External Assessment of Study Programmes

A Manual for Reviewers and Higher Education Institutions

www.zeva.org

Table of Contents

PREAMBLE

This document outlines the assessment framework and the general procedure for quality reviews of higher education programmes as applied by the Central Evaluation and Accreditation Agency (ZEvA). It is meant to serve as a practical guide for higher education institutions applying for evaluation and certification of their study programmes. Also, it provides guidance to members of review panels in preparation for their task.

Since the start of the Bologna Process in the mid-1990s, evaluation and quality assurance of teaching and learning have gained increasing importance for higher education institutions in Europe. Since 1995, ZEvA has been a major actor in this field nationally and internationally. ZEvA is a member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and of the European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA). The agency is also listed in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR).

ZEvA carries out different types of quality reviews: the focus may be on study programmes (as described in this brochure), or on the entire higher education institution and its internal quality management system.

The methods and criteria of evaluation applied by ZEvA are fundamentally rooted in the common European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ESG), which have also gained wide acceptance by higher education institutions outside Europe (cf. linklist in Annex 3). Hence, it is the agency's policy to monitor adherence to already existing and internationally applied standards, rather than setting its own standards (cf. assessment framework outlined in Section C).

Higher education institutions (and European ones in particular) have undergone rapid changes since the Bologna Process was launched. Their social, political, economic and cultural roles and functions have diversified, and new ideas of teaching, learning and institutional governance have emerged. However, in spite of the immense diversity of the European higher education landscape, there is still solid common ground: Essentially, the European Higher Education Area is "based on academic freedom and autonomy, on student-centred learning and on the link between teaching and research, which will continue the development of institutions which have been changing for 800 years".[1] As a partner of higher education institutions, it is part of ZEvA's mission to safeguard these fundamental values and principles.

---

[1] Floud, Roderick 2007 "Convergence and Diversity" in Froment, Kohler, Purser, Wilson (eds), EUA Bologna Handbook, Making Bologna Work, A 1.2.-1

A. EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT OF STUDY PROGRAMMES: AIMS AND BENEFITS

External quality reviews provide an opportunity for higher education institutions to further enhance the quality of their educational programmes and their internal management based on the recommendations of independent experts. By having their programmes accredited, universities can also gain competitive advantages on the higher education market.

ZEvA Quality Reviews are usually conducted as peer reviews: the agency assembles a review panel consisting of qualified and experienced experts. Based on the self-report of the higher education institution and after on-site talks with all its stakeholders, the members of the panel report on their findings and present a recommendation for a decision to the ZEvA Commission for International Affairs. In case of a positive vote, ZEvA awards its quality seal for a limited period of time (usually 5-7 years). The university receives official accreditation certificates and may also use the ZEvA seal for PR purposes. The individual steps of the peer review are described in more detail below (cf. Section B of this manual).

First and foremost, ZEvA Quality Reviews are designed to support higher education institutions in achieving their strategic goals. Beyond assessing adherence to European quality standards, a strong focus is placed on quality enhancement and quality development.
The individual missions and profiles of each higher education institution are taken into account at all times. Not least, the review procedure serves to assess whether the institution has clearly formulated its aims in teaching, learning and research, whether it has implemented adequate strategies and has allocated sufficient resources to reach those aims, and whether there is verifiable evidence of success.

The following pages contain a detailed description of a standard programme-related assessment procedure. The sample questions provided in the template should not be mistaken for a comprehensive "checklist". Rather, they give you a general idea of the various aspects impacting quality in higher education. ZEvA ensures that the design of each quality review is tailored to the needs of the higher education institution, which may also mean choosing a more narrow thematic focus.

B. MAIN STEPS OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE

As a general rule, English should be the language used by all parties involved throughout the entire review procedure. Sometimes it may be advisable to engage a professional interpreter for assistance.
The institutional self-report must be written in English. Also, central supplementary documents like the course descriptions or the examination regulations should be translated into English if necessary.

1. **Contracting phase**
   ZEvA is happy to provide all information regarding its services to interested higher education institutions and to give a first estimate of the costs involved. A personal meeting with a representative of the agency may be helpful in order to clarify the particular needs and wishes of the HEI and the type of service required.
   In case the HEI decides to engage ZEvA for a quality review, the exact nature of the service to be provided, the costs incurred and the time schedule will be laid out in a contract. The agency assures strict confidentiality.

2. **Assembly of an expert panel**
   Selecting suitably qualified and independent experts is of central importance because a review procedure seeks to do justice to a higher education institution, its particular profile, its strategic goals in teaching and research and to the disciplines involved.
   On principle, the selection of experts lies with the agency. All panels must be formally approved by the ZEvA Commission for International Affairs.
   The size of a panel varies, depending on the scale and nature of the review procedure, the number of subjects/academic disciplines involved etc. As a general rule, the peers will not only have an unquestionable academic reputation, but should ideally have some experience in higher education management and quality assurance, too. Also, at least one member of the panel will be familiar with the language and culture of the country the HEI is located in.
   Apart from these qualifications, members of a review panel are characterized by the following personal qualities:
   - a demonstrable commitment to the principles of quality assurance and quality audit in higher education,
   - a critical but constructive disposition,
   - powers of analysis and sound judgment,
   - personal authority and presence, coupled with the ability to act as an effective team player,
   - the ability to make appropriate judgments in the context of unfamiliar environments,
   - experience of organisation and management, preferably in relation to teaching and learning and to course development and operation,
   - a high standard of oral and written communication, preferably with some experience of writing formal reports to deadlines,
   - good time-management skills.

   The HEI has a right to object to a reviewer selected by the agency for well-grounded reasons (as e.g. conflicts of interest). The reviewers must always confirm their independence as part of their contract with ZEvA.

3. **Submission and desktop validation of the institutional self-report**

The HEI (or the department/faculty in charge) generates a self-report that includes a detailed description of the institution's profile, its internal quality assurance system and of the programmes to be evaluated. The following should be kept in mind during this process:

- All aspects of the assessment framework (cf. Section C) should be covered by the report, in as much detail as necessary.
- The HEI should also submit a separate reader containing central documents like the course catalogue, official examination regulations etc. (cf. template in Section D). Please note: it may be necessary to have some of the documents translated into English to create transparency for the reviewers.
- The complete and final report should be submitted to the agency **at least** 6 weeks prior to the on-site visit. We strongly recommend handing in a draft version for a pre-check about 10 weeks prior to the on-site visit.

Prior to the on-site talks, the final version of the self-report is forwarded to the panel members for desktop validation.

4. **On-site talks**

On average, the on-site review takes about two days. The members of the expert panel interview representatives of all stakeholders of the HEI (leadership board, faculty and staff, students, employers etc.) and inspect the HEI's infrastructure and resources. (Cf. sample schedule given in Annex 2) As an assistant to the panel members the responsible ZEvA project coordinator is also present during the visit.

During the visit the panel reflects on and discusses the written and verbal material so far presented, refines its findings and draft recommendations and at the end of the visit gives a brief oral presentation of its findings in a meeting with the institution's leaders and other members of faculty, staff and students

The purpose of conducting interviews is to clarify written material, to listen to the views and perspectives of different stakeholders, to verify that policies and procedural rules are put into practice, and to collect evidence of outcomes.

To gather as wide a variety of inputs as possible, interviews are usually conducted with smaller groups of interviewees (normally no more than eight to ten at a time). Typical interviewees are:

- leadership board of the HEI
- senior staff/heads of academic departments responsible for developing teaching and learning policies and overseeing implementation, including members of key committees and those with responsibility for staff development and educational development
- staff responsible for managing individual programmes (e.g. programme and subject co-ordinators)
- teaching staff at various levels and with various degrees of experience
- students in a variety of programmes, both undergraduate and postgraduate, including members of student representative bodies
- graduates from a variety of programmes
- external stakeholders, such as employers and representatives of professional bodies

Interviews are typically scheduled in sessions up to 60 minutes. Some may take a bit longer, depending on the number of participants involved and the topics to be covered.

Interviews are typically scheduled in sessions of up to 60 minutes. Some may take a bit longer, depending on the number of participants involved and the topics to be covered.

5. Evaluation report

Following the on-site talks, the ZEvA project coordinator generates a draft evaluation report in cooperation with the panel members. The report presents the panel's findings, supported by detailed analysis and commentary.

Findings are presented for each of the focus areas included in the assessment framework (cf. Section C).

Wherever appropriate, the findings are expressed as:

- **commendations** of good practice
- **affirmations**, which recognise improvements the institution is already making as a result of its self-review
- **recommendations** for improvement.

As soon as the expert report is finalised, the project coordinator passes it on to the HEI for scrutiny. On principle, the HEI gets a chance to generate a brief written statement in response to it (1-2 pages) which is published along with the report after completion of the review procedure.

6. Final decision and awarding of quality seal

As soon as the HEI has submitted its response to the evaluation report, all relevant documents (including the institutional self-report), are presented to the ZEvA Commission for International Affairs. Based on the written material and the supplementary information provided by the project coordinator, the commission takes a final decision on awarding of the quality seal and the duration of the accreditation period (usually 5-7 years).

The ZEvA Commission for International Affairs consists of the following members:

- Academic Director of ZEvA (chairperson)
- 4 experts with international experience in teaching, research and/or quality assurance and/or management in higher education
- 1 professional (from outside academia)
- 1 student

It is ZEvA's policy to ensure that at least two members of this commission are of non-German nationality.

On average, a review procedure is completed within 9-12 months, depending on the number of programmes involved. An institutional accreditation takes about the same amount of time.

7. Arbitration procedure

Objections to accreditation decisions may be directed to the ZEvA Arbitration Commission within a period of 4 weeks after notification of the decision. Higher education institutions may also lodge complaints regarding procedural errors or irregularities.

Based on the recommendation of the Arbitration Commission, the Commission for International Affairs may revise its decision or prompt the agency to repeat the review procedure completely or in parts.

C. ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

Each educational programme for which an institution seeks accreditation/certification must be consistent with national legal requirements. Furthermore, the programmes should be in line with the central requirements of the Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area, the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ESG) and the ECTS Users' Guide. The following assessment framework is therefore based on these key documents of the European Higher Education Area.

For a programme review to be successful, the following criteria should be fully met:

1.   Institutional Governance and Management

The Higher Education Institution (HEI) has a clearly defined institutional profile.

It has developed its own vision of quality in teaching and learning to create a basis for the development and realisation of its study programmes. The vision and its related policies are documented.

Strategies for implementing gender equality and equal opportunity policies are accounted for at all levels.

The institution takes appropriate measures to enhance internationalization both at programme and institutional level (support of student mobility, exchange programmes, scholarships, foreign language training etc.).

2.   Intended Learning Outcomes

The educational goals of the study programme are clearly laid out and published. Graduates are familiar with the principles, methods and theories of science and research in their particular fields.

The programme also ensures that

- its students not only acquire key competencies within their chosen field of study but also relevant ones outside it,
- the future employability of students is taken into account in the design of learning outcomes,
- the formulated goals of the study programme are in line with the corresponding level in the Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area and comply with the general standards of the discipline and/or the professional field.

3.   Concept and Structure of the Study Programme

The concept of the study programme and its curriculum ensure that

- the intended learning outcomes are achieved and that it is possible to achieve them within the time frame allocated to them,
- the qualifications of incoming students are taken into account,
- there is a course catalogue describing the intended learning outcomes (fields of knowledge and competencies to be acquired), the contents and methods of teaching, the exact student workload and other details for each educational unit,
- the ECTS key features are reflected in the structural design of the curriculum, including the national and international transfer of credits and adequate recognition procedures for credits collected at another HEI,
- in the case of special programme profiles (joint programmes, distance learning, professional Master's programmes etc.), the special needs of the students are met.

4. Teaching Faculty

The university or faculty guarantees that

- there is a sufficient number of academically qualified teaching faculty with adequate educational expertise that cover all subject areas and disciplines included in the study programme,
- there is an institutional policy and practice to support and enhance the faculty's scholarly competence and research productivity,
- policies and strategies are in place for the continuous professional development of the teaching staff,
- there are fair and merit-based procedures for staff recruitment and promotion.

5. Infrastructure, Resources and Student Support

The institution ensures that

- the resources available for the support of student learning are adequate and appropriate, especially with regard to the reviewed programme(s),
- there is a sufficient number of technical and administrative staff to support teaching and learning activities and to provide advice to students in personal, social and career matters,
- the infrastructure and facilities (lecture rooms, labs, computing facilities etc.) are adequate to the curriculum requirements,
- there is an adequately equipped library at the students' disposal,
- the programme has sufficient financial resources.

6. Student Assessment

The institution or faculty ensures that

- the chosen forms of student assessment are apt to monitor the achievement of intended learning outcomes,
- the criteria, regulations and procedures for student assessment are clear, published and consistently applied,
- examinations are organized in such a way that they remain feasible for students (e.g. limited number of examinations within a certain time period, options of repeating exams),
- the exam regulations meet national legal requirements,
- there is a compensation scheme for disabled students, as e.g. alternative forms of assessment or more flexible time regimes.

7. Quality Assurance

The HEI has implemented and published its policy and procedures for assuring and enhancing the quality of programmes and awards. All stakeholders of the HEI are involved in quality assurance procedures and programme development.

The HEI proves that it compiles, analyses and uses relevant information for the effective management of study programmes and other activities.

Its has developed appropriate instruments and procedures for the approval, periodic review and monitoring of programmes and awards, as e.g. course evaluation, monitoring of student workloads, tracing of graduates' professional careers.

8. Transparency and Public Information

The HEI regularly publishes up-to-date, accurate information about the programmes and awards offered (including the examination regulations, admission requirements, equal opportunities policies etc.).

D. TEMPLATE

Self-Report of XXX (Name of Higher Education Institution, Faculty/Department)

List of Study Programmes to be Reviewed:

Name of the Programme	Degree Awarded	ECTS Credits	Duration of the Programme	Full-time – Part-time	Intake Capacity per Year
Programme A					
Programme B					
….					

Preliminary Remarks

The institutional self-report should be structured according to the following template. HEIs should make sure that each of the focus areas outlined in Section C is covered to a sufficient degree. To this end, the template includes cross-references to the assessment framework wherever appropriate.

Some of the standards described above apply to the higher education institution as a whole while others are more programme-specific. Accordingly, the self-report should be divided into a first part that covers more general issues and a second part which focuses on the study programme(s) under review. In order to avoid unnecessary duplication of information, each programme-related chapter should only address those aspects which are unique to the particular programme and hence essential for the assessment. Where necessary, references to the general part should be made in the programme-specific chapters.

For each chapter, sample questions are provided in order to give you an idea of what sort of information should be given there. However, the questions should be taken as a general guideline that need not be followed meticulously. You may also choose not to address certain topics and discuss other aspects instead which might not be mentioned in the template at all but are nonetheless significant for the understanding of your institution and your programmes.

There are no definite limits to the length of the self-report. Experience has shown that it takes about 4-5 pages to outline the most important features of a study programme. The first part of the report (general information on the higher education institution) should not be longer than 30 pages.

The list of appendices is not exhaustive – you may add anything you consider to be of relevance, as long as it does not exceed a reasonable scope (maximum: ca. 200 pages).

Course catalogues are a central part of each self-report, as they usually contain extensive information about each educational unit, its contents, intended learning outcomes etc. This manual includes a sample course description (excerpt from the ECTS Users' Guide). If your own course catalogues/course handbooks do not fully match this format, this is no problem – in this case, please submit the documents that you use in your everyday practice, instead of creating new ones based on the template.

PART 1: GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION

a) Mission, Profile and Strategy of the HEI

Central questions to be addressed:

- When, by whom and why was the HEI founded? What development has the HEI taken since then?
- How many students are currently enrolled?
- Which study programmes in which academic disciplines are offered? (For very large institutions offering a wide range of programmes, a general survey may be more helpful than a detailed elaboration).
- What does the governance structure of the HEI look like? (Leadership board, senate, councils, number of schools/departments, support units etc.) It may be helpful to add a diagram illustrating the institution's organizational units and their responsibilities.
- What is the institution's mission, aim or goal? Where is it described and documented?
- What makes the HEI different from other institutions? What constitutes its special profile in teaching and research?
- …

⇨ *Cf. Section C.1*

b) Basic Information on the National Higher Education System

Central questions to be addressed:

- Who are the central actors and their responsibilities within the national higher education system? What are the most fundamental legal regulations impacting the HEI?
- What degree of autonomy does the HEI have regarding the design of curricula, the appointment of faculty and staff, research projects etc.? Which aspects relevant for teaching and learning are decided upon at ministerial/governmental level?
- To what extent does the country the HEI is situated participate in the Bologna process?
- …

c) Governance, Management and Quality Development

Central questions to be addressed:

- What degree of autonomy do the organisational units have? Can you provide a general description/illustration of the decision-making processes? As a general rule, are all stakeholder groups of the HEI involved in decision-making?
- Is there an equal opportunities policy? What measures are taken to create equal opportunities at all levels and for all members of the university? (Student selection procedures, recruitment of faculty and staff, support services for students with special needs etc.)
- What is done to increase internationalization at all levels? (International Office, number of incoming/outgoing students, number of incoming/outgoing lecturers, general support of student and teacher mobility, recognition of credits/learning agreements, cooperative relationships with foreign institutions, participation in joint/double degree programmes etc.)
- Does the HEI have an official policy for quality assurance and quality development? What quality circles/quality frameworks have been implemented?
- How does the HEI collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of its study programmes and other activities? Which instruments are being applied? (Course evaluation, monitoring of student workload, alumni surveys etc.)
- Who is responsible for quality assurance? Are all stakeholders of the institution involved in QA procedures and the continuous improvement of study programmes?
- What were the most significant results of quality surveys conducted during the past few years? What consequences were drawn from them, and what concrete measures were taken to remedy identified deficiencies?
- ….

⇨ *Cf. Section C.1, C.7*

d) Teaching Faculty, Resources and Infrastructure

Central questions to be addressed:

- What are the main quality criteria for the selection of faculty/teaching staff? Who is involved in the selection procedure?
- Do all faculties/departments employ a sufficient number of teaching staff to run the study programme? Does the composition of the teaching staff allow for adequate coverage of all areas and disciplines included in the study programme?
- Are the members of faculty active as scholars/researchers? Is there an institutional policy and practice to support and enhance the teaching staff's scholarly/research production?
- How does the institution ensure that all members of the teaching staff have appropriate qualifications as educators? Are policies and strategies in place for continuing professional development of teaching staff?
- Are there a sufficient number of adequately equipped lecture rooms, laboratories, libraries, computing facilities etc. at the students' disposal?
- What student support services does the HEI offer? (Counselling and advisory services, career counselling, International Office, services for disabled students etc.) Is there a sufficient number of staff to provide these services?
- .....

⟹ *Cf. Section C.4, C.5*

e) Students

Central questions to be addressed:

- At what age do the students usually enter third level education?
- What are the general entrance requirements? (Secondary school degree, entry exams etc.)
- Do students direct their application to the HEI, or is there a state-organized (pre-)selection procedure?
- Is there a students' union? Do student representatives participate in decision-making processes? At what levels, in which bodies?
- Do students have easy access to all information that is of relevance to them (course catalogues, exam regulations, other rules and guidelines)?
- ....

⟹ *Cf. Section C.8*

PART 2: DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMMES

Preliminary Remark:

If more than one study programme is to be reviewed and if the programmes share a lot of common features (which, for instance, is usually the case if all programmes of one faculty are evaluated), it may be more convenient to create one general chapter that covers all of the shared aspects and to focus on more specific issues in the programme-related chapters.

Programme A

a) Intended Learning Outcomes (LIOs)

Central questions to be addressed:

- When and why was the study programme implemented? Is it a long-established subject/one of the HEI's core programmes, or is it a new/experimental/innovative and more recently established part of the programme portfolio? What role does it play for the overall institutional profile?
- Have Intended Learning Outcomes (ILO) been formulated for the programme and for each curricular component?
- Are the ILOs in line with the corresponding level defined by the Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area (Dublin Descriptors) and do they comply with the general requirements of the discipline and/or the professional field?
- Is the employability of future graduates considered to be an explicit educational goal of the programme?
- Do the ILOs include knowledge and competencies beyond the academic discipline (as e.g. acquisition of soft skills)?
- Have further educational aims been defined for the programme (as, for example, supporting students in developing their individual personalities, raising students' socio-political awareness etc.)?

⇨ *Cf. Section C.2*

b) Structure and Content of the Study Programme

Central questions to be addressed:

- Are the key features of ECTS (awarding of credits for achieved learning outcomes) applied throughout the programme?
- How many ECTS credits are awarded in total and for each educational component?
- Does the completion of the programme allow graduates to proceed to the next educational level (from Bachelor to Master or from Master to PhD)?
- Is the programme designed in such a way that students can achieve the ILOs within the calculated time frame?
- Are the teaching contents in line with the corresponding level defined by the Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area (Dublin Descriptors)? Do they comply with the general requirements of the discipline and/or the professional field?
- How does the programme utilize different forms and methods of teaching in the delivery of the curriculum? (Individual/group tutorial, relationship with professional practice, use and integration of e-learning tools and technology, projects, internships, etc.)
- What role does research play within the programme? Do students gain hands-on experience in research?
- To what extent do the curriculum and the educational processes offer international perspectives?

⇨ *Cf. Section C.3*

c) Student Assessment

Central questions to be addressed:

- What are the main methods of assessment and how do these methods relate to teaching and learning?

- In how far do the chosen forms of assessment ascertain the achievement of the intended learning outcomes (in terms of knowledge and competencies) formulated for each educational component?
- What kind of grading system is being used in examinations and assessments?
- Is the ECTS grading scale applied?
- Can special arrangements be made for disabled students? (alternative forms of assessment etc.)
- How often and within which period of time may failed examinations be repeated?
- Are the examination regulations made accessible to all students?
- What happens in case of conflict between students and lecturers? Is there a complaints procedure?
- What is the drop-out rate for the programme? What is done to keep it low?
- What is the average number of graduates per year?

Cf. Section C.6, C.8

If possible, please fill out the following chart for each programme in order to illustrate its structure, contents and progression. Alternatively, you may create a diagram that shows all educational components/modules, their time duration, the type of examination and the credits awarded for the completion of each unit. It should also become transparent for the reader whether the units are compulsory or optional parts of the curriculum.

Structure of the Study Programme

Educational Units and Courses	Semester	Form of Examination	Workload (hours)		ECTS-credits	Lecturer in charge
			Contact Time	Self-Study Time		
Unit 1						
Course 1 (name, content)						
Course 2 …						
Course n						
Unit 2						
Course 1						
Course 2						
Unit 3						
Course 1						
Course 2						
Unit n						
Course 1						
Course 2						
Internship						
Thesis						
Total						

Programme B, Programme C, Programme D …

PART 3: SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

- Mission statement

- Course catalogue or similar document describing the contents and intended learning outcomes of the study programmes

- CVs of professors, research assistants and other members of faculty involved in the programmes (max. 1-2 page / person). The CVs should also include a survey of research projects and major recent publications)

- Examination regulations (translated into English, if applicable)

- Other relevant regulations, e.g. cooperation agreements with industry or other HEIs

- Diploma Supplement(s)

- Quality assurance policy (if available)

- Survey questionnaires (course evaluation, workload monitoring, alumni surveys etc.)

- Equal opportunities policy (if available)

Course/Module Description (Example)

Title of Course/Unit/Module				

Term	Duration	Type of Course	ECTS Credits	Student Workload
		(mandatory, elective)		(hours) teaching, self-study

Requirements for Participation	Type of Examination (oral, written, term paper etc.)	Methods of teaching and learning (lecture, seminars etc.)	Course Coordinator

Learning Outcomes

Contents

Exemplary Literature

Units		
Teacher	**Title**	**hours**

PLEASE NOTICE: This template is an excerpt from the ECTS User's Guide. It is meant as a sample that you do not necessarily have to use. In any case, please submit those documents that you actually use in your everyday practice as part of your self-report.

Statistics on Faculty & Students

Chart 1:   **Survey of Faculty and Academic Staff**

Name	Academic degree	Position	Qualification/Academic Discipline	Full-time/Part-time	Area of Teaching
Max Miller	Ph.D.	Full Professor/ Assistant Professor/ Senior Lecturer/ Visiting Lecturer/ Professional etc.	Engineering, Computer Science, Management etc.		Please name educational units/lectures/courses/laboratories

Please create a separate chart for each study programme. If the review procedure takes only one faculty/department/organizational unit into focus, you may also list all members of faculty in one chart.

Chart 2: **Acceptance Rates**

Study Programme:	Number of Applicants					Number of First Year Students					Acceptance Rate				
	minus 4	minus 3	minus 2	minus 1	Current Year	minus 4	minus 3	minus 2	minus 1	Current Year	minus 4	minus 3	minus 2	minus 1	Current Year
Programme A															
Programme B															
Programme C															
….															

Chart 3: **Student Numbers**

Study Programme:	Total Number of Students					Female Students					Foreign Students				
	minus 4	minus 3	minus 2	minus 1	Current Year	minus 4	minus 3	minus 2	minus 1	Current Year	minus 4	minus 3	minus 2	minus 1	Current Year
Programme A															
Programme B															
Programme C															
….															

Chart 4: **Drop-Out Rates and Graduates**

Study Programme	Number of Graduates			Drop-Out After One Year (%)			Completion in Nominal Time (%)			Completion in Overtime (%)		
	minus 2	minus 1	Current Year	minus 2	minus 1	Current Year	minus 2	minus 1	Current Year	minus 2	minus 1	Current Year
Programme A												
Programme B												
….												

E. ANNEX

      1. Schedule of On-Site Review (Example)

      2. Useful Links

ANNEX 1: SAMPLE FOR A SCHEDULE OF AN ON-SITE REVIEW (EXAMPLE)

Preparatory meeting of expert panel (usually on the day before the site visit)

Mandate of panel, distribution of tasks, application of basic rules and guidelines, discussion of the institution's self-report

Meeting with Members of the Leadership Board (President/Rector, Vice-Rectors, Head of Quality Management Department, Head of Supervisory Board, Representatives of the International Office, Chancellor etc…)

Topics include:

- ➢ institutional mission and profile
- ➢ portfolio of study programmes: current situation and future development
- ➢ institutional governance & participation of stakeholders (students, professionals etc.)
- ➢ quality assurance system (policy & procedures)
- ➢ general information on resources and infrastructure
- ➢ diversity management
- ➢ regional and international outreach

Meeting with Heads of Schools and/or Departments (Full Professors, Deans etc.)

Topics include:

- ➢ qualification objectives & learning outcomes
- ➢ internationalization & mobility
- ➢ underlying concepts of study programmes
- ➢ human resources & infrastructure
- ➢ examination system
- ➢ quality assurance system (policy & procedures)
- ➢ transparency & information
- ➢ diversity management
- ➢ regional and international outreach

Meeting with the Coordinators of the Study Programmes

Topics include:

- ➢ qualification objectives & learning outcomes
- ➢ program concepts & implementation
- ➢ examination system & student assessment
- ➢ human resources & infrastructure
- ➢ transparency & information
- ➢ quality assurance
- ➢ internationalization & mobility of staff and students
- ➢ student counseling and advisory services

Meeting with Teaching Faculty and Staff (full professors, assistant lecturers, research assistants, associate professors etc.)

Topics include:

- qualification objectives & learning outcomes
- applied methods of teaching and learning
- examination system & student assessment
- quality assurance
- internationalization & mobility
- student counseling and advisory services

Guided Tour of Campus

Guided tour of campus (lecture rooms, computer pools, library etc.) Time for informal talks between experts and staff/faculty

Meeting with Students

Topics include:

- qualification objectives & learning outcomes
- programme concept & implementation
- examination system & student assessment
- information policy
- quality assurance
- internationalization & mobility
- counseling and advisory services

Internal discussion of the expert panel (about 2-3 hours)

Final feedback session (open to all)

General feedback regarding the talks; discussion of open questions; outline of further procedure

Depending on the size of the cluster and the number of individuals involved, it may be advisable to reserve two rather than only one day for the on-site talks.

ANNEX 2: USEFUL LINKS

ZEvA website: www.zeva.org

European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education (ECA): http://ecahe.eu/

European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA):

http://www.enqa.eu/

ECTS Users' Guide:

http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/publications/2015/ects-users-guide_en.pdf

European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area:

http://www.enqa.eu/index.php/home/esg/

Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area

http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Documents/QF-EHEA-May2005.pdf