense of important local issues with respect to strategic management
- To ask for supplemental information to the self-evaluation report
- To develop a programme for the main site visit

In addition, the practical arrangements of the main site visit should not be forgotten:

- Decide upon dates for the main visit and overall visit schedule
- Decide which faculties and other institutes to visit, which persons to meet etc.
- Visit the working room(s) that the evaluation team will use during the second visit

Please note that, unlike the second (or main) site visit, the preliminary visit is not intended to lead to any conclusions. The evaluation team will not produce an evaluation report at this point. The preliminary visit contributes to the team’s understanding of the specific characteristics of the university. Thus, the preliminary visit should result in a validation of the presentation of the university’s situation, and the evaluation team should get a broad impression of how the university operates (decentralisation, co-ordination, etc.).

Therefore, the choice of persons the evaluation team meets is highly important. For the benefit of both the university and the team, a representative and diversified sample of the university...
community should take part in the preliminary visit. This includes academic and non-academic staff, as well as different types of students and representatives of external “stakeholders”. The evaluation team wishes to meet “average” students and “average” academic staff, i.e. not all should be members of official bodies (senates or council) or unions.

An indicative list of persons and bodies that the evaluation team should meet includes:

- The rector as well as other members of the rector’s team
- The self-evaluation group including any sub-group
- Representatives of the central staff; mainly from the quality office, international relations office, financial services, personnel office, planning unit, co-ordinating unit of research activities, public relations office etc.
- Representatives of external stakeholders and partners (public authorities, private industry, other actors from society etc.)
- Delegation of senate / council
- Deans / dean council
- Students (bachelor, master and doctoral level)
- One or two faculties, one or two special centres (if any)

To ensure open and frank discussions, the number of participants in each meeting should be limited accordingly, with no more than three or four persons from the university, except for students who seem to prefer larger groups, up to ten persons. Please note that the teams must be able to meet privately with individual groups, e.g. only students should be present at the students’ meeting, and not members of the academic staff. These meetings will be treated confidentially by the evaluation team: it will not report on an individual person’s statements.

In addition, these meetings are meant to be interactive. The evaluation team will have questions to ask participants, who should be discouraged from preparing formal presentations.

The preliminary visit lasts two days. A sample schedule for the preliminary visit is presented below, but other options are also possible in consultation with the evaluation team secretary.

The sample schedule includes parallel visits to four faculties. Please note that:

- Faculty is used here in a generic sense to mean a “structural unit”, i.e. some institutions have only faculties while others have a mixture of faculties, research institutes and other structures. The evaluation team (split in pairs) will be interested in visiting a mixture of these units.
- The number and types of units to be visited should be adjusted based on the institutional structure and size: some institutions have small numbers of large units; others have large numbers of small units.

Please adapt the schedule to the characteristics of your institution and keep in mind that the teams should have the opportunity to visit other units during the second visit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>What &amp; who?</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY 0</td>
<td>Late afternoon</td>
<td>Arrival of evaluation team</td>
<td>Division of tasks; discussion of the self-evaluation; inventory of issues for preliminary visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90 minutes</td>
<td>Briefing meeting</td>
<td>Evaluation team alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Evaluation team, with rector and liaison person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00 - 9.30</td>
<td>Meeting with rector</td>
<td>Evaluation team, rector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.40 – 11.00</td>
<td>Introduction meeting</td>
<td>Evaluation team, liaison person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.10 – 12.30</td>
<td>Meeting with self-evaluation group</td>
<td>Self-evaluation steering group, evaluation team, liaison person, task forces (if any)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.30 – 14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Evaluation team, liaison person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 1</td>
<td>14.10 – 14.40</td>
<td>Visit to faculties A &amp; B</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.40 – 15.40</td>
<td>Visit to faculties A &amp; B</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.50 – 16.40</td>
<td>parallel Visit to faculties A &amp; B Students</td>
<td>Students’ views on university experience (e.g., teaching and learning, student input in quality control and (strategic) decision making)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel Evaluation team splits into pairs to visit two faculties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.50 – 18.00</td>
<td>Tour of campus / main university locations Evaluation team, liaison person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30 - 19.30</td>
<td>Debriefing meeting Evaluation team alone</td>
<td>Reflect on impressions; prepare second day of visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dinner Evaluation team alone</td>
<td>Reflect on impressions gained thus far</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 9.30</td>
<td>parallel Visit to faculties C &amp; D Dean</td>
<td>as in faculties A and B (adapt as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel Evaluation team splits into pairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30-10.15</td>
<td>parallel Visit to faculties C &amp; D Academic staff representatives</td>
<td>as in faculties A and B (adapt as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15 – 11.00</td>
<td>parallel Visit to faculties C &amp; D Students</td>
<td>as in faculties A and B (adapt as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel Evaluation team splits into pairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 12.00</td>
<td>Meeting with external partners (industry, society and/or local authority)</td>
<td>Discuss relations of the university with external partners of the private and public sectors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 12.30</td>
<td>Debriefing meeting Evaluation team alone</td>
<td>Reflect on impressions; list issues for additions to self-evaluation report and main visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Evaluation team, liaison person</td>
<td>Plan main visit schedule (select faculties or units, special or additional persons to speak); logistical support for or during visit; visit team’s meeting and working rooms (where team can work on its oral report)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00 Lunch</td>
<td>Evaluation team, rector and liaison person</td>
<td>Concluding session to agree topics of additional documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Departure of evaluation team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A ten-minute leeway should be left between each meeting to allow for groups to go in and out, to give the evaluation team a few minutes to reflect together on previous meetings or to make changes to plans for the next meeting. Such brief breaks, in addition to coffee breaks, can also be useful to catch up on time if some meetings take longer than expected. If the evaluation team needs to move from one location to another (e.g. to another faculty), please leave ample time for doing so.

If the institution has several campus sites, careful consideration should be given if visits to several sites are indeed necessary. Unnecessary visits should be avoided in order to keep travelling time at a minimum.

Enough time should be left for the team debriefing sessions in order to reflect on impressions, to prepare the following meetings, and to discuss feedback to the university.

The liaison person will make the necessary arrangements for the preliminary visit, including arranging transportation for the evaluation team to and from the airport, hotel reservations and scheduling meetings.

The liaison person provides nameplates for the meetings, distributes the evaluation team’s short biographies in advance of the site visit and informs university participants about the general objectives of the preliminary visit and of the particular meeting in which they are involved. Moreover, the liaison person will make sure that the self-evaluation report is sent at least four weeks prior to the first site visit to the team members and the EUA secretariat (see 2.4).

Please note that the first site visit for small institutions (less than 2000 students) will last only one day, instead of two. Small institutions are invited to contact EUA if they require a sample schedule for the shortened visit.

### 3.3 From the preliminary to the main visit: additional documents

As an outcome of the preliminary visit, the team may also ask for additional documents or data on specific subjects. Clarity on these points must be reached before the end of the preliminary visit.

These additional documents, as well as any other information that has been requested, should be sent to all members of the team and to the EUA secretariat at least four weeks before the date of the main site visit.

### 3.4 The main site visit

During the main visit, the evaluation team’s task is to reach a well-founded view of the strategic management of quality in the institution as a whole. This judgement is an external, but well informed, view of the institution, as the team will have received structured information through the self-evaluation report and the preliminary visit.

The focus during the main visit is no longer on gaining an understanding of what is specific about the university but on finding out whether, how, and with what results, the university’s strategic and internal quality policies and procedures are implemented throughout the institution.

Observations made about the responsibilities for organising the preliminary visit apply to the main visit as well, although for the main visit the evaluation team will take a more pro-active role in establishing the schedule than for the first visit. An example of a schedule for the main visit is given below. The schedule of the visit must be discussed between the liaison person and the team secretary in advance. As shown below, the schedule of the visit may include parallel sessions in order to cover more ground and collect more evidence. The team will advise the university in good time of its plans in this respect.

The usual length of the main site visit for institutions with more than 2000 students is 3 days (see the sample schedule below) and 2 days for smaller institutions (please request a sample schedule from the EUA secretariat).

However, in exceptional circumstances, the chair of an evaluation team may extend the main site visit by up to one day, should this be deemed necessary. This may be the case, for instance, with
very large institutions (over 25,000 students) or with smaller institutions which are very complex. Any extension of the main site beyond the usual length must be decided by the chair (in agreement with the evaluation team) and announced to the institution during the preliminary site visit at the latest.

**Sample schedule of the main site visit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>What &amp; who?</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DAY 0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late afternoon</td>
<td><strong>Arrival</strong> of evaluation team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td><strong>Briefing meeting</strong> Evaluation team alone</td>
<td>Division of tasks, preliminary discussion of evaluation report structure and issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evening</td>
<td><strong>Dinner</strong> Evaluation team, with rector and liaison person</td>
<td>Welcome, renew acquaintance; go over site visit programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DAY 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00 – 10.00</td>
<td><strong>Meeting with rector</strong> Evaluation team, rector</td>
<td>Discuss privately issues that need to be stressed in team’s visit and report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.10 – 11.00</td>
<td><strong>Meeting with self-evaluation steering group</strong> Self-evaluation group, evaluation team, liaison person, task forces</td>
<td>Discuss any changes in context or internal situation since preliminary visit, analyse impact of main visit, review additional information sent to the team, clarify any open questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.10– 12.30</td>
<td><strong>Meeting with the deans</strong> Deans’ Council or deans from several faculties, evaluation team</td>
<td>Discuss relationship of faculties with university central level with respect to quality management; input in self-evaluation; special issues arising from self-evaluation parts one and two and/or from talk with rector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.40 – 14.00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong> Evaluation team, liaison person</td>
<td>Reflect upon impressions of first meetings and complete information as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 15.00</td>
<td><strong>Meeting with central office staff members</strong> Evaluation team splits into pairs</td>
<td>Discuss role of e.g. institutional strategic documents (development plans, etc.) in development of university; special issues arising from self-evaluation parts one and two and/or from talk with rector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.10 – 16.00</td>
<td><strong>Meeting with senate</strong> Senate representatives</td>
<td>Discuss relationship of senate/democratic representation body with rectoral team regarding strategic and quality management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00 – 16.45</td>
<td><strong>Meeting with central student delegation</strong></td>
<td>Students’ views on the university, on relations with rectoral office, on student input in quality management and in (strategic) decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>Evaluation teams splits into pairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00 - 18.00</td>
<td><strong>Meeting with outside partners</strong></td>
<td>Discuss relationships of university with external stakeholders of private and public sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Industry, society and/or local authorities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00 – 19.00</td>
<td><strong>Debriefing meeting</strong></td>
<td>Exchange impressions, review the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td><strong>Dinner</strong></td>
<td>Reflect on impressions and start preparing oral report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation team alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Visit to faculties E and F</strong></td>
<td>Introduction to the faculty: structures, quality management and strategic management; discuss relationships of faculties with the university central level; input in self-evaluation; role of quality control activities in faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Visit to faculties E and F</strong></td>
<td>Discuss relationships of faculties with the university central level; input in self-evaluation; role of quality control activities in faculty; recruitment of new staff; staff development; motivation policies. Please note that deans or vice deans should not be present at this meeting: it is reserved for &quot;regular&quot; academic staff only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15 – 12.15</td>
<td><strong>Visit to faculties E and F</strong></td>
<td>Students’ views on university experience (e.g., teaching and learning, student input in quality control and (strategic) decision making)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 – 14.00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation team, alone, to exchange impressions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation team alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 17.15</td>
<td><strong>Faculties G and H</strong></td>
<td>as in faculties E and F (adapt as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separate meetings with the dean, academic staff and students, as in faculties E and F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td><strong>Debriefing meeting</strong></td>
<td>Exchange impressions, review day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation team alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td><strong>Dinner</strong></td>
<td>Continuation of debriefing meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation team alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DAY 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.30 – 22.00</td>
<td><strong>Drafting oral report</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation team alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[evaluation team needs working room in the hotel for this task]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 10.00</td>
<td><strong>Concluding meeting</strong></td>
<td>Discussed draft oral report with the rector alone, to ensure it reflects the findings of the team as well as the needs of the rector for the university’s further development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rector, evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 – 10.30</td>
<td><strong>Adapting oral report</strong></td>
<td>Adapt oral report according to discussion with rector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation team alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 12.00</td>
<td><strong>Presentation of oral report</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation team, rector and members of the university community (invitations to be decided by the rector, e.g. rectoral team, liaison person, self-evaluation group, senate etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon                      Lunch and departure of evaluation team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 After the main site visit

The evaluation team will draft a written report based on the oral report presented at the end of its visit. The draft report will then be communicated to the rector’s office. The rector must react to this report from the point of view of the institution, correcting factual errors and, most importantly, commenting on the usefulness of the report for the institution’s follow-up process.

The institution’s reaction must be sent to the EUA secretariat, which will forward it to the team secretary. The report will then be finalised and sent officially to the rector, thus formally concluding the main evaluation process. EUA encourages institutions to make the final report public. If an institution decides not to publish the report, EUA will consider the review a consultancy rather than an EUA evaluation.

Please see below a detailed indicative timeframe and division of tasks during the report-writing stage. EUA can assist in the follow-up process at the request of the rector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write draft report</td>
<td>Team secretary and chair</td>
<td>6 weeks after main visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment on draft</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send redraft to EUA</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit</td>
<td>EUA editor</td>
<td>Within 1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team comment on editing</td>
<td>Secretary (if necessary, in consultation with the team chair)</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send report to university</td>
<td>EUA</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University reacts to EUA</td>
<td>Rector</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any change + sending final report to university</td>
<td>EUA (if necessary, in consultation with the team chair and secretary)</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sample handout on the IEP

The EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme

This brief appendix may be a useful handout for all participants in the self-evaluation process or in the site visits.

The long-term aim of the EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) is to strengthen institutional autonomy and support institutional change in universities.

The evaluation is undertaken from the perspective of the university to ensure understanding of the institutional context and to make recommendations to increase the effectiveness of the internal governance and management processes and quality arrangements. In this way, the evaluation is responsive to the university's needs, mission, culture and situation and is future-oriented since it emphasises the development of the university. The IEP is strictly independent from national agencies and government evaluation programmes.

The EUA evaluation team consists of rectors or vice-rectors (active or former) with a university professor or other higher education professional acting as academic secretary. Team members provide an international and European perspective; they all come from different countries, and none of them come from the country of the participating institution.

The EUA team focuses on the institutional decision-making processes and structures, and the effectiveness of strategic planning. It will evaluate the relevance of internal quality processes and their use in the strategic development of the university. The IEP evaluation has a formative orientation, i.e. it is aimed at contributing to the development and enhancement of the institution. The IEP is not geared towards passing judgements or ranking or comparing institutions against others.

During the preliminary visit, the evaluation team becomes acquainted with the university and its environment. In the main visit, two months later, the focus is on finding out whether, how, and how effectively, the university's strategic policies and quality procedures are being implemented throughout the institution.

It should be emphasised that the main preoccupation of the team is to be helpful and constructive. Team members will come prepared to lead discussions with carefully prepared questions. Sessions are intended to be interactive. No formal presentations by either university members or the evaluation team should be made.

The evaluation team's conclusions and recommendations are collected in a report that will be presented to the institution.

Since 1993, nearly 200 evaluations in 39 countries (mostly in Europe but also in Latin America and South Africa) have been conducted by EUA.
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Special foci

As mentioned before, institutions have the option of choosing a special focus in addition to the evaluation of their strategic capacity for change (supra 2.3). The following sections present checklists for suggested special foci to assist universities in dealing with this aspect in their self-evaluation report. Please contact EUA if your special focus is not mentioned in this section. The treatment of the special focus should not exceed 6 pages in the self-evaluation report.

The following checklists are primarily based on the outcomes of EUA projects on the respective topics. For detailed information on these projects, please consult the published reports. They are cited in the list of references in the final section of these guidelines and are available on the EUA website at www.eua.be.

I. Internationalisation

In terms of the evaluation of this area, the following aspects should be considered in the checklist:

- What are the institution’s international priorities and are they expressed in any official documents (mission statement etc.)?
- What is the institutional infrastructure for internationalisation (e.g. international office)?
- Institutional information policy on issues linked to internationalisation (information for students and staff on study/research abroad opportunities and grants etc.)
- Incoming and outgoing mobility data for students and staff
- Policy and practice in student and staff exchange programmes, including orientation programmes for incoming and outgoing participants
- Is students’ international experience used in the classroom?
- Internationalisation of the curriculum (including an international dimension in course work, developing policies regarding language studies etc.)
- Links with international research and educational networks

II. Implementing Bologna

Attitude towards and general assessment of Bologna reforms

- What is the level of awareness of the Bologna process in your institution and what is its response to the Bologna goals?
- How does the Bologna process fit into the institution’s strategic plan?
- Have there been legislative changes linked to the Bologna process? If yes, please comment on their effects.
- Which overall changes has the Bologna process brought about in the institution so far?
- Please comment on the funding of the implementation of Bologna goals. Are there any financial incentives provided by the public funding bodies?
- How autonomous do you feel your institution is with respect to implementation of the Bologna reforms (decision making, financing mechanisms, timing)?

Curricular reforms/Introduction of the Bologna study structure

- Please comment on the state of implementation of the Bologna study structure at your institution and the major challenges in this process.
- What do students do upon completion of the bachelor (continue their studies, enter specific professions, etc.)? Do graduates with bachelor’s degrees experience any specific difficulties in entering the labour market?
- What types of master programmes are offered at your institution?
- Have there been any changes in doctoral training based on the Bologna debates?
- Are there differences among disciplines in terms of implementation of the Bologna study structure?
- Have structural changes had an impact on student mobility patterns?
- How relevant is the concept of learning outcomes for your curricular reforms?
- What difficulties have you experienced in the restructuring of curricula?

Recognition of degrees and periods of study
- Are ECTS/other credits used for transfer and/or accumulation purposes? Are there differences among disciplines?
- What is the policy in terms of the recognition of non-academic/non-formal qualifications?
- Are there any difficulties in the recognition of students’ exchange/mobility periods?
- Is the Diploma Supplement issued to all graduates? Which problems have you encountered in the implementation process?
- What are the institution's procedures for recognising foreign diplomas?

III. Research leadership and management

Research strategy
- What are the university’s main institutional research strategies and priorities?
- How have these strategies been developed?
- What is the institutional framework for resource allocation?
- What research-specific quality management processes are in place at the institution?
- Does the institution have an ethical code of conduct for research activities?
- Does it have mechanisms for encouraging individual research initiatives through incentives?

Services to researchers
- Does the university provide support to researchers in obtaining external/internal funding?
- Does the university support researchers in start-ups/spin-off activities?
- Does the university provide administrative and accounting services for research teams?
- Does the university provide legal counselling on contractual issues?
- Does the university provide mobility support for researchers?

Technology transfer
- Please comment on university – industry research relationships at the institution.
- Please comment on intellectual property rights of researchers and institutions. How is information provided and how is this issue managed by the institution?
- How are research results utilised?
- Are there any specific initiatives to attract contract research?

Funding and costing of research
- What is the process of seeking new funding?
- How does the university ensure sustainable funding of research?
- Does the university fully cost its research?
Doctoral programmes

- Please comment on the organisation of doctoral programmes at your institution and the formal requirements for the awarding of the degree. Are there any disciplinary differences?
- Supervision: Please comment on the role of dissertation advisors/dissertation committees.
- Recruitment criteria, admission requirements, procedure and selection of doctoral candidates (regulated or unregulated; transparency about eligibility, application, selection and decisions on admission).
- Funding issues: (sources of funding; new ways of funding and co-funding /co-operation with industry, sponsorship; financial management; introduction of tuition fees; grants and scholarships; loans; salaries)?
- The doctoral candidate’s legal status (Status as a student/ or an employee? What are the duties and tasks of the doctoral candidate, e.g. teaching/ or research assistance and what is the extent of these duties? Access to security benefits, e.g., does the candidate have the right to health insurance, maternity leave, pension, unemployment benefit etc.).
- Is there a European/international dimension in doctoral programmes (award of ‘European doctorates’/‘co-tutelles’ etc., mobility as an obligatory part of doctoral programmes)?
- Is there active career promotion/counselling available to candidates?

IV. E-Learning

The following checklist is provided to institutions requesting a focus on e-learning activities as a structure for that portion of the self-evaluation report.

Mission

- How do e-learning activities fit into the mission of the university?
- What priority do e-learning programmes have in regard to regular programmes?
- What is the institution’s targeted audience? What are the specific needs of this audience? How can these needs be met by e-learning technologies?
- What is the institution’s e-learning approach? Does the institution have a unified approach for all programmes or does every programme use its own approach?
- What is the relationship between e-learning and traditional learning methodologies?
  - E-learning as an independent product or as a complement to traditional learning?
  - E-learning as another way to deliver traditional courses and programmes?

Activities

- How does the institution deal with the distance between students/teachers, students/students, teachers/teachers? How does the institution facilitate community building? How does the institution deal with the advantages/disadvantages of distance?
  - How does the institution organise its programme portfolio?
  - How does the university organise students’ and teachers’ access to library resources?
  - How does the university deal with the examination of long-distance students?
- What is the human resource strategy of the institution in respect to academic staff involved in e-learning? Does the institution have its own cadre of permanent staff for this area? Does it provide training opportunities in e-learning technology to its entire academic staff?
- How does the university involve e-learning teachers/students in governance?

Internal quality

- How does the institution develop the quality of its e-learning activities?
Annex 3


Participation fee:
The cost of participating in the Institutional Evaluation Programme in 2007 – 2008 is **30,000 Euros** for EUA members (32,500 for non-members), payable at the beginning of the evaluation procedure. In addition, participating institutions have to cover the accommodation (hotels and meals) and local transportation (airport transfer) costs for the members of the evaluation team.

The participation fee is used towards the international travel of team members and the IEP programme administration, including the training of pool members. Please note that team members do not receive any payment for their services.

Interval between the site visits:

Care must be taken to avoid an unduly long interval between the preliminary and the main site visit. As a rule, the normal interval should be one to four months. An interval exceeding nine months should be avoided, because this would, in most cases, require such a significant update of the self-evaluation report that the whole evaluation process would have to start again. Moreover, it is important that the impressions collected by the team members during the first visit are still fresh in their minds by the time they undertake the second visit.

For this reason, EUA will make every effort to ensure, in cooperation with the institution, that the main site visit takes place within nine months of the first. If this time frame cannot be met due to delays caused by the institution, EUA will consider the ongoing evaluation as having been terminated, unless a different time frame for the evaluation has been specifically agreed upon by the institution and EUA, either initially or in the course of the evaluation. In the case of a termination, the evaluation fee is due in full.

Should the institution choose to commence the evaluation process anew after the termination, there may be a negotiated modification of the fee. This will depend on the extent to which the operations and results of the terminated evaluation can be used for the new evaluation, thus reducing the overall cost.
Annex 4

Follow-up activities

After a university has participated in the Institutional Evaluation Programmes, it becomes eligible for the following activities and services:

- **An immediate follow-up:** EUA can assign, on demand, one or two experts to accompany the university in implementing specific recommendations that have resulted from the IEP evaluation.

- **A follow-up evaluation two years later:** at the request of the institution, EUA will form a team of three evaluators (two of whom participated in the original evaluation) to conduct a follow-up evaluation on the changes implemented since the initial evaluation.

- **Participation in the Alumni Forum:** the Forum meets twice a year on the occasion of major EUA conferences to discuss timely topics related to quality.

Please contact EUA if you are interested in the follow-up activities of the IEP.
Selected further reading

EUA (CRE) publications

Please note that all EUA publications may be downloaded from the EUA website at http://www.eua.be/index.php?id=128


Self-evaluation and quality management in higher education


Quality management in higher education institutions: reader Unit 3 of the CHEPS/CHERI postgraduate course by distance learning: Institutional management and change in higher education. Enschede: CHEPS/QSC/LEMA, 1999


**SWOT**


**Strategic management in higher education**


*Management and decision-making in higher education institutions: reader Unit 2 of the CHEPS/CHERI postgraduate course by distance learning: Institutional management and change in higher education.* Enschede: CHEPS/QSC/LEMMMA, 1999.
