EUA
European University Association

European University Association

Institutional Evaluation Programme

Guidelines for participating institutions

2008

Rue d'Egmont, 13

B-1000 Brussels, Belgium

Tel: +32 (0)2 230 55 44

Fax: +32 (0)2 230 57 51

e-mail: iep@eua.be

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION AND SCHEDULE

1.1 Introduction

The Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) is an independent membership service of the European University Association (EUA) that has been designed to ensure that higher education institutions gain maximum benefit from a comprehensive evaluation conducted by a team of experienced European higher education leaders. The intention is that these evaluations will support the participating institutions in the continuing development of their strategic management and internal quality culture.

The distinctive features of the Institutional Evaluation Programme are:

- A strong emphasis on the self-evaluation phase
- A European and international perspective
- A peer-review approach
- An improvement orientation

The focus of the IEP is the institution as a whole rather than individual study programmes or units. It focuses upon:

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

In addition, participating institutions have the possibility to select a strategic priority for more in-depth analysis and recommendations. This topic will be evaluated within the institutional context and constitute a separate heading in the evaluation report.

1.2 Evaluation teams

IEP evaluation teams consist of highly experienced and knowledgeable higher education leaders. Team members are selected by the Steering Committee of the Institutional Evaluation Programme with a view to providing each participating institution with an appropriate mix of knowledge, skills, objectivity and international perspective. The number of team members is determined by the size of the participating institution. Generally, teams consist of five members; institutions with fewer than 2000 students will have a four-member team.

The teams consists of rectors or vice rectors (current or former), one student and a senior higher education professional acting as the academic secretary. Each team member comes from a different country, and none comes from the same country as the participating institution.

1.3Indicative timeframe

The following timeframe applies for the institutions that register for the IEP during the regular registration period in the spring. The IEP secretariat is prepared to work with each participating institution to adapt this timeframe to its specific circumstances and requirements.

Stage 1: June-October 2008

- The institution applies for participation in the Institutional Evaluation Programme by the end of June
- IEP establishes an evaluation team for each participating institution during the IEP annual seminar that is attended by all members of evaluation teams

- The participating universities have the option of attending a seminar organised by IEP to discuss the objectives of the evaluation and to receive guidance on planning the process

Stage 2: October 2008 - March 2009

- Self-evaluation phase: the participating institutions undergo a self-evaluation process and provide IEP with a self-evaluation report on the basis of the IEP guidelines. (Please note: the self-evaluation report **must be received four weeks** prior to the first site visit.)
- External evaluation phase begins: the evaluation team conducts a first site visit to the institution and requests any additional information as appropriate

Stage 3: April - May 2009

- The institution submits any additional information as requested by the evaluation team

Stage 4: May - July 2009

- The evaluation team makes a second site visit to the institution

Stage 5: July – October 2009

- IEP presents the written report to the institution for comments on factual errors
- IEP sends the finalised report to the institution
- IEP publishes the evaluation report on its web-site (www.eua.be/iep)

2 SELF-EVALUATION: PROCESS AND REPORT

The IEP emphasises the self-evaluation as a crucial phase in the evaluation process. The self-evaluation phase has two aspects that are equally important: the self-evaluation *process* and the self-evaluation *report*:

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

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

As soon as the institution has received these guidelines it should begin the self-evaluation process by setting up the self-evaluation group (Section 2.1). The self-evaluation group will base its work on the checklist provided in Section 2.2 and will write the self-evaluation report (Section 2.3).

2.1 The self-evaluation group

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

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

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

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

The institutional leadership will:

- Clarify the responsibility of the self-evaluation group towards staff members who are not on the team, i.e., the self-evaluation group should not work in isolation but seek, through institution-wide discussions, to present as broad a view as possible of the institution
- Support and encourage the process along the way by explaining its purpose across the institution.

The self-evaluation will result in a report submitted to the external evaluation team under the responsibility of the rector. This does not mean that the rector or all actors in the institution necessarily agree with all statements in the self-evaluation report. But the rector must accept responsibility for both the self-evaluation process as well as the report.

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

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

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

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

As the main vehicle for the institution to present itself, the self-evaluation report is also an opportunity for the institution to reflect critically upon the way it is managed and handles quality as a central process in its strategic decision making.

Therefore, the self-evaluation report should not be simply descriptive, but *analytical, evaluative and synthetic*. It is based on a SWOT analysis (assess strengths and weaknesses, identify threats and opportunities) and show how the various elements of strategic thinking and quality management are interconnected.

Four central questions structure this SWOT analysis:

- What is the institution trying to do? What are its norms and values, the mission and goals?
- How is the institution trying to do it? What are the organisational characteristics of the institutions and its key activities and to what extent these are in line with the norms and values?
- How does the institution know it works? To what extent does the institution know whether its activities and organisational structures meet the institution's objectives?
- How does the institution change in order to improve?

2.3 The Checklist

The following checklist will guide the data collection and analysis in the preparation of the self-evaluation report. It is important that all the bullet points on the list are addressed by the self-evaluation group but, since each institution operates within its own specific context, the self-evaluation group may want to tailor the checklist before starting its work. If some questions are not relevant or if specific pieces of information are impossible to provide, this should be noted in relation to the questions.

The checklist is structured into four major sections that reflect the four central questions mentioned above. A fifth – optional – section considers a strategic priority for the evaluation, which may be selected by the institution for more in-depth consideration.

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

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

- Governance and management

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

- Academic profile
  - What balance is the institution aiming to achieve among its teaching, research and other services?
  - What are the institution's academic priorities, i.e. which teaching programmes and areas of research are emphasised?
  - Does the institution have a policy or preferences regarding certain didactic approaches?
- Academically-related activities: What are the institution's goals for its relationship to society (external partners, local and regional government) and its involvement in public debate?
- Funding: What should be the institution's relationship to its funding agencies (public and others, such as research contractors)?
- What balance is the institution aiming to achieve in terms of its local, regional, national, and international positioning?
- Any other institutional goals?

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

In practice, the institution manages its activities (teaching, research, and service to society) so as to realise its mission and goals, while taking account of the specific opportunities and constraints it faces. The inevitable discrepancy between what ought to be (norms and values) and what actually exists (organisation and activities) is an indicator of the institution's strengths and weaknesses. It is the analysis of strengths and weaknesses that constitutes the next phase of the self-evaluation.

The issues addressed in Section I should be re-visited, but rather than stating objectives, Section II will reflect upon the institution's strategy in terms of each of these issues and how they are achieved, and will analyse the extent to which the institution takes full advantage of its autonomy. Moreover, each subheading in this section should also contain concrete proposals on how identified weaknesses could be remedied and strengths could be further enhanced.

- Governance and management: Re-visit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
  - Analysis of management practice: what are the respective roles of central-level administrators, offices and faculties/institutes? Does co-ordination among faculties/institutes take place, and if so how? What does the institutional leadership control and decide? What do the deans of faculty[1] control and decide with respect to:
    - Academic activities and policies (teaching and learning, research)
    - Funding issues
    - The selection and promotion of academic and administrative staff
    - The selection of students
    - Development of entrepreneurial activities
  - How does the institution involve students and external stakeholders in institutional governance?
  - How adequate are the institution's human resources, human resource policy and practice to current and future needs (e.g., age profile, recruitment, promotion, redeployment and staff development);
  - Does the institution have a gender policy? To what extent is it successfully implemented?

[1] The term faculty is used in this text in a generic sense to denote the main structural sub-units of an institution

  - ✓ How does the institution's involvement in inter-institutional cooperation (at regional, national or international level) reflect its positioning as identified in Section I
  - ✓ How do the actual management policies reflect the institution's mission and goals, and how could discrepancies between the goals and reality be amended and strengths be reinforced?

- Academic profile : Re-visit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
  - ✓ Analysis of research and educational approaches. This can be brief unless some programmes or approaches, teaching or research units deserve specific mention because they reflect the institution's academic profile (e.g., special didactic approaches, a unique and/or very large research institute, e-learning etc.)
  - ✓ Analysis of educational programme design and organisation of research activities
  - ✓ How do the study programmes and research activities reflect the mission and goals, and how could discrepancies between the goals and reality be amended and identified strengths be reinforced?
  - ✓ Does the institution have a language policy?
- Academically-related activities: Re-visit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
  - ✓ Analysis of research and technology transfer, continuing education, regional and community service, etc. This can be brief, unless some programmes deserve specific mention
  - ✓ Analysis of student support services: How do the various academically-related activities reflect the institution's mission and goals, and how could discrepancies between the goals and reality addressed and strengths reinforced?
- Funding: Revisit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
  - ✓ What is the total budget of the institution, including salaries, contracts, etc.?
  - ✓ What percentage is allotted by the state or other public authorities, by student fees, by private sources (research contracts, foundations, etc.)?
  - ✓ Is the state allocation a lump sum, or, if not, what percentage of this allocation is ear-marked?
  - ✓ What part of the budget is controlled centrally?
  - ✓ What are the amounts allotted to faculties and departments, and according to which criteria are they distributed? Are these amounts decided by the institution?
  - ✓ What are the allocation procedures within the institution? Who decides what and how?
  - ✓ What percentage of the budget could be used by the institutional leadership to implement new initiatives?
  - ✓ Is the institution able to calculate the full costs of research and teaching activities?
  - ✓ What does the institution perceive as strengths and weaknesses in terms of its funding, and how could weaknesses be remedied and strengths be further enhanced?

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

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

These quality processes include data gathering and an evaluative judgement concerning the institution's activities. Processes related to teaching and learning are enshrined in the "Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area" (ESG), which were adopted by ministers in Bergen (2005)[2] and are provided below.

- Are internal quality processes based on explicit and publicly available quality strategy and policy? Are these quality policies widely known and accepted in the institution? Is there a shared quality culture?
- What is the role of students and stakeholders?
- Does the institution have formal mechanisms for approval, periodic review and monitoring of its programmes?
- Are students examinations based on published criteria, regulations and procedures that are applied consistently?
- Does the institution have procedures to ensure that teaching staff is competent and qualified?
- Are the available resources to support student learning adequate for each programme offered?
- Does institution have regular quality procedures to monitor other activities besides teaching:
  - ✓ Research activities
  - ✓ Administrative processes
  - ✓ External relations (local, regional, national and international)
- How does the institution ensure that the data collected via quality procedures is extensive, analysed and used for effective management of the activities?
- To what extent are the outcomes of internal quality processes used in decision making and strategic development? For instance, if student course evaluations are carried out, how does the unit concerned (programme, department, etc.) handle the results from these evaluations if they fall outside norms set by the unit? Or what are the consequences, for example, of external evaluations of research units?
- Does the institution publish regularly up to date, impartial and objective information about its activities?

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

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

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

V. Strategic priority

Institutions have the option of selecting one or two strategic priorities for the evaluation. This can be on such topics as research strategy, teaching and learning, implementing Bologna, etc. The

[2] http://www.enqa.eu/pubs.lasso

topic chosen will be examined within the institutional context and will receive specific recommendations. The topic in question should also receive special attention of the institution also in the self-evaluation phase and self-evaluation report.

2.4 The structure of the self-evaluation report

After the self-evaluation group has collected and analysed the data as outlined above, it will synthesise all the information gathered and present its findings in the self-evaluation report. The following proposes a structure for this report. The report should be fairly short, analytical, reflective and critical.

<u>Introduction</u>

Brief analysis of the self-evaluation process:

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

<u>Institutional context</u>

Brief presentation of the institution in its context:

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

<u>Body of the report</u>

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

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

Optional section: Analysis of the special strategic priority chosen by the institution

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

<u>Conclusion</u>

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

A useful conclusion has the following characteristics:

- Since the goal of the evaluation is to promote ongoing quality and strategic development, the report should be honest and self-reflective. Therefore, strengths and weaknesses need to be stated explicitly; specifically, it is best to avoid playing down or hiding weaknesses.
- Strengths and weaknesses that are not discussed in the body of the report should not appear in the conclusion since they would be unsubstantiated.
- Strengths and weaknesses that are discussed in the main part of the report are summarised again in the conclusion.
- Plans to remedy weaknesses are offered in the conclusion in the form of a specific action plan.

Appendices

Annexes will include the following:

- An organisational chart of the institution's faculties (or any other relevant units of teaching/research)
- An organisational chart of the central administration and support services (rector's office staff, campus maintenance, libraries etc.)
- An organisational chart of the management structure (rector, council/senate, faculty deans and councils, major committees, etc.)
- Student numbers for the whole institution, with a breakdown by faculty, over the last three to five years; student/staff ratio (lowest, highest and mean ratios); time-to-graduation; drop-out rates; gender distribution by faculty; demographic trends in the wider target population
- Academic staff numbers (by academic rank and faculty) for the whole institution, over the last three to five years, with a breakdown by level, discipline, gender and age
- Funding: government funding (amount and percentage of total budget), other funding sources (type and percentage of total budget) and research funding (percentage within total budget); amount of institutional funding for teaching and research per faculty over the last three to five years
- Infrastructure in relation to the number of students and staff: number and size of buildings, facilities, laboratories, and libraries; their location (e.g., dispersed over a large geographical area or concentrated on a single campus); age and condition of the facilities

These data should be analysed within the national and institutional context.

Beyond these annexes, the institution is free to add other information, but the number and length of appendices should be limited to what is strictly necessary in order to understand the statements and argumentation in the self-evaluation report.

Practical aspects

- The maximum length of the self-evaluation report is 20 - 25 pages, excluding the appendices. The reason for this relatively short report is to maintain a focus on institutional management without probing too deeply into the specifics of all faculties and all activities. Institutions are encouraged to make use of any existing data and documents.
- The self-evaluation report is written partly for an internal audience (the institution's staff members and students) and partly for the evaluation team. The evaluation team is knowledgeable about higher education in general but, as internationals, they may lack in-depth knowledge of specific national situations. The self-evaluation group should keep this in mind when writing its report.
- IEP and the evaluation teams will consider the self-evaluation report as confidential and will not provide any information regarding this report to third parties.

- The self-evaluation report should be read and signed by the rector before being sent to IEP and the evaluation team. This ensures that the institutional leadership is informed appropriately.
- The self-evaluation report should be made available to all institutional members who will meet the evaluation team during the site visits.
- The report should be sent to the IEP Secretariat <u>and</u> to each individual team member at least four weeks prior to the first site visit.

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

3 SITE VISITS

3.1 Preparing for the site visits

We have stressed that the IEP process is intended to act as a support to develop further the universities' capacity to change. Therefore, the guidelines and sample programmes for the visits should be adapted to the institution's specific needs and circumstances. Each institution will be visited twice, as detailed below.

3.2 First visit: agenda and suggested schedule

For the participating institution, the first visit serves the following purposes:

- To contribute to greater awareness by the institution at large of the evaluation process and its main purpose: to enhance the institution's strategic development and change management through an examination of its internal quality arrangements
- To identify the topics for the second site visit and to set the appropriate tone. An open and self-critical approach on the part of the institution is much more beneficial than a "public-relations" approach

For the evaluation team, the first visit will contribute to develop their understanding of:

- the national higher education context
- institutional operations in terms of students, staff, finance, facilities and location
- the structures and processes of strategic decision making (planning, teaching and research, financial flows and personnel policy)
- the important local issues with respect to strategic management
- the existing procedures for quality assurance

The first visit should result in a validation of the self-evaluation report, and the evaluation team should get a broad impression of how the institution operates (decentralisation, co-ordination, etc.).

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

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

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

In order to ensure fruitful discussion:

- The number of participants in each meeting **should not exceed eight**, except for students who seem to prefer larger groups, up to ten or 12 persons.
- The team should meet privately with individual groups, e.g., only students should be present at the students' meeting, and not members of the academic staff. These meetings will be treated confidentially by the evaluation team: it will not report on an individual person's statements.
- The team should not meet anyone more than twice.
- All meetings are interactive: the evaluation team will come prepared with questions in order to start a dialogue. **Participants should not prepare formal presentations**.

The first visit lasts **2 days**. The institution is responsible for proposing the schedule for the first visit, which will need to be validated by the evaluation team. A sample schedule for the first visit is presented below, but other options are also possible in consultation with the evaluation team secretary.

The sample schedule includes parallel visits to faculties or other units. Please note that:

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

Please adapt the schedule to the characteristics of your institution and keep in mind that the team will have the opportunity to visit other units during the second visit.

Sample schedule for the first visit

Time	***What & who?***	***Why?***
	DAY 0	
Late afternoon	**Arrival** of evaluation team	
90 minutes	**Briefing meeting** Evaluation team alone	Division of tasks; discussion of the self-evaluation; inventory of issues for preliminary visit
Evening	**Dinner** Evaluation team, with rector and liaison person	Welcome, make acquaintance; go over preliminary programme; discuss key issues for evaluation from the institution's perspective (arising from self-evaluation and/or from rector's experience)
	DAY 1	
9.00 – 10.00	**Meeting with rector** Evaluation team, rector	Discuss *privately* issues that need to be stressed in evaluation team's visit and report

10.15 – 11.00	**Introduction meeting** Evaluation team, liaison person	Introduction to the institution: structures, quality management and strategic management; national higher education and research policies; students issues (e.g. tuition fees, governmental grants and aid)
11.00 – 12.30	**Meeting with self-evaluation group** Self-evaluation steering group, evaluation team, liaison person, task forces (if any)	Understand self-evaluation process and extent of institutional involvement; how useful was self-evaluation for the institution (emerging issues, function in strategic planning processes)? Are self-evaluation data still up to date? Will they be updated for the second site visit?
12.30 – 14.00	**Lunch** Evaluation team, liaison person	Reflect upon impressions of first meetings and complete information as necessary
14.10 – 14.40 **parallel** Evaluation team splits into pairs to visit two faculties	**Visit to faculties A & B** Dean	Introduction to the faculty: structures, quality management and strategic management; discuss relationships of faculties with the central level; input in self-evaluation; role of quality control activities in faculty
14.40 – 15.40 **parallel** Evaluation team splits into pairs to visit two faculties	**Visit to faculties A & B** Academic staff representatives	Discuss relationships of faculties with the central level; input in self-evaluation; role of quality control activities in faculty; recruitment of new staff; staff development; motivation policies. Please note that deans or vice deans should not be present at this meeting: it is reserved for “regular” academic staff only.
15.50 – 16.40 **parallel** Evaluation team splits into pairs to visit two faculties	**Visit to faculties A & B** Students	Students’ views on experience (e.g., teaching and learning, student input in quality control and (strategic) decision making)
17.00 – 18.00	**Meeting with external partners** (industry, society and/or local authority)	Discuss relations of the institution with external partners of the private and public sectors
18.30 – 19.30	**Debriefing meeting** Evaluation team alone	Reflect on impressions; prepare second day of visit
Evening	**Dinner** Evaluation team alone	Reflect on impressions gained thus far

DAY 2		
9.00 – 9.30 **parallel** Evaluation team splits into pairs	**Visit to faculties C & D** Dean	as in faculties A and B (adapt as appropriate)
9.30 – 10.15 **parallel** Evaluation team splits into pairs	**Visit to faculties C & D** Academic staff representatives	as in faculties A and B (adapt as appropriate)
10.15 – 11.00 **parallel** Evaluation team splits into pairs	**Visit to faculties C & D** Students	as in faculties A and B (adapt as appropriate)
11.00 – 12.00	**Tour of campus** Evaluation team, liaison person	To visit a sample of labs, classrooms and libraries
12.00 – 12.30	**Debriefing meeting** Evaluation team alone	Reflect on impressions; list issues for additions to self-evaluation report and main visit
12.30 – 13.00	Evaluation team, liaison person	Plan the second visit schedule (select faculties or units, special or additional persons to speak); logistical support for or during visit; visit team's meeting and working rooms (where team can work on its oral report)
13.00	**Lunch:** Evaluation team, rector and liaison person	Concluding session to agree topics of additional documentation
Afternoon	Departure of evaluation team	

Practical considerations:

- Enough time should be left for the team's debriefing sessions.
- A ten-minute leeway should be left between each meeting to allow groups to go in and out, to give the evaluation team a few minutes to reflect together on previous meetings or to make changes to plans for the next meeting. Such brief breaks, in addition to coffee breaks, can also be useful to catch up on time if some meetings take longer than expected.
- If the evaluation team needs to move from one location to another (e.g., to another faculty), please take realistically into account the time for doing so.
- If the institution has several campus sites, careful consideration should be given as to whether visits to several sites are necessary. Unnecessary visits should be avoided in order to keep travelling time at a minimum.
- The liaison person will make the necessary arrangements for the first visit, including arranging transportation for the evaluation team to and from the airport, hotel reservations and scheduling meetings.

- The liaison person provides nameplates for the meetings, distributes the evaluation team's short biographies in advance of the site visit and informs participants about the general objectives of the first visit and of the particular meeting in which they are involved.

At the end of the first visit, the team will:

- Ask for additional, written information. These additional documents, as well as any other information that has been requested, should be sent to all members of the team and to the IEP secretariat at least four weeks before the date of the main site visit.
- Decide the dates of the second visit
- Identify the persons, bodies or units to meet

The first visit contributes to the team's understanding of the specific characteristics of the institution. As such, it is not intended to lead to any conclusions. The evaluation team will not produce an evaluation report at this point.

3.3The second site visit

The focus during the second visit is no longer to gain an understanding of what is specific about the institution but to find out whether, how, and with what results, the institutional strategy and internal quality policies and procedures are implemented coherently in the institution.

The practical aspects for organising the first visit apply to the second visit as well, with one important difference. The evaluation team will be responsible for establishing the programme of the second visit. An example of a schedule for the second visit is given below. The schedule of the visit must be discussed between the liaison person and the team secretary in advance. As shown below, the schedule of the visit may include parallel sessions in order to cover more ground and collect more evidence. The team will advise the institution in good time of its plans in this respect.

The **usual length** of the second site visit **is 3 days** (see the sample schedule below). The evaluation team may decide, where appropriate, to shorten the visit to **2 days** for very small institutions (less than 2000 students) or to extend it to a maximum of **4 days** for very big institutions.

In exceptional circumstances, however, the chair of an evaluation team may extend the second site visit by up to one day, should this be deemed necessary. This may be the case, for instance, with very large institutions (over 25.000 students) or with smaller institutions which are very complex. Any extension of the main site beyond the usual length must be decided by the chair (in agreement with the evaluation team) and announced to the institution during the first site visit at the latest.

Sample schedule of the second site visit

Time	***What & who?***	***Why?***
	DAY 0	
Late afternoon	**Arrival** of evaluation team	
60 minutes	**Briefing meeting** Evaluation team alone	Division of tasks, preliminary discussion of evaluation report structure and issues
Evening	**Dinner** Evaluation team, with rector and liaison person	Welcome, renew acquaintance; go over site visit programme

DAY 1		
9.00 – 10.00	**Meeting with rector** Evaluation team, rector	Discuss *privately* issues that need to be stressed in team's visit and report
10.10 – 11.00	**Meeting with self- evaluation steering group** Self-evaluation group, evaluation team, liaison person, task forces	Discuss any changes in context or internal situation since the first visit, analyse impact of first visit, review additional information sent to the team, clarify any open questions
11.10 – 12.30	**Meeting with the deans** Deans' Council or deans from several faculties, evaluation team	Discuss relationship of faculties with central level with respect to strategic development and quality management; input in self-evaluation; special issues arising from self-evaluation parts one and two and/or from talk with rector
12.40 – 14.00	**Lunch** Evaluation team, liaison person	Reflect upon impressions of first meetings and complete information as necessary
14.00 – 15.00	**Meeting with central office staff members**	Discuss role of e.g. institutional strategic documents (development plans, etc.) in development of institution; special issues arising from self-evaluation parts one and two and/or from talk with rector
15.10 – 16.00	**Meeting with senate** Senate representatives	Discuss relationship of senate/democratic representation body with rectoral team regarding strategic and quality management
16.00 – 16.45	**Meeting with student delegation** Student representatives	Students' views on the institution, on relations with rector's office, on student input in quality management and in (strategic) decision making
17.00 – 18.00	**Meeting with outside partners** (Industry, society and/or local authorities)	Discuss relationships of institution with external stakeholders of private and public sector
18.00 – 19.00	**Debriefing meeting** Evaluation team alone	Exchange impressions, review the day
Evening	**Dinner** Evaluation team alone	Reflect on impressions and start preparing oral report

DAY 2		
9.00 – 10.00 **parallel** Evaluation team splits into pairs	**Visit to faculties E and F** Dean	Introduction to the faculty: structures, quality and strategic management; discuss relationships of faculties with the central level; input in self-evaluation; role of quality control activities in faculty
10.00 – 11.00 **parallel** Evaluation team splits into pairs	**Visit to faculties E and F** Academic staff	Discuss relationships of faculties with the central level; input in self-evaluation; role of quality control activities in faculty; recruitment of new staff; staff development; motivation policies. Please note that deans or vice deans should not be present at this meeting: it is reserved for “regular” academic staff only.
11.15 – 12.15 **parallel** Evaluation team splits into pairs	**Visit to faculties E and F** Students	Students’ views on their experience (e.g., teaching and learning, student input in quality control and (strategic) decision making)
12.30 – 14.00	**Lunch** Evaluation team alone	Evaluation team, alone, to exchange impressions
14.00 – 15.00	**Meeting with international researchers and international graduate students**	To discuss their experience of the institutions
15.30 – 20.00	**Debriefing meeting** Evaluation team alone	Exchange impressions, review day and begin drafting the oral report [evaluation team needs a working room in the hotel for this task]
20.00	**Dinner** Evaluation team alone	Continuation of debriefing meeting
21.00 – 23.00	**Drafting oral report** Evaluation team alone	[evaluation team needs a working room in the hotel for this task]
DAY 3		
9.00 – 10.00	**Concluding meeting** Rector, evaluation team	Discuss draft oral report *with the rector alone*, to ensure it reflects the findings of the team as well as the needs of the rector for the institution’s further development
10.00 – 10.30	**Adapting oral report** Evaluation team alone	Adapt oral report according to discussion with rector
10.30 – 12.00	**Presentation of oral report** Evaluation team, rector and members of the institution (invitations to be decided by the rector, e.g. rectoral team, liaison person, self-evaluation group, senate etc).	
Afternoon	Lunch and departure of evaluation team	

4 EVALUATION REPORT

The evaluation team will draft a written report based on the oral report presented at the end of its visit. The draft report will then be communicated to the rector. The rector will correct any factual errors and, most importantly, comment on the usefulness of the report for the institution's follow-up process.

The institution's reaction must be sent to the IEP secretariat, which will forward it to the team secretary. The report will then be finalised and sent officially to the rector, thus formally concluding the main evaluation process.

Please note that as of 2008-2009 evaluation round IEP will publish final evaluation reports on its web-site (www.eua.be/IEP).

The Table below summarises the key milestones and division of tasks during the report-writing stage.

Indicative timeframe and division of labour		
Task	**Main responsibility**	**Time Frame**
Write draft report	Team secretary	6 weeks after the second visit
Comment on draft	Evaluation team	Within 2 weeks
Send redraft to IEP staff	Team secretary	Within 2 weeks
Edit	EUA editor	Within 1 week
Comment on new draft	Team secretary (if necessary, in consultation with the team chair)	Within 2 weeks
Send report to institution	IEP staff	ASAP
Institution corrects factual errors	Rector	Within 3 weeks
Any change + sending final report to institution + publishing it on IEP web-site (www.eua.be/IEP)	IEP staff (if necessary, in consultation with the team chair and secretary)	Within 2 weeks

Annex 1:

The EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme

This sheet can be distributed by participating institutions to all participants in the self-evaluation process or in the site visits.

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

The IEP focuses on the institutional decision-making processes and structures, and the effectiveness of strategic development. It evaluates the relevance of internal quality processes and their use in the strategic positioning of the institutions. The IEP evaluations have a formative orientation, i.e., they are aimed at contributing to the development and enhancement of the institutions. The IEP is not geared towards passing judgements or ranking or comparing institutions.

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

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

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

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

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

Since 1994, over 250 evaluations in 39 countries (mostly in Europe but also in Latin America and South Africa) have been conducted by IEP. These have included all types and sizes of higher education institutions: public and private universities and polytechnics, comprehensive and specialised institutions, including art and music schools.

Annex 2

Terms and Conditions for participation in the Institutional Evaluation Programme 2008/2009

Participation fee:

The cost of participating in the Institutional Evaluation Programme in 2008 – 2009 is **31,500 Euros** for EUA members (34,000 for non-members), payable at the beginning of the evaluation procedure. In addition, participating institutions have to cover the accommodation (hotels and meals) and local transportation (airport transfer) costs for the members of the evaluation team.

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

Interval between the site visits:

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

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

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

Annex 3

Follow-up activities

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

- **A follow-up evaluation two to four years later:** at the request of the institution, IEP will form a team of four evaluators (two of whom participated in the original evaluation) to conduct a follow-up evaluation on the changes implemented since the initial evaluation.
- **Participation in the Alumni Forum:** the Forum meets twice a year on the occasion of major EUA conferences to discuss timely topics related to quality.

Please contact IEP staff (iep@eua.be) if you are interested in the follow-up activities of the IEP.

Selected further reading

EUA (CRE) publications

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

Barblan, A. (1995). *Management for Quality: the CRE Programme of Institutional Evaluation - Issues encountered in the pilot phase - 1994/1995*. CRE action n° 107. CRE, Geneva.

Conraths, B. & Trusso, A. (2007). *Managing the University Community: Exploring Good Practice.* EUA, Brussels

CRE (2000), *Quality Assurance as a Tool for Change: a Project Report on Quality Strategies in South Western Europe.* CRE-dossier n° 1. CRE, Geneva.

EUA (2004). *Developing Joint Masters Programmes for Europe. Results of the EUA Joint Masters Project.*

EUA (2005). *Doctoral Programmes for the European Knowledge Society. Results of EUA Doctoral Programmes Project.*

EUA (2006). *Guidelines or Quality Enhancement in European Joint Master Programmes. EMNEM - European Masters New Evaluation Methodology*.

EUA (2006). *Quality Culture in European Universities: A Bottom-Up Approach. Report on the Three Rounds of the Quality Culture Project 2002-2006*.

EUA (2007). *Embedding Quality Culture in Higher Education - A selection of papers from the 1st European Forum for Quality Assurance*

EUA (2007). *Creativity in Higher Education - Report on the EUA Creativity Project 2006-2007*

Hofmann, S. (2005). *10 Years On: Lessons Learned from the Institutional Evaluation Programme*. EUA, Brussels.

Kanaan, S. & Barblan, A. (1997). *Institutional Evaluation as a Tool for Change - L'évaluation institutionnelle comme un outil de changement*. CRE doc n°3. CRE, Geneva.

Reichert, S. (2006). *The Rise of Knowledge Regions: Emerging Opportunities and Challenges for Universities.* EUA, Brussels.

Reichert, S. (2006). *Research Strategy Development and Management at European Universities.* EUA, Brussels.

Tabatoni, P. & Barblan, A. (1998). *Principles and Practices of Strategic Management in Universities*, CRE-Guide n° 2. CRE, Geneva.

Tabatoni, P, Davies, J and Barblan, A (2002). *Strategic Management and Universities' Institutional Development*, Geneva: EUA Thema N°2, EUA, Brussels.

van Vught, F. A., & Westerheijden, D. F. (1996). *Institutional Evaluation and Management for Quality: The CRE Programme: Background, goals and procedures.* CRE-Action n° 107. CRE, Geneva.

Weber, L. *Governance and Capacity for Change*, EUA, Brussels. http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/governance_capacity4change.1156863919271.pdf

Self-evaluation and quality management in higher education

Alstete, J. (1996). *Benchmarking in Higher Education*. Washington DC: George Washington University/ASHE-Eric.

Barnett, R. (1992). *Improving higher education: Total Quality Care*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Brennan, J., Frazer, M., Williams, R. (1998). *Self-Evaluation in Higher Education: A pack of materials for groups undertaking self-evaluation.* London: QSC/Open University Press.

Dill, D. D. (1992). Quality by design: Towards a framework for academic quality management. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Vol. VIII).

Frederiks, M. M. H., Westerheijden, D. F., & Weusthof, P. J. M. (1994). Effects of Quality Assessment in Dutch Higher Education. *European Journal of Education, 29*, 181-200.

Kells, H. R. (1995). *Self-Study Processes*. New York: ACE/McMillan.

Kristoffersen, D., Sursock, A., & Westerheijden, D.F. (1998). *Manual of Quality Assurance: Procedures and Practice*. Torino: European Training Foundation.

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

Schwarz, S. and Westerjeijden D.F. (eds.) (2004). *Accreditation and Evaluation in the European Higher Education Area*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Trow, M. (1994). *Academic reviews and the culture of excellence.* Chancellor's Office, 1994:1, Stockholm.

Vroeijenstijn, A. I. (1995). *Improvement and accountability: navigating between Scylla and Charybdis: Guide for external quality assessment in higher education*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Weusthof, P. J. M. (1995). Internal Quality Assurance in Dutch Universities: an empirical analysis of characteristics and results of self-evaluation. *Quality in Higher Education, 1*, 235-248.

SWOT

Balamuralikrishna, R. & Dugger, J. C. (1995). SWOT Analysis - A Management Tool for Initiating New Programs in Vocational Schools. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education, 12*(1) 36-41.

Groff, Warren H. (1981) Strategic Planning Techniques: Matching External Assessment with Internal Audit.

Herman, J. J. (1993). Strategic Planning for School Success. *NASSP Bulletin, 77(*557), 85-91.

Hill, T., & Westbrook, R. (1997). SWOT analysis: It's time for a product recall. *Long range planning, 30*(1), 46-52.

Nijssen, E.J. & Ligthart, P.E.M. (1999). SWOT-analyse: Vloek of zegen? *Bedrijfskunde, 71*(1), 15-19

Slocum, J. W. & McGill, M. (1994). The new learning strategy: Anytime, anything, anywhere. *Organizational dynamics, 23*(2), 33-48.

Strategic management in higher education

Afuh, A. (1998). *Innovation management: Strategies, implementation and profits*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Birnbaum, R. (1989). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management Fads in Higher Education: Where They Come From, What they Do, Why they Fail.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campbell, C., Kanaan, S., Kehm, B., Mockiene, B., Westerheijden, D., & Williams, R. (2000). *The European University: A Handbook on Institutional Approaches to Strategic Management, European Policy and Academic Recognition*. Torino: European Training Foundation.

Clark, Burton R. (1983). *The Higher Education System.* University of California Press.

Clark, Burton R. (ed.) (1984). *Perspectives on Higher Education.* University of California Press.

Hussey, D. (1998). *Strategic management: From theory to implementation.* 4th ed. Oxford: Butterworth Heineman.

McNay, I (1997), *Institutional management for universities.* TOP-Handbook. Torino: European Training Foundation.

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

Stacey, R. D. (1996). *Strategic management and organisational dynamics.* 2nd ed. London: Pitman.

Wit, B. de (1998). *Strategy: Process, Content and Context. An international perspective.* London: TBP.