

Breakout session II

ENQA Agency Review: strengths and weaknesses

Main conclusions

- **Compliance versus enhancement.** There seems to be an agreement regarding:
 - ✓ Applying a different approach to the **second review** (more enhancement oriented). However, it will still focus on compliance.
 - ✓ Including a **follow up** phase which would concentrate on other issues (enhancement of the agency; respond to the question: is this a “good” agency within its particular national context?). This follow up phase should be:
 - ✓ **Specific** (diversity of agencies). This probably means that the agency should actively participate in the composition of the team, evaluation modality, the definition of the scope of the follow up, etc.
 - ✓ It could benefit from a previous work from ENQA regarding **good practices**
- **Conditional membership for new member:**
 - ✓ There was a negative perception regarding this issue (under which conditions would this status be given? Wouldn't it be difficult to remove membership once it has been given?)
 - ✓ A suggestion has been made to rather have “candidate members”

Breakout session II

ENQA Agency Review: strengths and weaknesses

- **Public call for concerns**
 - There is an agreement regarding the fact that it would be good to increase stakeholder involvement during agencies reviews
 - However, to launch a public call for concerns would be problematic. How representative would these concerns be? What credit could we give to them? How to treat them?
 - As CHEA uses this method, the pros and cons of it could be investigated by contacting them.
 - Some alternative suggestions:
 - ✓ To ask for an official statement from the main stakeholders/ stakeholders organizations
 - ✓ To systematically look at the feedback reports prepared by the agencies on the different processes and at the complaints gathered.

Breakout session II

ENQA Agency Review: strengths and weaknesses

- **The role of the secretariat**
 - Giving a more active role to the secretariat during the visits seems like a good idea (i.e. to improve consistency).
 - However, several issues should be taken into account.
 - ✓ The roles within the audit team should be clarified (mainly to avoid overlaps with the secretary/chair)
 - ✓ The extra work burden should be assessed
 - ✓ The potential conflicts of interest should be considered (secretariat works with different agencies in European projects for example; would it be necessary to have dedicated staff for this task?)