

# **ENQA TRAINING Dublin**

**11/12 February 2010**

**Paul Mitchell  
HE Consultant, UK**

[mega.mitchell@btinternet.com](mailto:mega.mitchell@btinternet.com)

[www.megamitchell.com](http://www.megamitchell.com)

# **Part 2**

## **The Final Report**

# The Final Report

- The main outcome of the review process is a report of about 40 pages
- The first draft of the review report is written by the Review Secretary on the basis of the self-evaluation report, site visit and Review Panel's findings. It is first agreed with the Chair and then circulated by the Secretary to panel members
- It is the expectation that the draft version circulated to Panel members will be in 'near-final' form. The final version is 'signed off' by the Chair, in the light of comments received from panel members
- The Agency under review is provided with a copy of the draft report and given sufficient time to check its contents for errors of fact.

# The Final Report: managing delivery

Plan in advance.....

Timeline (weeks)	Action
Visit + 2	Secretary sends draft report electronically to Panel
Visit + 4	Last date for comments from Panel members to secretary
Visit + 5/6	Secretary (with Chair) finalises draft and sends to Agency under review
Visit + 6/8	Agency comments on issues of factual accuracy
Visit + 8/12	Secretary produces final report and sends to Panel, Agency and (where applicable) the Co-ordinating body. (The Agency <i>might</i> produce a formal response to the final report)

# **The Final Report: structure**

## **1 Executive summary**

including:

- the terms of reference of the review
- the details of the timescale over which the review was conducted
- the identity of all panel members and administrative support arrangements
- a description of the main stages of the review
- any recommendations for improvement

## **2 Glossary of terms**

(if required)

# The Final Report: structure

## 3 Introduction

contextual information relating to:

- reason(s) for the commissioning of the review
- the place of the Agency in the quality assurance structure of its jurisdiction
- the main functions of the Agency
- the engagement of the Agency with the ENQA membership provisions/ ESG
- how was the review carried out (e.g. what was the work method employed, how was consensus reached within the Review panel, etc.)
- the national (and international) context of the review (e.g. description of HE system and legal framework)

# The Final Report: structure

## 4 Findings *(each membership criterion is discussed separately as below)*

ENQA criterion 1: External quality assurance processes	ESG Part 2
ENQA criterion 1: Activities	ESG 3.1 and 3.3
ENQA criterion 2: Official status	ESG 3.2
ENQA criterion 3: Resources	ESG 3.4
ENQA criterion 4: Mission statement	ESG 3.5
ENQA criterion 5: Independence	ESG 3.6
ENQA criterion 6: External quality assurance criteria and processes used by the members	ESG 3.7
ENQA criterion 7: Accountability procedures	ESG 3.8
ENQA criterion 8: Miscellaneous	---

# The Final Report : structure

Findings: a note about ENQA Criteria 3 and 7

## Additional to ESG:

- ENQA Criterion 3 – Resources  
Agencies should have adequate and proportional resources, both human and financial, to enable them to organise and run their external quality assurance process(es) in an effective and efficient manner, with appropriate provision for the development of their processes, procedures and staff.
- ENQA Criterion 7 – Accountability procedures  
[...] iii. a mandatory cyclical external review of the agency's activities at least once every five years which includes a report on its conformity with the membership criteria of ENQA.



# The Final Report: structure

Findings: A note about ENQA Criterion 8 'Miscellaneous'

## Additional to ESG:

- 1 The agency pays careful attention to its declared principles at all times, and ensures both that its requirements and processes are managed professionally and that its judgments and decisions are reached in a consistent manner, even if the judgments are formed by different groups;
- 2 If the agency makes formal quality assurance decisions, or conclusions which have formal consequences, it should have an appeals procedure. The nature and form of the appeals procedure should be determined in the light of the constitution of the agency;
- 3 The agency is willing to contribute actively to the aims of ENQA.

# The Final Report: structure

**5** Any sections relating to **additional Terms of Reference of the review** (e.g. for a Type B review)

**6 Conclusion and development.** If the Review panel wishes to, this section might also include an analysis from both the Review panel and the Agency on how the review was conducted and the way forward.

**7 Annexes** (*Key pieces of evidence – i.e. extracts from legislation, policies and procedures etc. – may be added to the report in the form of appendices*)

**8 Optional** *Can add reflections and developmental recommendations*

# The Final Report: structure

**9 Overall compliance of the Agency.** The Panel is not required to comment on overall compliance, but may do so if it wishes, in the form of a summative RECOMMENDATION.

(This should also take account of the ENQA additional membership criteria)

The level of conformity with the ENQA membership criteria (and thereby, the ESG) that is expected is 'substantial compliance', not rigid adherence

# The Final Report: 'Findings' section

## Structure

- Parts II and III of the ESG should be fully covered
- Each ENQA criterion/ESG standard should be discussed separately

# The Final Report: 'Findings' section

## The 'evidence-analysis-conclusion' format.

Under each ENQA membership criterion/ESG standard, the report should include:

- **EVIDENCE:** a short description of the evidence gathered – making reference to documentation explored and meetings;
- **ANALYSIS:** a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the Agency does (or does not) meet the criterion/ESG standard; and
- **CONCLUSION** (judgement on compliance): in the opinion of the Panel, how compliant the Agency is with the criterion/ESG standard

# The Final Report: 'Findings' section

## The Conclusion

The CONCLUSION (judgement on compliance) sets out the Panel's opinion on how compliant the Agency is with the individual criterion/ESG standard, using one of the following descriptors:

- **fully compliant:** the Agency is entirely in accordance with the criterion/ESG standard, which is implemented in an effective manner;
- **substantially compliant:** the Agency is to a large extent in accordance with the criterion/ESG standard, the principle/spirit of which is followed in practice;
- **partially compliant:** some aspects or parts of the criterion/ESG standard are met while others are not. The interpretation of the criterion/ESG standard is correct, but the manner of implementation is not effective enough;
- **non-compliant:** the Agency fails to comply with the criterion/ESG standard.

# The Final Report: 'Findings' section

## EXAMPLE - QAA compliance with 2.3

### 2.3 Criteria for decisions

#### Standard:

Any formal decisions made as a result of an external quality assurance activity should be based on explicit published criteria that are applied consistently.

#### Guidelines:

Formal decisions made by quality assurance agencies have a significant impact on the institutions and programmes that are judged. In the interests of equity and reliability, decisions should be based on published criteria and interpreted in a consistent manner. Conclusions should be based on recorded evidence and agencies should have in place ways of moderating conclusions, if necessary.

QAA's criteria for its decision-making procedures are all widely published in its handbooks and in other operational documents. The Panel found these to be clearly and unambiguously expressed, explicit and consistent overall. The criteria themselves are based on the Academic Infrastructure and the Code of Practice and are well-founded. The peer review teams are well trained for their role through a rigorous and continuing training process. Overall management of the teams is in the hands of trained and professional assistant directors, who ensure that the judgements of the teams are defensible in terms of the evidence available to support them, and who are also responsible for exercising editorial control over the drafting of reports by the team members. All report drafts are required to include references to the sources of the supporting evidence for analyses and judgements. In essence, QAA adopts the policy of entrusting the judgements to the team members, while testing them and retaining control over the form of the reports.

#### Panel judgement:

Fully compliant

## Exploring an issue

- the review is a process of verification of the information provided in the self-evaluation report and other documentation and the exploration of any matters which are omitted from that documentation
- the review is an evidence-based process carried out by independent experts; the report produced must be sufficiently detailed to provide satisfactory assurance for the ENQA Board of the robustness of the review
- the report must provide sufficient, verified information which clearly shows that the ENQA membership criteria have been met.



# Example based on **ESG 3.6**

## **'Independence**

### **Standard:**

Agencies should be independent to the extent both that they have autonomous responsibility for their operations and that the conclusions and recommendations made in their reports cannot be influenced by third parties such as higher education institutions, ministries or other stakeholders.

### **Guidelines:**

An agency will need to demonstrate its independence through measures, such as:

- its operational independence from higher education institutions and governments is guaranteed in official documentation (e.g. instruments of governance or legislative acts)
- the definition and operation of its procedures and methods, the nomination and appointment of external experts and the determination of the outcomes of its quality assurance processes are undertaken autonomously and independently from governments, higher education institutions, and organs of political influence
- while relevant stakeholders in higher education, particularly students/learners, are consulted in the course of quality assurance processes, the final outcomes of the quality assurance processes remain the responsibility of the agency'

# AGAE (Andalusia)

## **'Independence' criterion**

- Extensive document review
- Inputs from:
  - Secretary General for the Regional Ministry of Innovation, Science and Enterprise
  - Chief Executive and staff
  - Senior University officers
  - Appointed Reviewers
  - Board members
  - Students

# QAA (UK)

## **'Independence' criterion**

- Extensive document review
- Inputs from:
  - Chairman of the Board of QAA
  - Higher Education Funding Council
  - Chief Executive and staff
  - Senior University officers
  - Appointed Reviewers
  - Students and national student Officers

# Gathering and recording the evidence

Consider using a simple mapping tool which:

- sets out each of the ESG/ENQA criteria individually
- allows the team in advance to record preliminary evidence against each standard and to identify possible lines for more detailed enquiry
- allows the team to map agreed issues to particular meetings and to record the outcome
- Provides in one place the factual basis for judgements

**PART 1: THE EUROPEAN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES**

<b>STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA</b>				<b>Issues for discussion</b>	<b>For session number</b>
Part 2: European standards and guidelines for the external quality assurance of higher education	2.1 Use of internal quality assurance procedures	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	2.2 Development of external quality assurance processes	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	2.3 Criteria for decisions	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	2.4 Processes fit for purpose	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	2.5 Reporting	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	2.6 Follow up procedures	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	2.7 Periodic reviews	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	2.8 System-wide analysis	Standard:	Guidelines:		
Part 3: European standards and guidelines for external quality assurance agencies	3.1 Use of external quality assurance procedures for higher education	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	3.2 Official status	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	3.3 Activities	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	3.4 Resources	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	3.5 Mission statement	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	3.6 Independence	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	3.7 External quality assurance criteria and processes used by the agencies	Standard:	Guidelines:		
	3.8 Accountability procedures	Standard:	Guidelines:		

**PART 2: OTHER ASPECTS OF [AGENCY X]'S WORK FOR CONSIDERATION AS PART OF THIS REVIEW, OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA.**

Activity	Sub-activity	Issues for discussion	For session number

**PART 3: PLANNING SCHEDULE FOR MEETINGS**

Day 1 <i>[date]</i>				
Time	Event	Person for interview	Issues for discussion	Lead Panel member

## Example.....

ESG No.	Standard	Guideline	Issues for discussion	Session Number/lead member
3.3. Activities	<b>Agencies should undertake external quality assurance activities (at institutional or programme level) on a regular basis</b>	These may involve evaluation, review, audit, assessment, accreditation or other similar activities and should be part of the core functions of the agency	e.g. –types, frequency and cycle of review(s)	?Meetings with: w-employers x-Agency reviewers y-Agency managers z-University representatives









# Questions and discussion

**Paul Mitchell**  
HE Consultant, UK

[mega.mitchell@btinternet.com](mailto:mega.mitchell@btinternet.com)

[www.megamitchell.com](http://www.megamitchell.com)

**Paul Mitchell**  
• 65 Holywell Avenue • Whitley Bay •  
• Tyne and Wear • UK •  
NE26 3AQ

**Tel: +44-(0)191-252-6611**

**Mobile: +44-(0)7770-385349**