

ENQA TARGETED REVIEW

# COMMISSION DES TITRES D'INGÉNIEUR (CTI)

TUE VINTHER-JØRGENSEN, SIMONA LACHE,  
MARION COY, AILSA CRUM,  
ARNOLDAS SOLOVJOVAS

24 APRIL 2024

# CONTENTS

<b>CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>BACKGROUND OF THE REVIEW AND OUTLINE OF THE REVIEW PROCESS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
BACKGROUND OF THE REVIEW .....	5
SCOPE OF THE REVIEW .....	5
MAIN FINDINGS OF THE 2018 REVIEW.....	6
REVIEW PROCESS.....	7
<b>CHANGES WITHIN THE AGENCY .....</b>	<b>9</b>
HIGHER EDUCATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM.....	9
CTI'S ORGANISATION/STRUCTURE .....	10
CTI'S FUNDING.....	10
CTI'S FUNCTIONS, ACTIVITIES, PROCEDURES.....	11
<b>FINDINGS: COMPLIANCE OF CTI WITH THE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (ESG) WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>ESG PART 3: QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCIES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>ESG PART 2: EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE .....</b>	<b>12</b>
ESG 2.1 CONSIDERATION OF INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE.....	12
ESG 2.2 DESIGNING METHODOLOGIES FIT FOR PURPOSE.....	22
ESG 2.3 IMPLEMENTING PROCESSES .....	24
ESG 2.4 PEER-REVIEW EXPERTS .....	27
ESG 2.5 CRITERIA FOR OUTCOMES.....	29
ESG 2.6 REPORTING.....	31
ESG 2.7 COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS.....	34
<b>ENHANCEMENT AREAS.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>ESG 3.6 INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE AND PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>OVERVIEW OF JUDGEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>38</b>

<b>SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>ANNEXES.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: GLOSSARY .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>ANNEX 4. DOCUMENTS TO SUPPORT THE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>54</b>
DOCUMENTS PROVIDED BY CTI.....	54
ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS PROVIDED BY CTI, BEFORE AND DURING THE VISIT, ON REQUEST OF THE REVIEW PANEL.....	54
OTHER SOURCES USED BY THE REVIEW PANEL.....	54

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report analyses the compliance of the Commission des titres d'ingénieur (CTI) with the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG 2015) Part 2 and 3. The report is based on an ENQA targeted peer review, following the methodology described in the Guidelines for ENQA Targeted Reviews and considering the *Use and Interpretation of the ESG* by the EQAR's Register Committee. In addition to the agency and its stakeholders, the report is meant to provide information for the ENQA Board's decision on CTI's renewal of membership and to EQAR to support the agency's reapplication to the register.

The external targeted review was conducted from September 2023 to April 2024, with a site visit of the review panel in charge of the evaluation taking place between December 6 and 8, 2023.

CTI was established by law in 1934 as a national quality assurance agency for the specific field of engineering, with the following aims, preserved until today: the accreditation of new engineering schools and programmes of the private sector, the evaluation of engineering programmes abroad leading to their recognition in France, and to advise on all issues regarding the engineering profession and education. Over the years, these missions have been expanded and include nowadays: the public sector HEIs; periodical review of all accredited engineering schools; the evaluation of institutional bachelor's programmes; the award of quality labels.

Based on the Terms of Reference for this targeted review, the panel has analysed the activities related to higher education falling under the scope of the ESG: accreditation of existing French and foreign engineering schools and programmes at Master's level, in France and abroad; evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level (academic grade of "Licence") – which is a new activity implemented since the last ENQA review; ex-ante accreditation of engineering schools and programmes of French institutions in France and at branch campuses abroad; attribution of the EUR-ACE label at Master level; quality labels for French and foreign institutions (CeQuint).

The ESGs specifically addressed in this targeted review are *2.1 Consideration of internal quality assurance*, *ESG 2.5 Criteria for outcomes*, *ESG 2.6 Reporting*, of which the latter two were found partially compliant at the last EQAR Register Committee's renewal decision, and standards 2.1 to 2.7 for the new activity introduced, i.e., *Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level* (academic grade of "Licence"). *ESG 3.6 Internal quality assurance and professional conduct* is addressed in the report as an enhancement area selected by CTI.

The panel considered the evidence given in the self-assessment report, additional evidence requested by the panel and provided by the agency (full list of additional documentation is in Annex 4) and performed an onsite visit which included meetings with a wide range of participants. The panel thoroughly analysed and discussed all the evidence and concluded that CTI complies with the ESGs as presented in the summary table below. Since the last ENQA review, the agency has made significant progress in relation to ESG 2.5 and 2.6, which were previously found partially compliant.

At the same time, the panel was impressed by the agency's concern to consider new approaches to evaluations for HEIs that have had multiple reviews in order to identify how new policies and procedures can assist the enhancement focus of its work, streamline procedures, reduce the burden on institutions, and explore risk-based and knowledge-based evaluations. When it comes to the selected enhancement area, the panel believes that the new information system of HEIs reviews, the developmental discussions with institutions based on themes arising from reviews and their recommendations, the stronger focus on follow-up or using the feedback from peer experts as well as that from the HEIs, are measures that could help CTI in achieving its goals for enhancement.

### Summary of agency's compliance with the ESG (Parts 2 and 3)

ESG	Compliance according to the targeted review <sup>1</sup>	Compliance transferred from the last full review <sup>2</sup>
2.1	Compliant	N/A
2.2	Compliant (for new QA activities only)	Fully compliant → Compliant (for QA activities reviewed during the previous full review only)
2.3	Compliant (for new QA activities only)	Substantially compliant → Compliant (for QA activities reviewed during the previous full review only)
2.4	Compliant (for new QA activities only)	Fully compliant → Compliant (for QA activities reviewed during the previous full review only)
2.5	Compliant	N/A
2.6	Compliant	N/A
2.7	Compliant (for new QA activities only)	Fully compliant → Compliant (for QA activities reviewed during the previous full review only)
3.1	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
3.2	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
3.3	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
3.4	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
3.5	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
3.6	Included in the targeted review as a self-selected enhancement area	Fully compliant → Compliant
3.7	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant

---

<sup>1</sup> Compliance refers to the focus areas that were evaluated in depth and are part of the Terms of Reference, i.e., standards that were only partially compliant with the ESG during the last full review, ESG Part 2 for newly introduced or changed QA activities of the agency, ESG 2.1 for all QA activities and any standard affected by substantive changes since the last full review. If any of the standards of Part 2 of the ESG are covered due to the newly introduced or changed QA activities, a remark "for new or changed QA activities only" is added in brackets to the compliance assessment.

<sup>2</sup> Compliance refers to the last EQAR Register Committee decision for renewal of inclusion on the Register, or in case when an agency is not renewing its registration in EQAR, compliance refers to the last ENQA Agency Review report and should its judgement differ from that of the panel, the judgement of the ENQA Board, as stipulated in the membership decision letter by the ENQA Board. Compliance refers to the QA activities of the agency that were reviewed during the previous full review.

# INTRODUCTION

This report analyses the compliance of the **Commission des titres d'ingénieur** (CTI) with the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG). It is based on an external review conducted in seven months (from September 2023 until April 2024) and should be read together with the external review report of the agency's last full review against the ESG.

## BACKGROUND OF THE REVIEW AND OUTLINE OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

### BACKGROUND OF THE REVIEW

ENQA's regulations require all member agencies to undergo an external cyclical review, at least once every five years, in order to verify that they act in compliance with the ESG as adopted at the Yerevan ministerial conference of the Bologna Process in 2015.

Registration on EQAR is the official instrument established by the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) for demonstrating an agency's ESG compliance. An external review is a prerequisite for registration.

CTI has been a member of the ENQA since 2005 and registered on EQAR since 2010. As CTI has undergone four successful reviews against the ESG Parts 2 and 3, it is eligible and has opted for a targeted review. The purpose of a targeted review is to ensure the agency's compliance with the ESG by covering standards that were found partially compliant during the agency's last renewal of registration in EQAR in 2019 and on standards that could have been affected by substantive changes<sup>3</sup> during the past five years while at the same time further strengthening the enhancement part of the review.

This targeted review and the findings of the panel are used for renewal of both CTI's ENQA membership and its listing on EQAR.

### SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

From the beginning of the review process, the panel took note of the Terms of Reference (ToR), which set the scope for the review. The following external quality assurance activities conducted by CTI are deemed to be within the scope:

- Accreditation of existing French and foreign engineering schools and programmes at Master's level, in France and abroad;
- Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level (academic grade of "Licence");
- Ex-ante accreditation of engineering schools and programmes of French Institutions, in France and on branch campuses abroad;
- Attribution of the EUR-ACE label at Master level;
- Quality labels of French and foreign institutions (CeQuint)

This report also deals with each of the focus areas below (ToR, page 2):

---

<sup>3</sup> e.g. organisational changes, the launch of new external QA activities.

1. Standards with a partial compliance conclusion in the Register Committee's last renewal decision:
  - a. ESG 2.5 – Criteria for outcomes: how the agency has addressed the shortcoming in ensuring consistency in its decision making;
  - b. ESG 2.6 – Reporting: to consider whether the agency started with full publication of all its review reports.
2. Standards 2.1 to 2.7 for the following activities: Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level.
3. ESG 2.1 Consideration of internal quality assurance.
4. Selected enhancement area: ESG 3.6 (Internal quality assurance and professional conduct).

For the ToR, please see Annex 2. For the glossary of terms used, please see Annex 3.

## MAIN FINDINGS OF THE 2018 REVIEW

The previous ENQA review took place in 2018 and its findings were also used for CTI's listing on EQAR. With respect to the ESG (2015) EQAR found CTI compliant with all the standards except for ESG 2.5 (Criteria for outcomes) and ESG 2.6 (Reporting), where the agency was found partially compliant. These are further elaborated in the section of this report presenting the current review's findings of CTI compliance with ESG (starting at page 12). EQAR concluded that, overall, CTI continued to comply substantially with the ESG.

The 2018 review also listed a couple of points of attention as recommendations to CTI on the specific standards:

- to develop follow-up procedures in the case of full accreditation. In order to limit administrative burden, CTI and HEIs might consider taking use of existing publication tools (e.g., conferences, certified data). The methods for follow-up should be implemented so that quality culture at the institutions will be further developed (ESG 2.3);
- to develop explicit criteria for conducting deliberations and decision-making, for improved consistency of decisions. They do not need to be mathematical but should still give a clear indication for the different types of decisions (ESG 2.5);
- to intensify efforts regarding the new template for panel reports in order to increase redactional uniformity and coherence. Full reports based on this new template should be publishable in a short period, given the fact that this recommendation has existed since the previous ENQA review (ESG 2.6).

After the external review in 2018, CTI was granted ENQA membership for five years and inclusion on the EQAR Register until 30 June 2023.

In 2021, the agency submitted to ENQA a follow-up report on recommendations in the panel report, which was approved by the ENQA Board.

In 2021, the agency submitted to EQAR a substantive change report for introducing a new external quality assurance activity: evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level. The Register Committee accepted this activity and noted that the current review should consider how CTI ensures consistency in its decision-making, considering in particular the previous issues raised by the panel in the previous review.

The review panel therefore acknowledges, in this report, the status of the ESG standards that were found to be in compliance with the ESG during the last full review, while at the same time addressing EQAR's remarks.

## REVIEW PROCESS

The 2023 external targeted review of CTI was conducted in line with the process described in the *Guidelines for ENQA Targeted Reviews*, the EQAR Procedures for Applications, and in accordance with the timeline set out in the Terms of Reference. The panel for the targeted review of CTI was appointed by ENQA and composed of the following members:

- Tue Vinther-Jørgensen (Chair), Assistant Manager at The Danish Agency for Higher Education and Science, Ministry of Higher Education and Science, Denmark, QA professional (ENQA nominee);
- Simona Lache (Secretary), Professor, and Vice-rector for Internationalization and Quality Evaluation, Transilvania University of Brasov, Romania, academic (EUA nominee);
- Marion Coy, Former President, Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Ireland, additional panel member;
- Ailsa Crum, Director of Membership, Quality Enhancement & Standards, Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), UK, QA professional (ENQA nominee)
- Arnoldas Solovjovas, PhD studies in laser technologies, Vilnius University, Lithuania, student (ESU nominee, member of the European Students' Union Quality Assurance Student Experts Pool).

Ms. Fiona Crozier (Higher Education consultant) acted as the ENQA review coordinator.

CTI elaborated a self-assessment report (SAR) which, in conjunction with the documents produced for and as a result of the 2018 ENQA review, provided the basis for the review panel's work. Panel members received the SAR from CTI on 17 September 2023 and immediately began to evaluate its contents according to the provisions of the ToR. The panel's introductory meeting with the ENQA coordinator took place online, on 20 October 2023, and was followed by the panel's kick-off session and the clarification meeting with the agency's resource person – both held online, on 20 November 2023. The meeting with the agency's resource person, also attended by the director of CTI, helped to clarify the agency's changes since the last full review against the ESG and to understand the background and motive of the agency's choice of the self-selected ESG standard for enhancement (next to the overall HE and QA context of the agency).

Three weeks prior to the site-visit, the secretary of the panel had to be supported by another person for the period of the actual site-visit to CTI in Paris, due to health reasons. Consequently, Ms. Marion Coy, Former President, Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Ireland, stepped into the position of additional panel member during the site-visit. Ms. Simona Lache remained the secretary of the panel contributing to the site-visit preparation and post site-visit work and also participating on-line to the site-visit. The agency was informed about the situation and agreed to the new arrangements.

The review panel's pre-visit meeting and preparations for day 1 were organised in hybrid mode on 5 December 2023. The panel conducted an onsite visit to CTI from 6 to 8 December 2023, where it further examined both the claims made in the self-assessment report and cross-checked other evidence as provided by the agency. The panel was also able to clarify any points at issue. The working language was English during the entire process of interaction with the agency, with translation provided when needed by an independent interpreter. Finally, the review panel produced the external review report based on the following sources: the SAR, additional information provided



by the agency upon the panel's request, information collected during the site visit, and other evidence (e.g., website, previous external evaluation reports). In doing so, the panel provided an opportunity for CTI to comment on the factual accuracy of the draft report. The review panel confirms that it was given access to all documents and persons it wished to consult throughout the review process.

### **Self-assessment report**

As described by the agency in the SAR, the self-evaluation process took about eight months and involved discussions and feedback from CTI members, staff, special advisors, and main stakeholders. The agency appointed a SAR working group formed by five CTI members, one former CTI member (now special advisor for internal quality assurance), one special advisor (for strategic issues) and one representative of the permanent staff, which conducted the process, produced the self-evaluation report, and discussed it with the CTI Board and members during the plenary sessions. While elaborating the SAR, the working group was assisted by the CTI working group on internal quality assurance, whose members provided feedback and shared their views. The draft of this document was also presented to the main stakeholders (i.e., Ministry of Higher Education & Research, association of the deans of engineering schools – CDEFI, national association of engineering students – BNEI), and CTI considered their feedback when completing the final version. The review panel could see during the interviews that all the participants knew about the SAR and its content.

The SAR was approved by the CTI Board on 27 June 2023, by the Plenary Assembly on 11 July 2023 and was sent to ENQA in September 2023.

The SAR included a summary regarding the higher education system in France and the engineering profession and education, as well as useful information about CTI in the national and European context. It then continued with the description of major evolutions of the agency since the previous ENQA review, in 2018 and tackled the substantive change of 2020 (i.e., the new mission assigned by the ministry in charge of higher education on external quality assurance of institutional bachelor's degrees offered by accredited engineering schools) under ESG Part 2. Fully following the Terms of reference of this review, the SAR addressed ESG 2.1 to all external quality assurance activities conducted by CTI and the updates on these activities to comply with ESG 2.5 and 2.6, which were found as 'partial compliant' at the 2018 review. In the final part, explanations regarding the self-selected standard for enhancement (ESG 3.6 *Internal quality assurance and professional conduct*) were provided, followed by a global SWOT analysis.

The review panel highly appreciated the SAR, considering it very well structured, analytical and concise, and containing both useful information for the experts and relevant findings for the agency to support further enhancement. The panel read it in conjunction with the documents of the previous ENQA full review (SAR, ERR, etc.) and with other additional material requested from the agency to get a complete image and understanding of CTI and its operations.

### **Site visit**

The site visit took place in person, between 6 - 8 December 2023, and was preceded by pre-visit/preparatory meetings, according to the visit schedule (Annex I); the review panel's secretary participated online in all activities. The visit schedule was agreed upon with the agency. The panel found the visit to be thorough and well organised, offering the opportunity to meet and interview all key internal and external stakeholders of the agency, including the CTI's President and Executive director, CTI members and permanent staff, heads, and directors of studies from Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), members of the experts' pool, students involved in external QA activities and BNEI student association leaders, and other stakeholders. The discussions in the meetings were

triangulated with the self-assessment report and the documentary evidence as provided by the agency in advance, which altogether allowed the panel to come to conclusions and judgements on the compliance as presented in this report. A special session was organised to discuss the self-selected enhancement area (ESG 3.6) with a wide range of participants: CTI members, staff, special advisors, and stakeholders. The dialogue was productive and insightful. The agency staff were open to feedback and suggestions and were very efficient in responding to the panel's requests, which allowed for meaningful conversations and clear understanding about the agency's operations.

The panel wishes to convey its thanks to all involved parties that dedicated their time to meet with and help the panel to better understand the activities of CTI and the context within which it operates. The frankness of communication and the openness shown by the interviewees are highly appreciated.

At the end of the site visit, the panel held a final internal meeting to discuss and agree on the preliminary conclusions on the level of compliance of CTI on each of the ESG standards under the scope of the targeted review. At the same time, the panel discussed the main findings on ESG 3.6 and formulated suggestions for enhancement accordingly. An oral feedback report was provided to the agency during the final debriefing session. The panel secretary drafted the report in cooperation with the rest of the panel. The draft report was submitted to CTI for fact checking on 15<sup>th</sup> of February 2024. The finalized version was sent to ENQA on 18<sup>th</sup> of March 2024.

## CHANGES WITHIN THE AGENCY

### HIGHER EDUCATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

The higher education system in France is regulated by the Ministry of Higher Education and Research and includes bachelor's, master's and doctorate studies accessible to all high school graduates who passed the final exam, i.e., the "baccalauréat" ('A' level equivalent).

External quality assurance at institutional level, for national bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees and research is carried out by the Haut conseil de l'évaluation de la recherche et de l'enseignement supérieur (Hcéres), while the Conférence des écoles et formations de gestion (CEFDG) evaluates the programmes of management schools, and the French Commission des titres d'ingénieur (CTI) evaluates the engineering schools. Since 1984, the evaluation by CTI of new programmes of French public HEIs became mandatory by law, and since 1997, all existing engineering programmes (by private and public HEIs) have to undergo a periodical evaluation procedure by CTI.

Besides the existing 5-year programmes that lead to the Master's level award in engineering in France, a parallel track for the new 3-year Bachelor awards was created in response to market demand regarding the shortage of appropriately skilled manpower and the need for middle-management expertise. Although initially not part of the CTI accreditation framework, the new Bachelor programmes in the engineering domain have been externally evaluated and accredited by the agency starting in early 2020, following new national regulations. Thus, the Ministry ensured that this unregulated development was subsumed into the existing framework following established QA policies and procedures that were aligned with the ENQA Standards and Guidelines and asked CTI to undertake this mission.

The cooperation between Hcéres and CTI has a long and positive history, based on mutual good will. At the beginning of 2022 this was formalised under the new law of research and its implementing decree. The two agencies undertake joint projects and work closely on European projects to ensure a coherent "French voice". While Hcéres evaluates all research activities in French HEIs, it has developed, together with CTI, some common institutional evaluation processes

in order to reduce duplication and to assist HEIs in reducing bureaucratic overload. This work was interrupted by the pandemic but has now been resumed.

## CTI'S ORGANISATION/STRUCTURE

There have been no changes in the structure or organisation of CTI since the review in 2018. Information on the agency's internal structure is published on its website: <https://www.cti-commission.fr/en/la-cti/organisation/lassemblee-pleniere>. The core is formed by 32 CTI members, appointed by the ministry in charge of higher education and which represents equally both components of the engineering education - academia and professional life: 8 professionals representing employers' organisations; 8 professionals representing trade unions and engineers' associations; 8 academic staff from HEIs under the ministry of higher education; 5 academic staff from HEIs under other ministries and 3 experts in science and technology. The 32 CTI members constitute the plenary assembly of CTI. The plenary assembly elects a board of maximum 9 persons among its members. With the elected president and 2 vice-presidents, they form the CTI board of a maximum of 12 members.. The executive director of CTI, the audit process managers of the permanent staff, the registrars as well as a student nominee also attend the board meetings. The main task of the board is to prepare the meetings of the plenary assembly.

The executive director of CTI is in charge of the day-to-day management of the organisation, including human resources: permanent staff as well as of a number of special consultants, who are employed on time limited contracts and work on specific tasks at CTI.

CTI currently operates according to the strategic objectives set for the period 2023-2027, focused on continuing to carry out its major mission of external quality assurance in the engineering field, including the new activity of evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level.

## CTI'S FUNDING

Since the SAR does not provide information regarding the CTI funding, the review panel relied on the 2018 ENQA Report and the site visit in 2023 and concludes there were no significant changes in funding since the last review. The total annual budget of CTI's services to engineering degree programmes (accreditation, national and international representation, etc.), including staff salaries, administrative operator's and experts' fees for management and evaluation, is formed by four sources: 1)- a grant from the ministry as a counterpart for CTI's mission of public service; 2)- contributions of the French HEIs as a counterpart for the CTI action in the promotion of the engineering studies, in the representation of the engineering education in national and international organisations; 3)- revenues from accreditation activities abroad (which are billed to the institutions on a full-cost basis); 4)- The billed expertise fees (used to pay the experts).

The institutions under review are responsible for the direct costs of the site visits (experts' travel, accommodation, and food). CTI's most important expense line is represented by staff costs; other categories are the rent, the operational expenses and the annual training sessions of members and experts. As the panel learned from the previous ENQA report, the budget is balanced. During the current review there was no information given to the panel to make it think otherwise.

## CTI'S FUNCTIONS, ACTIVITIES, PROCEDURES

Except for the new external quality assurance (EQA) activity introduced since the previous ENQA review, the agency's functions, activities, and procedures are being implemented as described in the 2018 ENQA report.

The new EQA activity of 'Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level' was undertaken by CTI in 2020, as the result of the desire of the government to create a national recognition framework for the 3-year programmes which HEIs had already created outside the existing national Quality Assurance (QA) framework. The stated intention of these programmes was to prepare participants for direct entry into employment. Entry into the existing 5-year programme is very selective in France and the new Bachelor is intended to broaden access to engineering. It is possible to transfer to the parallel Master's track of 5-year programme, but it requires an additional year of study to complete requisite additional modules in maths and science – thus a total of 6 years' study for any students who take this pathway.

The arrival of the pandemic coincided with the preparatory and pilot phases of this new EQA activity and, of necessity, required the development of an on-line procedure for the site visits. However, there is a general agreement: the fact that CTI was asked to undertake the accreditation of the new Bachelor programmes in the engineering domain has ensured consistency in the approach to accreditation and to the establishment of national standards.

# FINDINGS: COMPLIANCE OF CTI WITH THE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (ESG) WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

## ESG PART 3: QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCIES

The present targeted review does not include the ESG Part 3 standards, as the EQAR Register Committee found CTI compliant with ESG 3.1-3.7. The compliance is therefore transferred to this review.

## ESG PART 2: EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

### ESG 2.1 CONSIDERATION OF INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

Standard:

External quality assurance should address the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance processes described in Part I of the ESG.

### 2018 review recommendation:

EQAR Register Committee decision: 'The Register Committee therefore underlined that CTI is expected to report such substantial changes in its methodology immediately after they are adopted. CTI is thus expected to provide without delay a change report providing further information, i.e., mapping of its new R&O against ESG Part I.'

### Evidence

According to the Terms of Reference, the review panel is supposed to consider all external quality assurance (EQA) activities of CTI when assessing ESG 2.1.

The CTI major criteria for accreditation of engineering schools & degrees (Références et Orientations – R&O) are generally the same as in the last ENQA review; some additions have been made in the version of 2023, leading to increased emphasis on ecological transition and societal and environmental responsibility in the engineering education.

The structure of the R&O is still the same with the same organisation of the criteria in a number of chapters (from A to G), corresponding to the following topics:

- A. The engineering school and its governance
- B. The school's management: steering, organisation and quality system
- C. External links and partnerships
- D. The engineering degree curriculum
- E. Student selection and admission
- F. Student life and student community life
- G. Professional integration of graduates.

CTI developed a set of standards and criteria for the new accreditation process for Bachelor's programmes in Sciences and Engineering (BSE) in 2020 when it was assigned the task of evaluating engineering programmes at Bachelor's level. The structure of the pilot version of the document 'BSE Standards & Criteria' was reorganised in 2023 so that it matches the one of the R&O without changing the requirements of the criteria (SAR p.8). The SAR provides a mapping grid on how the BSE Standards & Criteria take into account ESG part I, which is presented in Table I.

Table I. Consideration of ESG Part I in the BSE Standards & Criteria

ESG Part I	BSE Standards & Criteria 2023
<p><b>I.1. Policy for quality assurance</b></p> <p>Standard: Institutions should have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.</p>	<p>Chapter B of the BSE Standards &amp; Criteria puts a special focus on IQA and the compliance with part I of the ESG:</p> <p><i>“The school is committed to quality and continuous improvement in the implementation and results of its various activities. The school ensures in particular the transparency of its processes and the implementation of its societal and environmental responsibility strategy. The school organises resources and implements measures to ensure the continuous quality of its educational offer and its overall management. To this aim, it complies with the national and European recommendations (see ESG-I) on quality management.”</i></p> <p>Chapters A and C put a particular stress on the involvement of the stakeholders:</p> <p>A.3: <i>“The school has a strong governance involving all its stakeholders in its strategic decisions.”</i></p> <p>A.4.2: <i>“The school's training programmes are based on its own research and innovation activities, or in partnership with or relying on identified research laboratories in its environment whose quality is recognized by the scientific community (Hcéres evaluation or equivalent evaluation abroad) as well as by the socio-economic sectors”.</i></p> <p>C: <i>“The school is strongly integrated in its local, national, European and international environment; it is fully aware that this openness to the outside world is a fundamental dimension that enables it to carry out its mission with quality; it establishes partnerships with counterpart institutions and its stakeholders, in particular employers and communities. It reports on the partnerships developed for the implementation of the programme with its public or private partners and other collaborations: agreements, research activities, joint programmes”.</i></p> <p>A specific chapter (F) deals with the quality of the student life and the student's welcome and integration.</p>
<p><b>I.2. Design and approval of programmes</b></p> <p>Standard: Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes</p>	<p>Section A.4.1 on the school's missions, clearly states: <i>“The engineering school has a global strategy for its educational offer; it is clear, diversified and adapted to the needs. The school offers engineering and bachelor's programmes, initial and/or continuing education, based on clear objectives, which are consistent with and complementary to the overall educational offer of the institution and</i></p>

should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area

the site.”

Chapter C is dedicated to External links and Partnerships and states that stakeholders such as professionals from industry, employers, researchers, teaching staff and students should be *“involved in the school's governance bodies, as well as in the design and implementation of the bachelor's programmes”*.

Chapter D is entirely devoted to the design and organisation of the BSE programmes. It includes a list of general learning outcomes of any BSE programme, grouped under 3 items: *“Acquisition of scientific and technical knowledge and command of its implementation; Adaptation to the specific requirements of a company and society; Awareness of the organisational, personal and cultural dimension.”*

Chapter D further states:

*“The programme design meets identified and significant needs for scientific, technical, industrial and organisational skills from one or more professional sectors and society. It aims at a direct professional integration after graduation or at further studies at master's level in France or abroad.”*

*“For each bachelor's degree for which the school wishes to obtain the "Licence" academic grade, the school designs a framework of competencies which the students will have achieved upon graduation.”*

*“This framework complies with the school's identity and represents a vision of the programme shared by the entire teaching staff and professional stakeholders.”*

*“The set of acquired skills, knowledge and abilities is referred to as “acquis d'apprentissage” in French, in line with the corresponding concept of “achieved learning outcomes” in the standards defined at European level”.*

*“The curriculum is available internally and externally, it is clear and structured into teaching units (TU) and constituent elements of teaching units (ECUE). It is built in compliance with the Bologna process, in particular with the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS). It should be available in English and French. For each teaching unit and constituent element, it gives the hourly workload by pedagogical modality (classes, tutorials, practical works, projects, distance learning), as well as the estimate of the student's personal workload.”*

*“The definition of learning outcomes contributes to a good communication between the school and its stakeholders, mainly applicants, students and the professional sector.”*

*“A dialogue structure is organised within the school (ex: Development Board). This structure is responsible for designing and updating the programme so that it remains in line with the needs of industry and*

	<p><i>the business community. It validates the training objectives and keeps track of the results.”</i></p> <p><i>“The school has defined and approved with its deliberative bodies a study regulation, basis of the deliberations of the juries. This regulation is made public and communicated to each student upon arrival at the school. The regulation describes in particular the conditions of validation of the teaching units (TU), semesters and the bachelor’s degree.”</i></p> <p><i>“The BSE programmes should enable students to develop skills at level 6 of the National and the European Qualifications Frameworks (RNCP &amp; EQF), which implies the acquisition of knowledge, know- how and skills necessary for their development.”</i></p> <p><i>“A form is completed in the "Répertoire national des certifications professionnelles" (National Register of Professional Certifications - RNCP) [...]. The RNCP form is consistent with the detailed curriculum, the competence-based approach and is regularly updated.”</i></p>
<p><b>I.3. Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment</b></p> <p>Standard: Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach.</p>	<p>The introduction of chapter D of the BSE Standards &amp; Criteria clearly states: <i>“Students are placed at the centre of the training process”</i>.</p> <p>Chapter E on Student Selection and Admission insists on the diversity of the students and their needs:</p> <p><i>“The school should ensure that candidates’ previous training and abilities are sufficient to achieve the programme objectives, allow the award of the degree.”</i></p> <p><i>“The school ensures the diversity of geographical and social origins of its students. It [...] develops a specific scholarship policy; it includes support for international mobility.”</i></p> <p><i>“The school defines and implements actions to strengthen gender diversity.”</i></p> <p><i>“The school has established specific actions for the organisation of tests, recruitment and accessibility for students with disabilities and students defined as “unable to attend.”</i></p> <p>Section D.3.1 clearly specifies that the students take an active role in their studies:</p> <p><i>“Along with the acquisition of skills, students accordingly monitor their progress with an individualized support provided by the school's services.”</i></p> <p>The student’s active involvement is confirmed in section D.3.4: <i>Personal work and the development of students’ autonomy are essential to the development of skills.”</i></p> <p>Section D.3.2 mentions the expected flexibility of the programmes:</p> <p><i>“The targeted outcome level for each expected competency should allow</i></p>



*a certain level of flexibility in the curriculum (elective subjects, optional pathway), but each student should have the opportunity to develop all the intended bachelor's learning outcomes described in the BSE Standards & Criteria (possibly at different levels depending on the chosen pathway)."*

Section D.3.1 also indicates that specific services and support must be provided for students with special needs, including assessment:

*"Adjustments to studies and assessments should be made on a case-by-case basis to take into account the individual situations related for instance to disability. Specific pathways may be planned for learners who are unable to attend courses (athletes, musicians, students involved in community work or victims of life accidents, etc.). [...] Specific pedagogical support schemes are set up to meet the needs of students in specific social situations and to promote their success."*

Section D.3.1 further deals with failures and appeals:

*"The regulation sets out the measures that can be taken in the event of non-validation of TUs or semesters, as well as the possibilities and modalities of appeal for a student. The procedure for collecting and dealing with appeals are set up and described in the study regulation."*

Different modes of delivery are encouraged in section D.3.4:

*"The school develops a pedagogy adapted to the competence-based approach, i.e. using many ideally transdisciplinary situations (projects, case studies, design office, problem-based learning) and favouring learner-centred educational methods (active pedagogy in general, such as flipped classroom, classes in large interactive audiences, scientific debates, group work, etc.). Pedagogical innovations, either face-to-face or in distance, are encouraged, developed and shared. They are evaluated on a regular basis. The school has an educational innovation plan."*

Student life and welfare is an essential element of the training, described in sections F1 and F2:

*"The school welcomes students and ensures the quality of their integration in the school and in the programme. A Welcome Booklet or equivalent is provided to each student."*

*"The school effectively communicates to students the study regulation and its rules of procedure."*

*"After analysing the situation, the school sets up the necessary training courses to harmonise the levels of admission. Educational support schemes or personalised training pathways are set up to meet the students' needs and promote their success."*

*"The school considers that student life, especially in its associative, civic, sports and cultural dimensions, is fundamental for the achievement of the programme outcomes and contributes to it. All students and apprentices should take part in student life and the school is*

	<p><i>encouraged to recognize student involvement.”</i></p> <p>Students, as major stakeholders, take an active role in all the school’s activities and decision making, chapter A.3: <i>“The school has a strong governance involving all its stakeholders in its strategic decisions.”</i> During an evaluation process, the Cti expert panels check the effective participation of the students in the decision-making bodies of the schools. This criterium is also part of the R&amp;O Major Criteria for engineering degree programmes which means that in order to be accredited, engineering schools must have student representatives in their decision-making bodies. The bachelor’s students, as a major stakeholder, could however be specifically mentioned in the design and decision-making processes, which will be the case in the 2024 version of the BSE Standards &amp; Criteria.</p>
<p><b>I.4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification</b></p> <p>Standard: Institutions should consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student “life cycle”, e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification.</p>	<p>The preceding section already mentioned the dedicated Chapter E on Student selection and Admission and Chapter F on Student Life and Student Community Life which are important elements of any bachelor’s programme.</p> <p>Chapter D on the Bachelor’s Curriculum describes in detail the organisation of the studies and validation of the expected Learning Outcomes and degree.</p> <p>Section D.3.1 explicitly states that: <i>“The school has defined and approved with its deliberative bodies a study regulation, basis of the deliberations of the juries. This regulation is made public and communicated to each student upon arrival at the school. The regulation describes in particular the conditions of validation of the teaching units (TU), semesters and the bachelor’s degree. The regulation sets out the measures that can be taken in the event of non-validation of TUs or semesters, as well as the possibilities and modalities of appeal for a student. The procedure for collecting and dealing with appeals are set up and described in the study regulation.”</i></p>
<p><b>I.5. Teaching staff</b></p> <p>Standard: Institutions should assure themselves of the competence of their teachers. They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff.</p>	<p>The CTI puts a particular stress on the teacher-student ratio; teaching staff’s workload; background, qualification and positions of the teaching staff; pedagogical innovation and the necessary link to research in the teaching.</p> <p>In Chapter A on the Engineering School and its Governance, a specific section (A.5.1) deals with human resources:</p> <p><i>“The school relies on a sufficient number of teachers, qualified teacher-researchers, as well as administrative and technical staff to define and implement its educational project. The school’s participation to a site policy can be set up to ensure the meaningful participation of teacher-researchers in the programmes and to meet the quality requirements of research supported training programmes.”</i></p> <p>The provided evidence must include:</p>

*“Temporary teaching staff from industry: Taught topics, status, main occupation; Numbers, working hours and percentage.”*

*“Temporary teaching staff from other HE institutions and research bodies: Taught topics, status (tenure, exchanges...), main occupation, Numbers, working hours and percentage.”*

*“Number and proportion of permanent teachers in the programme.”*

*“Number and proportion of teachers with a PhD in the relevant fields in the programme.”*

*“Number and proportion of teacher-researchers in the relevant fields among the teaching staff of the programme.”*

A dedicated section (D.3.5) indicates:

*“For each BSE programme and on each campus where it is operated, the school manages its teaching staff carefully: balance between the school's permanent teaching staff and temporary teachers, teachers' workload, resources allocated to the teaching, etc.”*

*“The school ensures that its students are supervised by permanent teachers and teacher-researchers at each of its campuses, so that the students can be properly monitored and supported throughout their studies.”*

*“According to the criteria table of the academic grade, at least 40% of scientific and technical teachings are carried out by the school's permanent staff (or by teachers from higher education institutions with which a training agreement has been signed for the specific programme) and at least 25% of the bachelor's scientific and technical courses are taught, on each campus, by the school's permanent teacher-researchers (or from a partner higher education institution with which a training agreement has been signed for the specific programme).”*

*The target for courses taught by temporary teachers from the socio-economic world is 25% of the total bachelor's programme for each campus. A ratio of less than 20% must be justified.”*

Innovation in teaching methods is encouraged, section D.3.4: *“Pedagogical innovations, either face-to-face or in distance, are encouraged, developed and shared. They are evaluated on a regular basis. The school has an educational innovation plan.”*

The workload of the teaching staff is an important aspect of the Cti's evaluation processes:

A.4.2: *“The school's teacher-researchers have sufficient working time to carry out their research activities.”*

In the BSE Standards & Criteria, all direct references to the staff are mostly from the point of view of their background and competencies, the quality of the programmes and efficiency of the student monitoring. The focus is not really on the development

	<p>and well-being of the staff itself (apart from the workload) although these elements are checked during the site visits. It may however be stressed that the BSE Standards &amp; Criteria point out the importance of the Corporate Societal and Environmental Responsibility (CSR) which obviously includes <i>“fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff”</i>: Chapter A: <i>“The school has built a strategy for social and environmental responsibility that is part of its organisation, its management and each of its missions. It is broken down into objectives which are monitored.”</i></p> <p>Also, prior to a bachelor’s evaluation process, the staff development and career opportunities have already been checked at institutional level during the accreditation process of the engineering schools and degree programmes. The fair human resources management and staff development could however be specifically mentioned and will be added in the 2024 version for the bachelor’s programmes.</p>
<p><b>1.6. Learning resources and student support</b></p> <p>Standard: Institutions should have appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and ensure that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided.</p>	<p>Since the CTI evaluates exclusively bachelor’s programmes from accredited engineering schools, the learning resources are assessed on a regular basis through the periodical evaluation of engineering degree programmes.</p> <p>The BSE Standards &amp; Criteria therefore focus on the programme part and on the resources specifically allocated to these programmes.</p> <p>The resources are specifically mentioned in section A.5. and section A.5.2 and in Chapter B:</p> <p><i>“The school's governance bodies should ensure that necessary and appropriate resources are allocated to provide the training.”</i></p> <p><i>“Facilities and physical resources are sufficient to achieve the pedagogic goals in good conditions, particularly for the students: premises dedicated to the teaching, computer resources, multimedia documentation centre, high-tech platforms, etc.”</i></p> <p><i>“The school organises resources and implements measures to ensure the continuous quality of its educational offer and its overall management”.</i></p> <p>The students’ support and services have already been mentioned with ESG. 1.3 above.</p>
<p><b>1.7. Information management</b></p> <p>Standard: Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other</p>	<p>With their self-evaluation reports, the engineering schools have to provide reliable data described in the annexes 2 and 4 of the BSE Standards &amp; Criteria, regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Academic background of admitted students;</li> <li>- Social background of the students and available financial support;</li> <li>- Number, profile and professional background of the teaching staff, teacher-student ratio;</li> </ul>

<p>activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Professional integration of the graduates;</li> <li>- Local and regional cooperation policy;</li> <li>- International mobility of students and teaching staff;</li> <li>- Quality approach;</li> <li>- Detailed syllabus.</li> </ul> <p>In order to facilitate the monitoring of these data, each school is requested to set up an internal digital portal in which essential documents and data are stored and updated annually. Considered as items of evidence for each evaluation process, these documents will thus be made available to the expert panels during an assessment and contribute to the school's internal quality assurance.</p>
<p><b>I.8. Public Information</b></p> <p>Standard: Institutions should publish information about their activities, including programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible.</p>	<p>Chapter B: <i>“The school ensures in particular the transparency of its processes”.</i></p> <p>Section D.1: <i>“This framework [of competencies] complies with the school’s identity and represents a vision of the programme shared by the entire teaching staff and professional stakeholders. It also serves as a communication tool downstream (for future learners), upstream (for employers) and internally to manage the programme.”</i></p> <p>Section D.3.1: <i>“The school has defined and approved with its deliberative bodies a study regulation, basis of the deliberations of the juries. This regulation is made public and communicated to each student upon arrival at the school”.</i></p> <p>D.3.3: <i>“The curriculum is available internally and externally”.</i></p> <p>D.1: <i>“A form is completed in the "Répertoire national des certifications professionnelles" (National Register of Professional Certifications - RNCP) [...]. The RNCP form is consistent with the detailed curriculum, the competence-based approach and is regularly updated.”</i></p>
<p><b>I.9. On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes</b></p> <p>Standard: Institutions should monitor and periodically review their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society. These reviews should lead to continuous improvement of the programme. Any action planned or taken as a result should be communicated to all those concerned.</p>	<p>Amongst the CTI’s major requirements for the HEIs is the existence of an observatory of societal evolutions and expected competencies, job profiles and labour market in the relevant sectors as well as advisory boards with representatives from industry.</p> <p>Section D.1: <i>“The programme meets an identified professional need. A dialogue structure is organised within the school (ex: Development Board). This structure is responsible for designing and updating the programme so that it remains in line with the needs of industry and the business community. It validates the training objectives and keeps track of the results. The school should demonstrate that these data are put in line with the regional, national and international context and allow to assess the validity of the project in terms of opportunities and student recruitment.”</i></p> <p>The link between training and research is a major criterium for</p>

	<p>the CTI.</p> <p>A.4.2: <i>“The school's training programmes are based on its own research and innovation activities, or in partnership with or relying on identified research laboratories in its environment [...] The school provides its students with a research environment on each of its sites involving permanent teacher-researchers and, on its own or in partnership, materials dedicated to research, premises, platforms, etc.”</i></p> <p>Satisfaction surveys and stakeholders' involvement must lead to continuous programme improvements. The number and outcomes of the surveys are part of the evidence and indicators to be provided with the HEIs' self-assessment reports.</p>
<p><b>I.10. Cyclical external quality assurance</b></p> <p>Standard: Institutions should undergo external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis.</p>	<p>The academic grade may be awarded to an institutional bachelor's degree for a maximum period of five years before the engineering school has to undergo a new evaluation process.</p> <p>Each CTI recommendation regarding the academic grade includes recommendations for improvement. The implementation of these recommendations is an important part of the following evaluation process.</p>

## Analysis

The panel fully supports the analysis made by the ENQA review panel in 2018 and still finds it valid, as the content and structure of the R&O are basically unchanged since the last review.

The analysis of the more recently developed BSE Standards & Criteria leads to the same conclusion as the structure and general content are basically the same as for the R&O.

HEI representatives, experts and CTI members all expressed their satisfaction with the high degree of alignment between the BSE Standards & Criteria and the general R&O.

The panel found that the references provided by the agency are largely supported by the evidence found in specific documentation (methodologies and other documents issued by the agency, external review reports) and widely confirmed by the interviewees (Ministry, HEIs and experts from the reviewers' pool).

It is, therefore, the view of the panel that the agency's EQA activities are aligned with ESG 2.1; from all the documents seen and discussions held during the site visit, the conclusion can be drawn that the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance processes within institutions is rigorously considered and evaluated in a meaningful manner.

The evaluation criteria of all procedures - existing as well as the new one (i.e. Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level) - effectively translate the standards of ESG Part I (Table I). Based on its meetings with stakeholders, it is clear to the panel that the agency's work has contributed to the development of internal quality assurance in the French Engineering Schools.

**Panel conclusion: compliant**

## ESG 2.2 DESIGNING METHODOLOGIES FIT FOR PURPOSE

**Standard:**

External quality assurance should be defined and designed specifically to ensure its fitness to achieve the aims and objectives set for it, while taking into account relevant regulations. Stakeholders should be involved in its design and continuous improvement.

### **2018 review recommendation:** none

#### **Evidence**

According to the Terms of Reference, the review panel is supposed to primarily focus on the new external quality assurance (EQA) activity of CTI (accreditation of Bachelor's programmes in Sciences and Engineering (BSE)) when assessing ESG 2.2.

The decision to have a formal evaluation and accreditation process for Bachelor's programmes in Sciences and Engineering (BSE) was made by the Ministry of Higher Education and Research in January 2020. CTI was assigned to prepare the policies and guidelines for engineering programmes, in order to ensure consistency and coherency with the existing framework of engineering programme evaluations and accreditations.

During the interviews, CTI staff and members reported on the tight time frame involved in the introduction of the new EQA activity of Bachelor evaluations and the importance of moving swiftly to pre-empt further unregulated development of new programmes (since this had already started in some HEIs).

CTI decided to use its existing standards and guidelines and then designed a process to incorporate the additional requirements specified by the Ministry. The design of the methodology (i.e., 'BSE Standards & Criteria' and 'BSE Evaluation Process') included consultation with all stakeholders, as the review panel was able to learn from the SAR and as confirmed during interviews with student union representatives, representatives from professional life, and from the Ministry. The Ministry representatives specifically told the review panel of their on-going consultation with social and economic partners and how, for example, their findings and conclusions from this consultation was provided to CTI to assist it in developing the criteria and procedures for BSE evaluations.

Amendments to the BSE standards & criteria were made after the first round of evaluations (pilot phase), based on CTI's internal feedback and comments received from the main stakeholders (CTI members and experts, Ministry of Higher Education and Research, students, and engineering schools). Other quality assurance agencies (CEFDG and Hcéres) were also involved in order to ensure harmonisation.

Regarding the changes to BSE criteria in 2022/ 2023 mentioned in the SAR, the panel learned from the CTI staff that these are intended to align the BSE Standards & Criteria with the general R&O criteria and place a greater emphasis on gathering both social and environmental information about institutions. The interview with representatives from professional life showed that the development of these criteria has been welcomed by stakeholders, and they were described as particularly significant in all the engineering disciplines. The new criteria do not affect the process for follow-up, as HEIs involved in follow-up procedures are expected to follow the criteria in place at the time of their evaluations.

The panel read in the SAR that the BSE methodology is annually updated taking into account stakeholders' feedback, and formally presented during the conference (the colloquium) that CTI organises at the beginning of each year. All stakeholders the panel was able to speak with knew about the event and consider it very useful for ensuring the on-going dialogue between the agency and the interested parties.

The BSE methodology takes into account that the HEIs are already accredited institutions, and thus puts less emphasis on chapters regarding the institutional level during the site visits; these are conducted online and last from two hours to one day but usually two and a half hours. The experts reviewing Bachelor programmes are required to familiarise themselves with all the relevant information from the appropriate institutional review, which is made available online by CTI. However, in the experts' opinion, the preparatory phase now takes much longer as panel members have to familiarise themselves with the extensive on-line data available on the HEI proposing a new Bachelor programme.

All the documents accompanying the new EQA activity of Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level are published on the agency's website. The interviews with heads of HEIs and directors of studies made it clear that the HEIs find the guidelines for the BSE evaluation very useful. During the interview, they were also very supportive of the role of the CTI in ensuring that industry and engineering schools were attentive to each other's needs and emphasised the importance of cohesion in evaluation of all types of engineering programmes. The same positive opinion was evident during the panel's discussions with the stakeholders from professional life.

## **Analysis**

After the assignment of the new mission by the ministry in January 2020, CTI was under a certain amount of pressure to ensure a rapid launch of the new EQA activity of 'Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level', from both HEIs and industry.

The first version of the methodology, including 'BSE standards & criteria' and 'BSE Evaluation Process' was published in May 2020, and the first round of evaluations was launched in autumn 2020 (SAR p. 8). This rapid development and implementation of the new evaluation concept for Bachelor degrees in engineering was referred to several times as "hasty" during the site visit, for instance by CTI members and CTI permanent staff. At the same time, the Covid pandemic hit and complicated things further. In the view of the panel, CTI managed to organise an inclusive development process involving the central stakeholders despite these obstacles. At the site visit, social partners, the students' organisation, as well as the Ministry representatives expressed satisfaction with their involvement in the development process. CTI is in itself an organisation composed of representatives from both academia and industry. This also ensures that different perspectives are considered when designing or updating the methodologies for the agency's EQA procedures.

The pandemic led to the online format of the site visit, which CTI has since maintained. Some experts expressed a wish to move to physical site visits, but all interviewed experts (including students), CTI members and HEI representatives agreed that the current arrangements enable the panels to conduct a thorough evaluation of the programmes under review.

The review panel was impressed that CTI was able to develop and implement a well-designed pilot concept for BSE under quite particular conditions and appreciated the awareness showed by the agency regarding the HEIs' workload: the new procedure makes extensive use of the information already available in the institutional reviews so that the site-visit for reviewing new Bachelor programmes could be conducted online in a time slot much reduced compared to a regular review (usually two and a half hours).



At the same time, the review panel notices with satisfaction that the number of online site visits will naturally be reduced as and when the BSE evaluations are included in the ordinary cycle of CTI evaluations of engineering schools. Online site visits of new Bachelor programmes in engineering will, however, be retained in the future.

The annual update of the BSE standards & criteria involves stakeholders and does not interfere with the midterm follow-up processes. This on-going updating approach has led to an improved methodology, structured in the same way as the general accreditation procedure for French engineering schools (R&O). The templates used, with reference points well aligned with those of engineering Master programmes and applied for all Bachelor programmes, are welcomed by the HEIs. CTI does not retrospectively apply the newly developed criteria to follow-up procedures; they become operational for an institution at the time of their first periodic review after their introduction. The review panel finds this to be a good procedure as this ensures that the HEIs do not need to address and fulfil new criteria between two periodic reviews.

The panel noted the general agreement derived from the interviews regarding the important role of CTI in accrediting all programmes in the engineering domain and that the same overall standards and guidelines are applied to both Bachelor and Master programme evaluations and accreditation.

### **Panel commendations**

- I. The panel commends the agency for being able to develop and implement a well-designed pilot concept for Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level under quite particular conditions.

### **Panel conclusion: compliant**

## ESG 2.3 IMPLEMENTING PROCESSES

Standard:

External quality assurance processes should be reliable, useful, pre-defined, implemented consistently and published. They include:

- a self-assessment or equivalent
- an external assessment normally including a site visit
- a report resulting from the external assessment
- a consistent follow-up

### **2018 review recommendation:**

ENQA Agency Review Report: 'Panel recommends that CTI develops follow-up procedures also in case of full accreditation. In order to limit administrative burden, CTI and HEIs might consider taking use of existing publication tools (e.g., conferences, certified data). The methods for follow-up should be implemented so that quality culture at the institutions will be further developed'.

EQAR Register Committee decision: no additional notes.

### **Evidence**

According to the Terms of Reference, the review panel is supposed to primarily focus on the new external quality assurance (EQA) activity of CTI (accreditation of Bachelor's programmes in Sciences and Engineering (BSE)) when assessing ESG 2.3.

As far as the new EQA activity is concerned, CTI publishes the revised set of the BSE Standards & Criteria prior to the annual round (campaign) of accreditations on its website. The agency also publishes a document entitled “BSE Evaluation Process”, describing the different steps in the accreditation process, and giving guidance to the HEIs with programmes under review.

An HEI that wants to have one or more institutional bachelor programmes in engineering accredited, must send a letter of intention to CTI (and the ministry, through the Direction Générale de l’enseignement supérieur et de l’insertion professionnelle - DGESIP) no later than May, one year in advance, in order to help plan the upcoming round. CTI appoints an expert panel with one CTI member (the panel chair), a national expert (or another CTI member), a student, and an international expert.

The following May, i.e., the year of the accreditation, the HEI submits a self-evaluation report. The report should be a collective and reflective piece of work containing several predefined annexes and with links to a digital folder with evidence material.

From June to September site visits are conducted for all programmes under review in the current round. The site visits are arranged as online meetings between the panel and as a minimum 1) the head and senior management group of the institution, 2) the head of department for the study programme under review, and 3) teaching staff. The panel can also ask to have meetings with social partners and with students, although the programmes are considered as new programmes. A site visit normally takes approximately 2.5 hours.

The panel then drafts a review report following the CTI report template, which contains advice and instructions on how to draft the report. The report contains a presentation of facts and evidence and a SWOT analysis with strengths and areas for development. The draft report is sent to the HEI for comments, including to check for factual accuracy.

The final report is submitted to the CTI plenary assembly for deliberation and decision making at a meeting in November. Prior to the meeting in the plenary assembly, the CTI member who has acted as panel chair prepares a document with a draft of the recommendations and conclusions (i.e., the decision on accreditation and the period of accreditation) that the plenary assembly could discuss and agree on with or without amendments. The final decision on the recommendations and conclusions (known by CTI as the “avis”) is made by the plenary assembly. The suggested recommendations and conclusion in the draft document are based on the review report and are normally discussed with the whole panel in the drafting process. In December, one month after the plenary assembly’s decision, the final version of the recommendations and conclusion (“avis”) is sent to the HEI, the ministry, and published on CTI’s website together with the panel report. The panel chair also gives oral feedback to the HEI ([https://www.cti-commission.fr/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Bachelor\\_Procedure\\_2023\\_V2023-03-20.pdf](https://www.cti-commission.fr/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Bachelor_Procedure_2023_V2023-03-20.pdf) - p. 1).

At the time of the ENQA panel’s site visit to CTI, there had not yet been any follow-up procedures regarding BSE accreditations, but the follow-up is planned to focus on the extent to which the HEI complies with the recommendations made by the CTI plenary assembly.

In response to the recommendation formulated by the ENQA panel of the previous review, CTI elaborated a new follow-up procedure for programmes that were granted a full five-year accreditation, which has become operational since the 2019-2020 campaign. The procedure requires HEIs to submit an interim (follow-up) report between two successive periodic reviews (re-accreditations). As far as the new institutional Bachelor programmes are concerned, the length of the accreditation period is normally coordinated with the scheduled time of the HEI’s next periodic

institutional evaluation. The periodic institutional evaluation will then act as the follow-up on the BSE accreditation.

The follow-up process is applied by two procedures:

- 1- Systematic follow-up tables: the follow-up template is predefined and consists of a table which lists the CTI recommendations and how they have been implemented or the action plan for their implementation. They are analysed by a member of the CTI permanent staff. If a discrepancy appears, the table is submitted to the CTI Board and potentially cross-checked by a CTI member who -when possible- will have participated in the last periodical review. Both the follow-up table and, if necessary, CTI's judgement are considered at the following periodic review.
- 2- Occasional follow-up reports on specific subjects: in the case of specific shortcoming(s), the CTI may ask a HEI to provide a detailed description of actions taken or planned by a written report. These reports are not systematic and regard a limited number of HEIs. They are analysed by -if possible- the chair of the relevant expert panel and the CTI board and the final judgement is made by the CTI plenary assembly. Both the follow-up report and CTI's judgement are considered at the following periodic review.

The panel learned from interviews (with CTI management and staff, HEIs representatives and experts) that, up to now, the follow-up procedure has been applied to the regular EQA activities of CTI, but not yet to the evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level (See Analysis below).

### **Analysis**

The new EQA activity, Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level, follows the traditional four stage model of evaluation procedures with a self-assessment made by the HEI, a site visit conducted by an external expert panel, a published report, and a predefined follow-up procedure. The panel confirms that all EQA activities are transparent and supported by clear and well written documents, available on CTI's website.

The panel understands that, in practice, new programmes do not obtain a full accreditation period of five years but only until the time of the next periodic institutional evaluation of the respective HEI is scheduled. In this way, institutional Bachelor programmes will, in the long run, be integrated with the usual 5-year evaluation cycle of the French engineering schools accredited by CTI. Therefore, the Bachelor programmes will also be integrated in the midterm follow-up process for institutions with a full 5-years accreditation period, as described in the 'Evidence' section. In the future, a separate accreditation process for institutional Bachelor programmes will only be necessary where new programmes are developed and introduced by the HEIs.

During the site visit, the heads of institutions and the directors of studies of HEIs expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the level of information in the panel reports, especially the SWOT analyses, which they generally found helpful in the institutions' and the programmes' further development process. The Ministry representatives had a similarly positive view of the pilot phase as operated by CTI.

The evidence collected from the SAR and gathered in the interviews with different stakeholders convinced the panel that the new procedure of Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level is regarded as useful and implemented in a consistent and transparent way.

**Panel conclusion: compliant**

## ESG 2.4 PEER-REVIEW EXPERTS

Standard:

External quality assurance should be carried out by groups of external experts that include (a) student member(s).

**2018 review recommendation:** none

### **Evidence**

According to the Terms of Reference, the review panel is supposed to primarily focus on the new external quality assurance (EQA) activity of CTI (accreditation of Bachelor's programmes in Sciences and Engineering (BSE)) when assessing ESG 2.4.

As in all other EQA procedures of CTI, the CTI members play an active part in the Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level.

According to the SAR (p. 15) and confirmed during the site visit meetings with CTI staff, experts, and student experts, since the 2023 round (campaign) of BSE accreditations, each expert panel consists of four members: one CTI member who acts as the panel chair; one national expert who is a specialist in a field related to the programme under review or in a transversal subject such as education; if the CTI member is from industry, the national experts will come from academia – and vice versa; the national expert can be replaced by another CTI member. The third panel member is a student expert proposed by the Association of Engineering Students (BNEI), and the fourth is an international expert.

All the interviewed students confirmed they felt treated as equal members of panels. They received a lot of support from panel chairs and were encouraged to email any queries in advance of the pre-meeting. They confirmed that they take responsibility for sections of the report.

In the pilot phase of the BSE accreditations, expert panels only consisted of one CTI member (chair) and one expert. Together, they both were supposed to represent industry and academia. The narrow panels without a student expert and an international expert in the pilot phase were explained during the site visit as due to the fast implementation of the BSE concept and the fact that it occurred during the first lock down period of the Covid crisis. According to the CTI President's explanations, involving students in the first campaign of evaluations, which began on-line in May 2020, had proved too difficult to achieve because of the time constraints and the impact of the pandemic. However, the Association of Engineering Students (BNEI) confirmed there had been discussion and dialogue with CTI throughout this period and, at present, all expert panels have both student and international expert members.

At the meeting with the CTI permanent staff during the site visit to CTI, it was explained that a specific committee (two CTI members and one permanent staff representative) is responsible for selecting the panel members for each BSE accreditation. The national and international experts and the student experts are selected from CTI's ordinary pools of experts. The composition of the expert panel is then sent to the HEI for approval and checked in case there are any real or perceived conflicts of interest (SAR p. 15).

According to the SAR (p. 14), a complementary team consisting of two other CTI members (representing both industry and academia) is also appointed. The role of this complementary team is primarily to give feedback to the first draft of the review report written by the expert panel.

All experts receive training prior to being appointed to an expert panel. The first training sessions for student experts and CTI members are organised separately immediately after their nominations. The following training sessions are common to all the experts and members. Training sessions are held periodically, either in a physical format or via videoconference. According to the SAR and the interview with experts, the training sessions include a specific part on accreditation of the Bachelor's programmes. CTI also organises more specialised training sessions throughout the year addressing specific issues and current topics, for instance the introduction of an increased emphasis on ecological transition and societal and environmental responsibility in the R&O. These sessions can be held online or during the annual CTI conference (colloquium), and they include all the different types of experts.

Besides participating in the specialised training sessions, experts benefit from support documents produced by CTI ('expert's toolkit') consisting of extensive information about the evaluation process and the role of different members in the expert panel. As the panel learned during the interview with the permanent staff, CTI also has a system whereby new experts can be appointed as "observers" to an experienced panel in order to ensure their familiarity with the policies, procedures and style of communication and interaction.

The executive director of CTI has introduced methodological issues to the agenda of the meetings in the CTI plenary assembly. At each meeting, longer or shorter sessions regarding the evaluation procedures and the role of the CTI members are prepared. At the same time, the panel learned that an in-house upskilling programme developed for both permanent staff and members of the plenary assembly has been launched.

Similar to the other EQA procedures conducted by the agency, all experts involved in BSE accreditations operate under the provisions of the deontology charter of CTI and are required to sign the declaration of no-conflicts-of-interest.

## **Analysis**

The way in which CTI recruits national and international experts and the student experts to its expert pools has not changed since the 2018 ENQA review of CTI. The panel finds the procedures extensive and secure, and they ensure broad representation of different expertise and perspectives in the expert pools. The procedures include nominations by CTI members of interesting profiles, the possibility for individual applications, and formal calls for applications amongst CTI's stakeholders and international partners. The last significant call was made in 2022 (SAR p. 14).

The panel appreciates the policy according to which no expert – national, international or student – can be appointed to a panel without completing the training offered by the agency and welcomes the initiative of appointing new experts as 'observers'. This allows the new experts to get some practical training and CTI to get a better understanding of how well new recruits have assimilated the training and how they are likely to manage on a subsequent panel.

When it comes to the nomination of student experts, CTI has a long-lasting cooperation with the national Association of Engineering Students (BNEI), who submits a list of potential student experts every year (SAR p. 14). The positive and constructive character of this cooperation was confirmed by the discussion the panel had with representatives from BNEI during the site visit.

The panel was also reassured that the training and procedures ensuring no-conflicts-of-interest and professional conduct are solid and effective.

The panel discussed the potential risk of developing different understandings about the accreditation processes when the training of new experts is organised in different sessions. In the meetings with CTI members, national and international experts, and student experts, this issue was not seen as a real problem in the work and cooperation within the panels. However, CTI could consider whether it would be possible to integrate the training of the different types of experts to a larger extent than is currently the case.

The panel did not find the narrow expert panels during the pilot phase of the BSE accreditations optimal, although it is understandable that it was a difficult task to engage especially student experts in this new activity during the pandemic. Although all interviewed stakeholders, including the representatives from the national association of engineering students (BNEI), during the site visit to CTI expressed understanding about this situation. The panel is also satisfied that student experts and international experts are now included in all expert panels of the BSE accreditations.

The panel finds all in all that the procedure for selecting experts and composing review panels for the BSE accreditations is robust. The panel agrees with the finding of the 2019-review that although two CTI-members are part of the panel and one of them acts as a chair, other panel members fully contribute to the panel as well.

#### **Panel commendations**

2. The panel commends the agency for having introduced methodological sessions at the meetings of the CTI plenary assembly, thus ensuring that the members remain updated regarding the requirements in their roles as panel chairs or members in the review processes.
3. The panel commends the agency for enabling new experts to be observers on evaluation visits conducted by experienced expert panels.

#### **Panel suggestions for further improvement**

1. The panel suggests there would be value in the agency considering whether it would be possible to integrate the training of the student experts with the other types of experts to a larger extent than is currently the case.

#### **Panel conclusion: compliant**

### ESG 2.5 CRITERIA FOR OUTCOMES

Standard:

Any outcomes or judgements made as the result of external quality assurance should be based on explicit and published criteria that are applied consistently, irrespective of whether the process leads to a formal decision.

#### **2018 review recommendation:**

ENQA Agency Review Report: 'For improved consistency of decisions, CTI is recommended to develop the deliberation rules and criteria for decision-making explicitly. They do not need to be mathematical but should still give a clear indication for the different types of decisions.'

EQAR Register Committee decision: 'The Register Committee welcomed the steps taken by the agency to address the shortcomings in ensuring consistency in its decision making but noted that the changes have not yet come into effect. The Register Committee therefore concurred with the panel's conclusion that CTI complies only partially with ESG 2.5.'

## **Evidence**

According to the Terms of Reference, the review panel is supposed to consider all external quality assurance (EQA) activities of CTI when assessing ESG 2.5.

Each EQA procedure conducted by CTI is based on pre-defined, explicit criteria published on the agency's website as "References and Guidelines (R&O). Accreditation Procedures for French Engineering Schools". The new EQA activity of 'Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level' operates under the "BSE Standards & Criteria" and the "BSE Evaluation Process", which are also published on the CTI's website.

The review panel noted that, for the Bachelor's programmes, the outcomes of the CTI evaluation is a recommendation to the Ministry of Higher Education and Research, as well as a public report. The CTI statement to the Ministry ("l'avis") includes a recommendation of a particular academic grade (the French bachelor grade - Licence) and a list of recommendations for improvement to the engineering school.

Since the last ENQA review, CTI has introduced deliberation tables, which are included in each section of the new template for evaluation reports. The tables require the expert panel to be explicit about the extent to which the criteria are met. These tables are primarily used by the expert panels as a support tool in the assessment process and also within CTI to check the consistency of decision-making by the panels. The tables are shared with the CTI plenary assembly and with the institution being reviewed.

The review panel learned from all interviewed experts, CTI members and staff that the tables are a useful tool for bringing about clarity and greater consistency in decision-making across expert panels. The existence of the tables also facilitates checking reports by CTI staff and are an aid to discussions in the CTI plenary assembly meetings. CTI members and management and some institutional representatives, particularly the heads of institutions, welcomed the fact that CTI shares the tables with the institutions, although some of the interviewed directors of studies found the tables less useful than the text of the reports.

## **Analysis**

During the site visit, the review panel was able to confirm that the criteria for accreditation and procedures are public and easily accessible to all stakeholders. There have been no changes regarding having explicit criteria for the EQA activities since the last review and CTI has complemented the documentation which now also includes the criteria for the new procedure of 'Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level'.

The review panel observed a clear progress of the agency to ensure consistency in the decision-making process by including deliberation tables regarding the compliance with the relevant criteria. At the same time, the panel considered that it was transparent of CTI to share the tables with the institution under review.

Overall, the panel agreed with CTI that this measure supported the panels in making assessment of the programmes and aided consistency and transparency across evaluations. In this sense, the agency addresses the recommendation from the previous review. CTI staff and the plenary assembly both use the tables in their check for consistency of decisions.

At all interviews, the review panel learned that the decision-making processes of CTI are held in high regard. The deliberation tables developed by the agency since the last ENQA review have been particularly welcomed and are widely seen as enhancing consistency. The tables in the report template are understood by those who use and see them as essentially a form of short-hand checklist and all parties reiterated the CTI view that the substantial text that accompanies the tables is far more comprehensive, specific, and considered.

### **Panel commendations**

4. The panel commends the agency for having introduced the new deliberation tables as a tool for making decision-making explicit with the expert panels and for underpinning consistency between panels.

### **Panel conclusion: compliant**

## ESG 2.6 REPORTING

Standard:

Full reports by the experts should be published, clear and accessible to the academic community, external partners and other interested individuals. If the agency takes any formal decision based on the reports, the decision should be published together with the report.

### **2018 review recommendation:**

ENQA Agency Review Report: 'The panel recommends CTI to intensify efforts regarding the new template for panel reports in order to increase redactional uniformity and coherence. Full reports should be publishable in a short period, given the fact that this recommendation already exists since the previous ENQA review.'

EQAR Register Committee decision: 'The Register Committee acknowledged the actions taken by the agency towards the full publication of its reports but stressed that the flag has not been addressed. As the agency does not currently meet the requirements of the standard (to publish full reports) at the Register Committee agrees with the panel's conclusions that CTI complies only partially with ESG 2.6.'

### **Evidence**

According to the Terms of Reference, the review panel is supposed to consider all external quality assurance (EQA) activities of CTI when assessing ESG 2.6.

According to the SAR, CTI uses the same reporting procedure for all its EQA activities, except for the Quality labels of French and foreign institutions (CeQuint) which are required to use a special template available on the ECA website. The review panel read in the SAR that no applications for CeQuint had been received by CTI since the 2018 ENQA review.

Following the recommendation from the previous ENQA review, CTI put in place a new template for the published evaluation reports which also includes the expert panel report, and not exclusively the synthesis report established by the plenary assembly, as was the case in the past.

The new evaluation report template has also been used for the evaluation processes of the new EQA activity of 'Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level'. During the site visit the



review panel was provided with feedback on the new template, which expressed a general view that it is more accurate and convenient for both experts and HEI members. All the interviewees agreed that the new template facilitates drafting more streamlined reports, with a very clear structure of the evaluation criteria and how they are fulfilled.

The CTI President and executive director confirmed that each report is drafted in full by the expert team, which is responsible for the criteria grading, makes suggestions for recommendations and has the last say over the final report text. The draft report is shared with the reviewed HEI to check for factual accuracy. The draft report includes deliberation tables which are part of the report template to ensure that all relevant sub-headings are covered in the findings and comments made in each section of the report. They are also used to assist with the consistency of reports, as already mentioned under ESG 2.5. These tables are removed from the final published report as they are only considered to be a tool for the panel, and because all the material contained within the tables is captured in the comments and SWOTs that are part of each section of the report.

After the factual check by the HEI, the draft reports are seen in their entirety by the plenary assembly, which makes the final decision. During the interviews with experts, CTI management, members, and staff the panel learned that the content of the panel report is not amended in any way by the plenary assembly. The panel chair, who is also a CTI member, formulates the draft recommendations to be made by the plenary assembly in a separate document. Amendments may be made to the recommendations (“l’avis”), and this only happens following a full discussion and vote of the plenary assembly. The principal reason for any changes is to ensure consistency of recommendations and length of accreditation across all evaluations and reports.

After the plenary assembly decision, the full report, and the recommendations (“l’avis”) with the duration of the approved accreditation are published by CTI (on its website and on the DEQAR database) and submitted to the Ministry. The Ministry subsequently publishes the list of accredited programmes and the duration of the accreditation on an official list each year.

The panel was able to check different reports and noted that the deliberation tables are not published with the final report, but their content is included in the text of the final report. All interviewees the panel spoke to (CTI management, members, and staff, HEIs, experts) agreed that removing tables from the final report is a good practice because this avoids misinterpreting the data and other information from the review or use being made of the reports by private ranking agencies and media in France to create invalid and inappropriate league tables.

Experts appreciate the new template of the report because it ensures a good balance between quantitative and qualitative information, addressing both compliance and enhancement. During the interview, the panel was told that the introduction of deliberation tables was considered a positive measure, important for ensuring consistency, although some experts used them more as a communication tool, not necessarily to make judgements. Regarding completing the draft reports, all experts confirmed they are involved and are offered the opportunity to contribute.

The HEIs consider that the evaluation reports are now more consistent in structure and content since the introduction of the new template. All directors of studies the panel spoke with confirmed that they got a draft report, an opportunity for commenting, and then a final report and the recommendations (“l’avis”) with the duration of accreditation after the decision-making process of the CTI plenary assembly. They described the draft report as essentially a document for factual checking. They welcomed the discussions they could have with CTI if they had a negative evaluation. They could then work on the issues and re-submit.

From the interview with different stakeholders the review panel learned that they found the CTI web-site useful to check the list of accredited engineering schools. Those who were members of the plenary assembly had good knowledge about the final reports published by CTI, while other stakeholders were not familiar with them. The representatives of the Ministry highly appreciated the quality of the reports and the overall work of the agency.

The SAR mentions the new CTI information system, which is in progress and provides an online framework for completing the evaluation reports. During the interview with the experts the review panel learned they were aware of this new tool and considered it a positive step forward.

## **Analysis**

It is clear to the review panel that CTI has made strenuous efforts to follow the recommendations of the previous ENQA review in connection with reporting.

The new template for reporting, introduced by the agency since the last ENQA review, has contributed to enhancing the quality of reporting; it is widely appreciated that the reports are better now: more streamlined, more concise, complete and useful for stakeholders. However, the review panel considers the reports and even the SWOT analyses to be quite descriptive and not informative enough. In the view of the panel, it would therefore be an improvement to make them more explicit and analytical.

Following the discussions with different interviewees, the panel is convinced that the content of the reports is the result of the independent work of the expert panel members, further analysed and approved by the CTI plenary assembly.

The review panel had some concerns to hear that the deliberation tables were removed in the final and published report, and therefore it thoroughly addressed, within meetings with different groups (CTI management, staff, members, experts, and HEIs), the process for drafting the report and that of publishing the final report. All groups shared the opinion that the main role of the deliberation tables was to ensure that: 1)- the external review report is appropriately elaborated by the expert panel, and 2)- there is a high degree of consistency in the assessments of the criteria. At the same time, based on the reports it was able to read, the panel agrees with stakeholders that, since the content of the deliberation tables is fully reflected in the text of the reports, the tables are clearly to be seen as a support tool for the panels. Therefore, the panel concludes that the evaluation reports of all EQA activities conducted by CTI are published in full – although the deliberation tables are not included. However, the panel also finds that CTI should remove the deliberation tables from the report template in order to avoid any possible confusion that they are part of the report, and not only a tool for the panels. The tables could instead be kept as part of the toolbox for experts or as a separate support document.

At the same time, the review panel does feel that it would enhance transparency to include the expert panels' overall recommendations and assessment in the final section in the report rather than as a draft for a separate linked document ("l'avis") for the plenary assembly as is currently the practice. The recommendations document ("l'avis") is issued by the CTI plenary assembly based on the expert panel's report. This practice with two separate documents could still be maintained, as the plenary assembly of course would have the authority to formulate its own recommendations based on the expert panel's report. While acknowledging CTI's efforts for publishing full reports, the panel notes that their visibility on the website could be improved.

### **Panel commendations**

5. The review panel commends the agency for introducing the new reporting template, which has led to more robust and consolidated reports.

### **Panel recommendations**

1. The review panel recommends the agency ensures there is more explicit and analytical content in the published reports.
2. The review panel recommends the agency improves the visibility of the reports on its website.
3. The review panel recommends the agency removes the deliberation tables from the report template - and hence from the draft reports - in order to underline the tables' status as an assessment and consistency tool for the expert panels.

### **Panel suggestions for further improvement**

2. The panel suggests the agency could consider including the expert panel's overall recommendations and assessment in the final section in the report rather than as a draft for a separate linked document ("l'avis") as is now the practice.

### **Panel conclusion: compliant**

## **ESG 2.7 COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS**

Standard:

Complaints and appeals processes should be clearly defined as part of the design of external quality assurance processes and communicated to the institutions.

### **2018 review recommendation: none**

#### **Evidence**

According to the Terms of Reference, the review panel is supposed to primarily focus on the new external quality assurance (EQA) activity of CTI (accreditation of Bachelor's programmes in Sciences and Engineering (BSE)) when assessing ESG 2.7.

As presented in the SAR (p. 18), the Complaints and Appeals procedure applied for the new EQA activity of BSE accreditations is the same as that applied to all other EQA activities of CTI and is included in the published document describing the BSE evaluation process. The written policies and procedures regarding complaints and appeals are also published in the by-laws of the agency, which are available on the website.

During the site visit the review panel learned there had been no formal complaints or appeals in the period under review. It was explained that in most cases issues tend to be resolved by discussion when the HEIs get the draft reports and the HEIs directly contact the CTI for explanation. The panel learned it was quite common for an HEI to ask for a discussion about a specific recommendation and that this was done by the panel chair and the CTI president.

The permanent staff of CTI confirmed the situation regarding appeals and complaints, i.e., the use of informal discussion, the possibility of an independent 3-person review if required (as described in the

2018 ENQA review report), and the fact that there has never yet been a situation that resulted in a completely new evaluation being required. In the event of a complaint about the behaviour of a review panel member, the procedure was to email the panel chair and/or the CTI president.

The HEIs welcome the discussions they could have with the agency in the event of a negative evaluation. None of them has used the formal procedure as they are confident any issues could be solved in discussion.

### **Analysis**

The Complaints and Appeals policies and procedures that were in place in CTI in advance of the last review in 2018 are still operational and contained in their published by-laws. They are also included in the 'BSE Evaluation Process' – the main document guiding the new EQA activity conducted by the agency. All stakeholders expressed satisfaction with how they operate.

The review panel notes that it is the custom and practice of CTI and its stakeholders to clarify and resolve any issues that arise through dialogue. This is a long-standing practice that all parties told the panel worked well. Stakeholders are aware of the existence of the written policies and procedures for complaints and appeals, but all said that they had never had occasion to use them. The review panel is satisfied with CTI's practice but suggests that a little more prominence could be given to the policy and procedure on the website.

### **Panel suggestions for further improvement**

3. The review panel suggests the agency makes the complaints and appeals policies and procedures easier to find within the documentation provided to the institutions and more visible on the website.

### **Panel conclusion: compliant**

## ENHANCEMENT AREAS

### ESG 3.6 INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE AND PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

CTI is a well-established, mature quality assurance agency, with a long tradition of evaluation of engineering programmes in France and abroad and with a high reputation among its stakeholders. It benefits from a strong professional community (CTI members and permanent staff) and has in place a robust internal quality assurance system and appropriately implemented procedures.

The SAR includes a chapter dedicated to the self-selected standard for enhancement, which explains the agency's interest in enhancing the internal quality assurance and professional conduct, as they are defined by ESG 3.6.

The panel noted that CTI had established a working group chaired by a former CTI member who has become also a special advisor. The working group focused on making a range of improvements to the administration and operation of CTI processes and practices. One of the **improvements** was to **the database for recording information about each of the HEIs' CTI reviews**. During the site visit the panel had a demonstration of the database which is clearly a valuable tool for CTI in ensuring it has captured key information about each institution and the programmes it offers. This is likely to enhance the ease of access to information and the capacity of CTI staff and experts to work with the HEIs.

During the site visit, the participants in the enhancement session (review panel members, CTI members and staff, special advisors, and stakeholders) engaged in a lively and informed discussion. The panel heard that CTI recognized **the need to consider how its review arrangements would adapt in the context of having reviewed several of the HEIs many times over a 30-year period**. The agency had considered offering targeted reviews in the past, but it was recognised that this carried the risk of not reviewing some aspects of practice and potentially overlooking some areas of risk.

The panel discussed with the agency a range of practices in other countries and touched on possible approaches to **focusing on follow up or engaging HEIs in developmental discussions based on themes arising from the reviews and their recommendations**.

The panel heard about the valuable sessions CTI runs - the colloquiums for the HEIs and professional bodies and the more recent sessions for reviewers to meet and share practices. CTI analyses the **outcomes and recommendations from its reviews** each year and **this could potentially inform developmental or enhancement activity with the HEIs** aimed at improving practice across the sector.

It was clear to the panel that CTI has engaged in careful consideration of its practices and how they could be enhanced further. For example, it has given detailed consideration to the kinds of information it holds about the HEIs, and the further information it generates through its review work. It is **considering how to make greater use of this information to inform its review work**. These **are positive steps to take** in the view of the panel.

The panel learned that for some time CTI has sought feedback from the HEIs following reviews and has begun to seek feedback from the peer experts . **Making use of the feedback from peer experts as well as that from the HEIs will enable CTI to consider connections between the review outcomes and the methodology they are using**.

It was evident that CTI does make use of external partners as part of its processes. While they were content overall, some of the external partners the panel met considered **there could be more**

**systematic ways for CTI to engage with them and for CTI's activities to be informed by those external perspectives.**

Due to the additional EQA activity assigned to CTI (i.e., Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level) and the increased number of reviews in general, there could be a risk of overloading the agency's permanent staff. At the same time, new tasks are required of the staff, e.g., accompanying the expert team on site visits and assisting them throughout the whole evaluation process. There are, therefore, questions within CTI about the extent to which the skills of the permanent staff are aligned to the changes that are likely to be required for enhancement in the future. Overall, the panel found CTI staff to be enhancement-orientated and there was evidence of an enthusiasm to keep considering how to make improvements in their work. At the same time, there is obviously a need for training and development, to help them achieve the new tasks. In the panel's view, **staff development (participation in trainings, exchange of good practices, e.g., staff mobility - exchange programmes with other agencies, etc.) is a direction to be further explored**, as it could be a step forward in strengthening IQA and the agency's engagement in the field of information exchange and professional conduct.

# CONCLUSION

## SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS

---

ESG 2.2 DESIGNING METHODOLOGIES FIT FOR PURPOSE	1. The panel commends the agency for being able to develop and implement a well-designed pilot concept for Evaluation of engineering programmes at Bachelor's level under quite particular conditions.
ESG 2.4 PEER-REVIEW EXPERTS	2. The panel commends the agency for having introduced methodological sessions at the meetings of the CTI plenary assembly, thus ensuring that the members remain updated regarding the requirements in their roles as panel chairs or members in the review processes.  3. The panel commends the agency for enabling new experts to be observers on evaluation visits conducted by experienced expert panels.
ESG 2.5 CRITERIA FOR OUTCOMES	4. The panel commends the agency for having introduced the new deliberation tables as a tool for making decision-making explicit with the expert panels and for underpinning consistency between panels.
ESG 2.6 REPORTING	5. The review panel commends the agency for introducing the new reporting template, which has led to more robust and consolidated reports.

---

## OVERVIEW OF JUDGEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

ESG 2.6 REPORTING	1. The review panel recommends the agency ensures there is more explicit and analytical content in the published reports.  2. The review panel recommends the agency improves the visibility of the reports on its website.  3. The review panel recommends the agency removes the deliberation tables from the report template - and hence from the draft reports - in order to underline the tables' status as an assessment and consistency tool for the expert panels.
-------------------	--

---

In light of the documentary and oral evidence considered by it, the review panel is satisfied that, in the performance of its functions, CTI is in compliance with the ESG.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT

---

ESG 2.4 PEER-REVIEW  
EXPERTS

1. The panel suggests there would be value in the agency considering whether it would be possible to integrate the training of the different types of experts to a larger extent than is currently the case.
- 

ESG 2.6 REPORTING

2. The panel suggests the agency could consider including the expert panel's overall recommendations and assessment in the final section in the report rather than as a draft for a separate linked document ("l'avis") as is now the practice.
- 

ESG 2.7 COMPLAINTS AND  
APPEALS

3. The review panel suggests the agency makes the complaints and appeals policies and procedures easier to find within the documentation provided to the institutions and more visible on the website.
-



# ANNEXES

## ANNEX I: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

SESSION NO.	TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	LEAD PANEL MEMBER
20 November 2023 - Online meeting with the agency's resource person				
1 Mon 20/11	13.00-14.00 (60 min)	Review panel's kick-off meeting and preparations for site visit	<b>Review panel</b>	Tue Vinther-Joergensen
2 Mon 20/11	14.00-15.00 (60 min)	An online clarification meeting with the agency's resource person to clarify the agency's changes since the last full review against the ESG and to understand the background and motive of the agency's choice of the self-selected ESG standard for enhancement (next to the overall HE and QA context of the agency)	<b>Review panel</b>  <b>CTI representatives:</b> Resource person, CTI Special adviser CTI Executive director	Tue Vinther-Joergensen
Tuesday 5 December 2023 – Day 0 (pre-visit)				
3 Tue 5/12	17.00-18.00 (60 min)	Review panel's pre-visit meeting and preparations for day 1		Tue Vinther-Joergensen
4 Tue 5/12	18.00-18.45 (45 min)	A pre-visit meeting with the agency's resource person to clarify any remaining questions after the online clarifications meeting	Resource person, CTI Special adviser	Tue Vinther-Joergensen
Wednesday 6 December 2023 – Day 1				
	9.00 – 9.30 (30 min)	Review panel's private meeting		Tue Vinther-Joergensen

SESSION NO.	TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	LEAD PANEL MEMBER
5 Wed 6/12	9.30 – 10.15 (45 min)	Meeting with the Executive Director and the President of the CTI Member	CTI President CTI Executive director	Tue Vinther-Joergensen
	10.15 – 10.30 (15 min)	Review panel's private discussion		
6 Wed 6/12	10.30 – 11.15 (45 min)	Meeting with 5-6 CTI members (including members engaged in the evaluation of institutional bachelor's programmes in engineering and if possible, the two vice-presidents)	CTI Vice-president CTI Member CTI Member CTI Member CTI Vice-president CTI Member	Tue Vinther-Joergensen
	11.15 – 11.30 (15 min)	Review panel's private discussion		
7 Wed 6/12	11.30 – 12.30 (60 min)	Meeting with the agency staff	CTI Audit process manager (information system, certified data) Audit process manager (administrative & financial management) CTI Audit process manager (audit programming, expert panels & training sessions)	Ailsa Crum
	12.30 – 13.30 (60 min)	Lunch (panel only)		
8 Wed 6/12	13.30 – 14.30 (60 min)	Meeting with 5-6 members of the expert pool - including CTI experts involved in the evaluation of institutional bachelor's programmes in engineering (academics and employers, from France and international)	<u>National experts:</u> Representative 1 Representative 2 Representative 3  <u>International experts:</u> Representative 1 Representative 2	Tue Vinther-Joergensen

SESSION NO.	TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	LEAD PANEL MEMBER
			Representative 3	
	14.30 – 14.45 (15 min)	Review panel's private discussion		
9 Wed 6/12	14.45 – 15.30 (45 min)	Meeting with 5-6 members of student expert pool - including CTI experts involved in the evaluation of institutional bachelor's programmes in engineering (from France and international)	Representative 1 Representative 2 Representative 3 Representative 4	Arnoldas Solovjovas
	15.30 – 15.45 (15 min)	Review panel's private discussion		
10 Wed 6/12	15.45 – 16.30 (45 min)	Meeting with local and national student organisations	BNEI President BNEI Vice-president	Arnoldas Solovjovas
11 Wed 6/12	16.30 – 17.30 (60 min)	Wrap-up meeting among panel members and preparations for day 2		
		Dinner (panel only)		
Thursday 7 December 2023 – Day 2				
	9.15 – 9.45 (30 min)	Review panel's private meeting		
12 Thu 7/12	9.45 – 10.15 (30 min)	Meeting with special advisors	CTI Special adviser	
	10.15-10.30 (15 min)	Review panel's private discussion		
13 Thu 7/12	10.30 – 11.15 (45 min)	Meeting with heads of some reviewed HEIs/ HEI representatives (including the ones where	Director UniLaSalle President UTT Director Centrale Marseille	Tue Vinther-Joergensen

SESSION NO.	TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	LEAD PANEL MEMBER
		reviews of bachelor's degrees were conducted)	Deputy director ENPC	
	11.15 – 11.30 (15 min)	Review panel's private discussion		
14 Thu 7/12	11.30 – 12.15 (45 min)	Meeting with directors of studies of HEIs (including the ones where reviews of bachelor's degrees were conducted)	Representative, Télécom Paris Representative, Mines de Paris Representative, Ecole Polytechnique Representative, EFREI	Ailsa Crum
	12.15 – 13.15 (60 min)	Lunch (panel only)		
15 Thu 7/12	13.15 – 14.00 (45 min)	Meeting with stakeholders, such as employers, professional bodies, local community	Representative, France Compétences Representative, IESF Representative, INRS Representative, France Compétences Representative, IESF Representative, UIMM Representative, Syntec Federation Representative, CFDT Cadres	Arnoldas Solovjovas
	14.00 – 14.15 (15 min)	Review panel's private discussion		
16 Thu 7/12	14.15 – 15.45 (90 min)	Session to discuss chosen enhancement area ESG 3.6 (participants to be selected by the agency, e.g., CTI members, staff, special advisors, stakeholders)	CTI Registrar CTI member CTI Special adviser Web developer, T'knoweb CTI Audit process manager (information system, certified data) CTI Audit process manager (audit programming, expert panels & training sessions) CTI Special adviser	Ailsa Crum

SESSION NO.	TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	LEAD PANEL MEMBER
	15.45 – 16.00 (15 min)	Review panel's private discussion		
17 Thu 7/12	16.00 – 16.45 (45 min)	A session to further investigate additional topics that may arise during the site visit regarding agency's compliance with the ESG (as necessary)	CTI Executive director Resource person, CTI Special adviser	Tue Vinther-Joergensen
18 Thu 7/12	16.45 – 17.45 (60 min)	Wrap-up meeting among panel members: preparation for day 3 and provisional conclusions		
		Dinner (panel only)		
Friday 8 December 2023 – Day 3				
19 Fri 8/12	8.30 – 9.30 (60 min)	Meeting among panel members to agree on final issues to clarify		Tue Vinther-Joergensen
20 Fri 8/12	9.30 – 10.15 (45 min)	Meeting with representatives of the Ministry for Higher Education and Research	Head, Department Quality and Recognition of Degrees Project manager, Department Quality and Recognition of Degrees	Tue Vinther-Joergensen
	10.15 – 10.30 (15 min)	Review panel's private discussion		
21 Fri 8/12	10.30 – 11.15 (45 min)	Meeting with the Executive Director to clarify any pending issues	CTI Executive director	Tue Vinther-Joergensen
22 Fri 8/12	11.15 – 12.30 (75 min)	Private meeting between panel members to agree on the main findings		Tue Vinther-Joergensen

SESSION NO.	TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	LEAD PANEL MEMBER
	12.30 – 13.00 (30 min)	Lunch (panel only)		
23 Fri 8/12	13.00 – 13.30 (30 min)	Final de-briefing meeting with staff and Board members of the agency to inform about preliminary findings	CTI President CTI Vice-president CTI Executive director CTI Special adviser CTI Audit process manager CTI Audit process manager CTI Audit process manager	Tue Vinther-Joergensen

## ANNEX 2: TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE REVIEW

# Targeted review of Engineering Degree Commission (CTI) against the ESG

# Annex I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

The present Terms of Reference were agreed between CTI (applicant), ENQA (coordinator) and EQAR.

## 1. Background

Engineering Degree Commission-CTI has been registered on the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) since 2009 and is applying for renewal of EQAR registration based on a targeted external review against *the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)* coordinated by The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA).

Engineering Degree Commission-CTI has been a member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) since 2005 and is applying for renewal of ENQA membership.

CTI is carrying out the following activities within the scope of the ESG:

- Accreditation of existing French and foreign engineering schools and programmes at master's level, in France and abroad;
- Evaluation of engineering programmes at bachelor's level (Licence)
- Ex-ante accreditation of engineering schools and programmes of French Institutions, in France and on branch campuses abroad;
- Attribution of the EUR-ACE label at Master level
- Quality labels of French and foreign institutions (CeQuint)

All these activities will be included on the agency's profile on the EQAR website and linked to DEQAR database. NB: The agency may not upload reports from other activities to DEQAR.

## 2. Purpose and scope of the targeted review

This review will evaluate the extent to which CTI continues to fulfil the requirements of the ESG. The targeted review aims to place more focus on those parts that require attention and provide sufficient information to support CTI's application to EQAR.

The review will be further used as part of the agency's renewal of membership in ENQA.

## 2.1 Focus areas

- A) Standards with a partial compliance conclusion in the Register Committee's last renewal decision:
  - a. ESG 2.5 – Criteria for outcomes
    - how the agency has addressed the shortcoming in ensuring consistency in its decision making
  - b. ESG 2.6 – Reporting
    - to consider whether the agency started with full publication of all its review reports
- B) Standards 2.1 to 2.7 for the following activities:
  - a. Evaluation of programmes at Bachelor level<sup>4</sup>;
- C) Standards affected by other types of substantive changes:
  - a. n.a.
- D) ESG 2.1 Consideration of internal quality assurance;
- E) Selected enhancement area: ESG 3.6 Internal quality assurance and professional conduct
- F) Other matters regarding ESG compliance that come up during the targeted review and that may affect the agency's compliance with the ESG (if any).

These issues should be investigated by the review panel as far as possible, providing an analysis and conclusion on the ESG standard(s) concerned.

## 3. The review process

The review will be conducted in line with the requirements of *the EQAR Procedures for Applications* and *the Policy on Targeted Reviews*, and following the methodology described in the *Guidelines for ENQA Targeted Reviews*.

The evaluation procedure consists of the following steps:

- Agreement on the Terms of Reference between EQAR, CTI and The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA);
- Nomination and appointment of the review panel by The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA);

---

<sup>4</sup> See Decision regarding CTI Substantive Change Report from 15/10/2021  
[https://backend.deqar.eu/reports/EQAR/2021-10\\_C64\\_SubstantiveChangeReport\\_CT1.pdf](https://backend.deqar.eu/reports/EQAR/2021-10_C64_SubstantiveChangeReport_CT1.pdf)



- Self-assessment by CTI including the preparation and publication of a self-assessment report;
- A site visit by the review panel to CTI;
- Preparation and completion of the final review report by the review panel;
- Scrutiny of the final review report by ENQA's Agency Review Committee;
- Analysis of the final review report and decision-making by the EQAR Register Committee;
- Decision on ENQA membership by the ENQA Board;
- Attendance to the online follow-up seminar.

### **3.1 Independence of the review coordinator**

The coordinator has not provided remunerated (e.g. consultancy) or unremunerated services to CTI during the past 5 years, and conversely CTI has not provided any remunerated or unremunerated services to the coordinator.

### **3.2 Nomination and appointment of the review team members**

The review panel consists of four members including an academic employed by a higher education institution, a student member and one other expert. At least two members are from another country.

At least one panel member should be a quality assurance professional that is currently employed by a QA agency and has been engaged in quality assurance within the past five years. When requested by the agency under review or when considered particularly pertinent, other stakeholders (for example, a representative of the labour market) may be included. In this case, an additional fee is charged to cover the reviewer's fee and travel expenses.

One of the members serves as the chair of the review panel, and one as the review secretary. At least one of the reviewers is an ENQA nominee (most often the QA professional[s]). At least one of the reviewers is appointed from the nominees of either the European University Association (EUA) or the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE), and the student member is always selected from among the ESU-nominated reviewers. If requested, the labour market representative may come from the Business Europe nominees or from ENQA. At least two panel members come from outside the national system of the agency under review (if relevant).

The panel will be supported by the ENQA Review Coordinator (an ENQA staff member) who will monitor the integrity of the process and ensure that ENQA's requirements are met throughout the process. The Review Coordinator will not be the secretary of the review and will not participate in the discussions during the site visit interviews.

ENQA will provide the agency with the proposed panel composition and the curricula vitarum of the panel members to establish that there are no known conflicts of interest. The reviewers will have to agree to a non-conflict of interest statement that is incorporated in their contract for the review of this agency.

Once appointed, the coordinator will inform EQAR about the appointed panel members.

### **3.3 Self-assessment by CTI, including the preparation of a self-assessment report**

CTI is responsible for the execution and organisation of its own self-assessment process and shall take into account the following guidance:

- Self-assessment includes all relevant internal and external stakeholders;

The self-assessment report is expected to contain:

- a description of the self-assessment process and the production of the SAR;
- a description of changes occurred within the agency since the last full review, including any eventual changes in the higher education system and quality assurance system in which the agency predominantly operates, the agency's structure, funding, its list of external quality assurance activities within the scope of the ESG, as well as the changes in the agency's quality assurance activities abroad (where relevant);
- a section that addresses the focus areas of the review, including standards that were considered to be partially compliant with the ESG in the last full review as well as ESG 2.1 and one self-selected ESG standard for enhancement (see 2.1 Focus areas);
- a SWOT analysis of the agency as a whole;
- for each of the individual standards enlisted above (see section 2) a consideration of how the agency has addressed the recommendations as noted in the previous EQAR Register Committee decision of inclusion/renewal (if applicable).

The report is well-structured, concise and comprehensively prepared. It clearly demonstrates the extent to which CTI fulfils its tasks of external quality assurance and continues to meet the ESG and thus the requirements for EQAR registration.

The self-assessment report is submitted to the review coordinator, which has two weeks to carry out a screening. The purpose of a screening is to ensure that the self-assessment report is satisfactory for the consideration of the panel. The coordinator will not judge the content of information itself but rather whether or not the necessary information, as outlined in the *Guidelines for ENQA Targeted Reviews*, is present. If the self-assessment report does not contain the necessary

information and fails to respect the requested form and content, the ENQA Secretariat reserves the right to ask for a revised version within two weeks.

The final version of the agency's self-assessment report is then submitted to the review panel a minimum of eight weeks prior to the site visit. The agency publishes the completed SAR on its website and sends the link to ENQA. ENQA will publish this link on its website as well.

### **3.4 A site visit by the review panel**

The review panel will draft a proposal of the site visit schedule considering the aspects included under the focus area (as defined under point 2.1 of the Terms of Reference).

The schedule will include an indicative timetable of the meetings and other exercises to be undertaken by the review panel during the site visit. The approved schedule shall be given to CTI at least one month before the site visit, in order to properly organise the requested interviews.

The site visit should enable the review panel to explore how the agency has addressed the standards where it has been found to be partially compliant (if the case), aspects of substantive change, consideration of internal quality assurance (ESG 2.1) and the self-selected ESG standard(s) for enhancement. The panel will include extra time during the site-visit to address any other arising issues (if the case) that might have an impact on the agency's compliance with the ESG.

The site visit will close with a final de-briefing meeting outlining the panel's overall impressions but not its judgement on the ESG compliance of the agency.

Prior to the physical site visit, the panel attends a joint briefing call between the panel, ENQA and EQAR to clarify the review expectations and address any possible arising matters.

In advance of the site visit (at least two weeks before the site visit), the panel will organise an obligatory online meeting with the agency. This meeting is held to ensure that the panel reaches a sufficient understanding of:

- The specific national/legal context in which the agency operates;
- The specific quality assurance system to which the agency belongs;
- The key characteristics of the agency's external QA activities.

### **3.5 Preparation and completion of the final review report**

The review report will be drafted in consultation with all review panel members and correspond to the purpose and scope of the review as defined under articles 2 and 2.1. In particular, it will provide a clear rationale for its findings concerning each ESG. When preparing the report, the review panel should bear in mind the *EQAR Policy*

*on the Use and Interpretation of the ESG* to ensure that the report will contain sufficient information for the Register Committee for application to EQAR<sup>5</sup>.

The external report will present the facts and analysis reflecting the reality at the time of review. This will form the main basis for the Register Committee's decision making.

A draft will first be submitted to the ENQA Review Coordinator who will check the report for consistency, clarity, and language. After panel has considered coordinator's feedback, the report will go to the agency for comment on factual accuracy. If CTI chooses to provide a position statement in reference to the draft report, it will be submitted to the chair of the review panel within two weeks after the receipt of the draft report.

Thereafter, the review panel will take into account the statement by CTI and submit the document for scrutiny to ENQA's Agency Review Committee and then to EQAR along with the remaining application documents (self-evaluation report, Declaration of Honour, statement to review report-if applicable). The report is to be finalised normally within 2-4 months of the site visit and will normally not exceed 30 pages in length. All panel will sign off on the final version of the external review report. The coordinantor will provide to CTI the [Declaration of Honour](#) together with the final report.

#### **4. Publication and use of the report**

CTI will receive the expert panel's report and publish it on its website once the ENQA Agency Review Committee has validated the report. Prior to the final validation of the report, the ENQA Agency Review Committee may request additional (documentary) evidence or clarification from the review panel, review coordinator or the agency if needed. The review report will be published on ENQA website regardless of the review outcome. The report will also be published on the EQAR website together with the decision on registration, regardless of the outcome.

ENQA will retain ownership of the report. The intellectual property of all works created by the review panel in connection with the review contract, including specifically any written reports, will be vested in ENQA. In the case of an unsuccessful application to EQAR, the report may also be used by the ENQA Board to reach a conclusion on whether the agency can be admitted/reconfirmed as a member of ENQA.

#### **5. Decision-making on EQAR registration and ENQA membership**

The agency will submit the review report via email to EQAR before expiry of the agency's registration on EQAR. The agency will also include its self-assessment

---

<sup>5</sup> See here: <https://www.eqar.eu/assets/uploads/2018/04/UseAndInterpretationOfTheESGv2.0-2015.pdf>

report (in a PDF format), the Declaration of Honour and any other relevant documents to the application to EQAR (i.e. annexes, statement to the review report).

EQAR is expected to consider the review report and the agency's application at its Register Committee meeting in (spring/summer, 2024). The Register Committee's final judgement on the agency's compliance with the ESG as a whole can either be substantially compliant (approval of the application) or not substantially compliant (rejection of the application). In case of a positive decision (substantially compliant with the ESG), the registration is renewed for a further five years (from the date of the review report).

The decision on ENQA membership by the ENQA Board will take place after EQAR Register Committee decision.

To apply for ENQA membership, the agency is requested to provide a letter addressed to the ENQA Board outlining its motivation for applying for membership and the ways in which the agency expects to contribute to the work and objectives of ENQA during its membership. This letter will be considered by the Board together with the confirmation of EQAR listing when deciding on the agency's membership. Should the agency not be granted the registration in EQAR or the registration is not renewed, the decision on ENQA membership will be taken based on the final review report, the application letter, and the statement from the Agency Review Committee. The decision on membership will be published on ENQA's website.

## 6. Indicative schedule of the review

Agreement on Terms of Reference	August 2023
Appointment of review panel members	August 2023
Self-assessment report (SAR) completed by CTI	September 2023
Screening of SAR by ENQA Review Coordinator	September 2023
Preparation of site visit schedule and indicative timetable	October 2023
Briefing of review panel members	October/November 2023
Review panel site visit	December 2023
Submission of the draft review report to ENQA Review Coordinator	End January/beginning February 2024
Factual check of the review report by the CTI	End February 2024
Statement of CTI to review panel (if applicable)	End February 2024
Submission of review report to ENQA	March 2024

Validation of the review report by the Agency Review Committee	April 2024
EQAR Register Committee meeting and decision on the application by CTI	Summer 2024
Decision on ENQA membership by the ENQA Board	Summer 2024

### ANNEX 3: GLOSSARY

BNEI	Bureau national des élèves ingénieurs/ National Association of Engineering Students
CEFDG	Conférence des écoles et formations de gestion
CTI	Commission des titres d'ingénieur
ECA	European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
ENQA	European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
EQAR	European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education
EQA	external quality assurance
ESG	Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, 2015
HE	higher education
HEI	higher education institution
Hcéres	Haut conseil de l'évaluation de la recherche et de l'enseignement supérieur
IQA	internal quality assurance
QA	quality assurance
SAR	self-assessment report

## ANNEX 4. DOCUMENTS TO SUPPORT THE REVIEW

### DOCUMENTS PROVIDED BY CTI

Self-assessment report (of September 2023) with embedded links to related documents:

- I.1 Joint press release by ministries in charge of labour and higher education, France Compétences, CTI, Hcéres, December 2022
- I.2 CTI note on the Qualiopi label for engineering schools
- I.3 Template for intermediate follow-up tables
- I.4 Mapping grid that summarizes how the evaluation of bachelor's programmes by the CTI meets the standards of part I of the ESG.
- I.5 BSE Standards & Criteria, BSE Evaluation Process, Example of a BSE evaluation report (ENTPE, 2022)
- I.6 Website page dedicated to the bachelor's programmes
- I.7 Publication of the 2022 outcomes of the bachelor's evaluation campaign
- I.8 Ministerial decree listing bachelor's programmes with the academic grade, 2022
- I.9 Press release regarding the consultation between the CTI, CEFDG and Hcéres
- I.10 Satisfaction survey for HEIs, CTI members, CTI experts
- I.11 References and guidelines: Accreditation Procedures for French engineering schools (R&O – Procédures)
- I.12 Link to the list of the CTI's members, CTI's experts, CTI's special advisors
- I.13 Composition of bachelor's expert teams in 2023
- I.14 List of training sessions during the period 2020-2023
- I.15 Deontology charters for members, experts, observers
- I.16 The CTI's By-laws
- I.17 Published recommendations regarding the academic grade and evaluation reports relating to the bachelor's programmes, plenary session of November 2022
- I.18 Search engine on the CTI's website
- I.19 Ministerial decree regarding bachelor's programmes, 2022, 2021, 2020.

### ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS PROVIDED BY CTI, BEFORE AND DURING THE VISIT, ON REQUEST OF THE REVIEW PANEL

- II.1 Summary reports or tables with results from satisfaction surveys for HEIs, CTI members, and CTI experts
- II.2 Short description of the members and responsibilities of 1) the CTI Board, 2) the CTI plenary session, 3) the CTI general assembly, and 4) CTI members taking part in the evaluation processes
- II.3 Information about the role of CTI staff members on the expert panels especially in relation to consistency of decision making
- II.4 Complaints that the agency has received since the last full review
- II.5 IQA activities CTI undertakes in each named month during a year.
- II.6 List of the most important goals for CTI's IQA activities.
- II.7 Follow-up reports showing how CTI has processed information from the stakeholder satisfaction surveys.

### OTHER SOURCES USED BY THE REVIEW PANEL

CTI's website: <https://www.cti-commission.fr/en/>

## ENQA TARGETED REVIEW 2023

THIS REPORT presents findings of the ENQA Targeted Review of the Commission des Titres d'Ingénieur (CTI), undertaken in 2023.

**enqa.**

European Association for  
Quality Assurance in Higher Education