Europe-Africa Quality Connect

Guidelines for universities

These guidelines have been adopted from the EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP)'s guidelines for institutions for the purposes of this particular project and should not be used in other contexts.

The project is carried out with the support of the Erasmus Mundus programme of the Europ Commission.

Table of Contents

The project is carried out with the support of the Erasmus Mundus programme of the Europ Commission.

1 Introduction and Schedule

1.1 Introduction

The project

The project *Europe-Africa Quality Connect: Building Institutional Capacity through Partnership* will address the need for assessing and enhancing institutional capacity for change, as well as contribute to the international dialogue and cooperation on institutional development and quality assurance, as core elements for partnerships between universities in Europe and Africa.

Europe-Africa Quality Connect intends to share the EUA's Institutional Evaluation Programme's (IEP; www.eua.be/iep) approach with five African universities in different regions of sub-Saharan Africa as a trial application. Twenty-five European and African experts will participate in these evaluations, comprising five evaluation teams. The project will also allow exchanges and networking between these experts in quality assurance, through mutual training exercises. Each evaluation team will issue an evaluation report with recommendations for the evaluated university. In addition, the five evaluation reports will contribute in developing recommendations for the reorientation of universities with regards to governance, partnership with governmental agencies and relationship to quality assurance systems. The main findings and recommendations will be publicised through a final project publication and a dissemination conference at the end of the project.

More information on this project is available on www.QAConnect-Africa.eu.

The methodology and evaluation cycle

The methodology of the evaluations is based on the Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP), an independent EUA service that stresses the institutional responsibility in defining quality and the means to achieve it. IEP has carried out about 250 evaluations worldwide since 1994, and has become a distinct European approach to quality enhancement and a flexible tool for strategic development. The idea of the IEP is to provide a flexible tool for assessing their institutional goals and sharpening their missions. The evaluation report highlights the good practices identified by the team, but it also provides the University with recommendations for further improvement in order to achieve its mission and goals. The recommendations are specifically tailored to the context of each respective University.

In the context of the QA Connect project, the IEP approach will be further refined and developed in cooperation with African regional associations committed to promoting institutional development.

The steps in the evaluation process are:

- After the 5 universities for the pilot are selected, the Vice-Chancellor of each university is asked to sign a Memorandum of Understanding, outlining the responsibilities of the institution in undergoing the evaluation. This includes nominating 1-2 follow-up contacts who will assist in coordinating the visits.
- Two representatives of all participating universities attend a workshop for universities, which will take place in Accra (Ghana) on 18-19 April 2011. This workshop aims to prepare the

participating universities for the evaluation process, and more specifically provide information on the self-evaluation phase.

- The EUA secretariat, who will act as the contact point for experts and universities to be evaluated, will confirm the dates of the first site visit to the university and inform them about the expert team that will be coming. The experts will be asked to make their travel arrangements. The university will make all local arrangements for accommodation, meals and transport, and communicate the practical information to the team coordinator and the EUA secretariat. The university will also assist with visa requests of experts whenever necessary.
- A **self-evaluation process** is conducted by the university, with a self-evaluation **report** sent to the evaluation team at least 3 weeks before the first visit.
- Each team member of the expert team reads and analyses the self-evaluation report from his/her assigned institution, and gets prepared for the site visits.
- The **first site visit** takes place (2 days).
- At the end of this first visit, the team requests any additional information that may be useful and agrees on the dates of the second visit with the university. The team coordinator communicates these dates to the EUA secretariat.

- The university provides additional information as agreed with the team, at least 3 weeks before the second visit.
- The **second site visit** takes place (3 days), with an oral report issued to the Vice-Chancellor/rector (and any other invited staff) on the last day.
- The universities have 5 weeks to request any reimbursement for costs incurred during the visit of the experts (including meals and local transport). These requests must respect the stipulations in Annex 2.

- The team coordinator drafts the **final report** and sends it to the other team members. The whole team exchanges views on the final report. The report as agreed among team members and approved by the chair is sent to the EUA secretariat for editing.
- The final report is sent to the university for a factual checking. When needed, the team is consulted before finalising the report.
- The EUA secretariat wraps up the process by officially sending the report to the university. The team members also receive a printed copy. All final reports will be published on the project website.
- Universities are asked to participate in the post-evaluation workshop, where the whole exercise will be discussed and debated amongst peers from different universities and QA actors
- Universities may participate in the final dissemination conference of the project

1.2 Evaluation teams

The evaluation teams consist of experienced and knowledgeable higher education leaders, academics and a student. Team members are selected with a view to providing each participating institution with an appropriate mix of knowledge, skills, objectivity and international perspective. A team consists of five members: two African higher education experts, two European higher education experts and one African student/ immediate alumni with experience studying both in Africa and in Europe. Each team will have a chair and a coordinator acting as the contact between the university or the EUA secretariat and the other team members. Each team member comes from a different country, and none comes from the same country as the participating university.

For the European experts, the Institutional Evaluation Programme run by EUA has an extensive pool of experienced European experts who have conducted evaluations world-wide. The African experts have been selected by the Association of African Universities via an open call, according to strict criteria. Students are selected amongst a pool of African students participating in the Erasmus Mundus scholarship programme of the EU.

1.3 Indicative time frame

The EUA secretariat is prepared to work with each university to adapt this time frame to its specific circumstances and requirements. However, it should be noted that the evaluations have to be terminated (with final report sent to the university) by **February 2012.**

Stage 1: March – September 2011

- ✓ Vice-Chancellor signs the <u>Memorandum of Understanding</u> and appoints a contact person to liaise with the EUA secretariat and the team coordinator.
- ✓ One or two university representative(s) attend(s) the <u>workshop for universities</u> organised in Accra (Ghana) on 18-19 April 2011, to discuss the objectives of the evaluation and to receive guidance on planning the process.
- ✓ The EUA and AAU establish an <u>evaluation team</u> for each university and send the CVs of the experts to the university.
- ✓ The EUA secretariat liaises with the university contact person so to communicate the exact travel schedules for each expert. Should experts need visas, the university assists the experts in visa requests and liaises with local authorities. EUA and AAU can provide official letters stating the participation of the universities and the experts in the project.
- ✓ The team coordinator exchanges with the university contact person so to agree on a draft programme for the first visit.
- ✓ The university makes arrangements for accommodation, airport pick-up, local transportation and meals, and communicates the quotes to the EUA secretariat at least 3 weeks before the first visit.
- ✓ <u>Self-evaluation phase</u>: the institutions undergo a self-evaluation process and provide the team and the EUA secretariat with a self-evaluation report on the basis of the Guidelines – see point 2, below. Please note that the self-evaluation report **must be received 3 weeks** prior to the first site visit.

Stage 2: September 2011 – December 2011

- ✓ The evaluation team conducts <u>a first site visit</u> to the institution and requests any additional information as appropriate.
- ✓ The institution submits any additional information as requested by the evaluation team.
- ✓ The team coordinator and the university contact person stay in touch so to agree on the programme of the second visit, as well as exchange on practicalities (flight schedules for experts...).
- ✓ The university makes arrangements for accommodation, airport pick-up, local transportation and meals, and communicates the quotes to the EUA secretariat at least 3 weeks before the second visit.
- ✓ The evaluation team makes <u>a second site visit</u> to the institution.

Stage 3: December 2011 – February 2012

- ✓ All invoices related to the site visits should be sent to the EUA secretariat. Claims must respect the stipulations in Annex 2.
- ✓ The EUA secretariat sends the draft written report to the institution for comments on factual errors.
- ✓ The EUA secretariat sends the finalised report to the institution. All reports will be published on the project website (www.QAConnect-Africa.eu).

2 Self-Evaluation: Process and Report

The self-evaluation is 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. Universities are urged to take this opportunity to involve all members of the institution in this process.
- 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. If a university wants the evaluation process to address a particular strategic priority of the institution in-depth, it should pay particular attention to the chosen priority in its self-evaluation process and report.

As soon as the university 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 (Section 2.3) and will write the self-evaluation report (Section 2.4).

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
- It represents the major constituencies in the university (academic and administrative staff and students) to maximise involvement of all major stakeholders. Whereas it is important that the abovementioned constituencies are represented, the group ought not to be an exhaustive gathering of all units and faculties within the institution.
- The rector should *not* be part of the group.
- The group is small (max. 10 members) to ensure that it is efficient.
- It selects a chairperson and an academic secretary to write the report under the chairperson’s responsibility
- It decides on the distribution of tasks
- It plans and coordinates the work: 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
- It provides opportunities for a broad discussion of the self-evaluation within the institution to promote a broad identification with the report

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.
- Appoint a contact person to the evaluation team and the EUA secretariat (a liaison person responsible for the arrangements of the site visits).

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. Annex 1 of these Guidelines contains a sample handout that may be used by the university for this purpose.

The institution will have access to an online repository on the website www.QAConnect-Africa.eu that will provide examples of prior self-evaluations reports and other relevant material.

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

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

- To present a succinct but analytical and comprehensive statement of the institution's view of quality and strategic management
- 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 quantitative and qualitative data supporting the analysis
- 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 **s**trengths and **w**eaknesses, identify **t**hreats and **o**pportunities) 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 institution, i.e. governance structures, 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

See annex 3

Annex 3 presents a checklist that 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.

2.4 The structure of the self-evaluation report

See annex 4

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. A proposed structure for this report is presented in annex 4. The report should be fairly short, analytical, reflective and critical.

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 activities. Institutions are encouraged to make use of any existing data and documents. Unless there has been a previous agreement on the language of the evaluation, the self-evaluation report and its appendices should be written in the language of the evaluation (English or French).
- 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.
- The project consortium partners and the evaluation team will consider the self-evaluation report as confidential and will not provide any information regarding this report to third parties. However, if the university wishes so and in order to share experience with the other participating universities, the self-evaluation report can be uploaded in a access restricted area of the project website, where the four other universities evaluated for this project as well as all expert teams will be able to read it.
- The self-evaluation report should be read and signed by the rector before being sent to the EUA secretariat 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.**
- The report should be sent to the EUA Secretariat and to each individual team member at least three 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 evaluation 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.

In order to ensure fruitful discussion during the site visits:

- The number of participants in each meeting **must not exceed eight (8)**, except for students who seem to prefer larger groups of up to ten persons.
- The team should meet **privately** with individual groups, e.g., only students should be present at the students' meeting, with no members of the staff present. These meetings will be treated confidentially by the evaluation team: it will not report on an individual person's statements.
- In countries with strong hierarchies and/or special respect to senior persons, equality among the persons on the panel should be respected to allow everyone to participate fully in the interviews.
- All meetings are interactive: the evaluation team will come prepared with questions in order to start a dialogue. **Participants should not prepare formal presentations**.

Practical considerations:

- Sample schedules for the visits are presented in annex 5, but institutions and evaluation teams should bear in mind that they are only suggestions and can be modified if appropriate, taking into consideration the size, structure etc. of the institution in question. The schedule of the second visit particularly is subject to changes depending on the themes that the evaluation team wishes to concentrate on.
- 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 account of the time to do 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 visits, 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. If

possible, it would be helpful for the team to receive the names and positions of the people to be interviewed in each meeting beforehand (for ex. the day before).

3.2 First visit

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

- To contribute to greater awareness in 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". It is important that, the evaluation team meets also "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/Vice-Chancellor as well as other members of the rector's team
- The self-evaluation group
- Representatives of the central staff: mainly from the quality office, international relations office, financial services, student 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)

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 in annex 5, but other options are also possible in consultation with the evaluation team coordinator.

The sample schedule includes visits to faculties or other units, which may (but need not) be organised as parallel sessions. 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 different types of faculties, research institutes and other structures. The evaluation team (split in pairs if necessary) may 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.

The schedule should be adapted to the characteristics of the institution and it should be kept in mind that the team will have the opportunity to visit other units during the second visit.

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

- Ask for additional written information if necessary. 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 EUA secretariat at least four weeks before the date of the second site visit.
- Decide the dates of the second visit (in co-operation with the institution)
- Identify the persons, bodies or units to meet during the second visit

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.

3.3 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 in annex 5, but the institutions and teams should keep in mind that it is always possible to tailor the schedule to suit the priorities of the institution and the needs of the evaluation process. The schedule of the visit must be discussed between the liaison person and the team coordinator 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 in annex 5).

Videotaping or recording the oral report session or including members of the media during this session is not recommended. If this does happen, it must be agreed to in advance of this session with the team chair.

4 Evaluation Report

The evaluation team will draft a written report based on the oral report presented at the end of the second visit. The draft report will then be communicated to the rector by the EUA secretariat. The Vice-Chancellor will ensure that any factual errors are corrected.

The institution's reaction must be sent to the EUA secretariat. The report will then be finalised and sent officially to the vice-chancellor, again via the EUA secretariat, thus formally concluding the evaluation process.

Please note that the five final reports will be published on the project website.

Please also note that reports are intended to be constructive and non-biased. They are designed to help the institutions reflect its current goals and objectives, and how it is attempting to achieve them. The evaluation does not prescribe strict quality criteria, but rather evaluates how the institution is responding to its own objectives, and how it may better meet those objectives.

The evaluations will in no way be used to rank or classify the institutions that take participate. However, institutions will be encouraged to share their experience undergoing this exercise in the context of the Quality Connect project.

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

Timeframe and division of labour		
Task	**Responsibility**	**Time Frame**
Write draft report	Team coordinator and chair	At the latest 4 weeks after second visit
Comment on draft	Evaluation team	Within 2 weeks
Send draft approved by the team chair to EUA secretariat	Team coordinator	ASAP
Edit	EUA editor	Within 1 week
Send report to institution	EUA secretariat	ASAP
Institution corrects factual errors	VC	Within 2 weeks
Any change + sending final report to institution + publishing it on project website	EUA secretariat (if necessary, in consultation with the team chair and coordinator)	Within 2 weeks

Annex 1

The Europe-Africa Quality Connect project

Participating institutions can distribute this sheet to all participants in the self-evaluation process or in the site visits.

The project

The project *Europe-Africa Quality Connect: Building Institutional Capacity through Partnership* will address the need for assessing and enhancing institutional capacity for change, as well as contribute to the international dialogue and cooperation on institutional development and quality assurance, as core elements for partnerships between universities in Europe and Africa.

Europe-Africa Quality Connect intends to share the European University Association's Institutional Evaluation Programme's (IEP; www.eua.be/iep) approach with five African universities in different regions of sub-Saharan Africa as a trial application. Twenty-five European and African experts will participate to these evaluations, as comprising five evaluation teams. The project will also allow exchanges and networking between these experts in quality assurance, through mutual training exercises. Each evaluation team will issue an evaluation report with recommendations for the evaluated university. In addition, the five evaluation reports will contribute in developing recommendations for the reorientation of universities with regards to governance, partnership with governmental agencies and relationship to quality assurance systems. The main findings and recommendations will be publicised through a final project publication and a dissemination conference at the end of the project.

More information on this project is available on www.QAConnect-Africa.eu.

The methodology and evaluation cycle

The methodology of the evaluations is based on the Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP), an independent EUA service that stresses the institutional responsibility in defining quality and the means to achieve it. IEP has carried out about 250 evaluations worldwide since 1994, and has become a distinct European approach to quality enhancement and a flexible tool for strategic development. The idea of the IEP is to provide a flexible tool for assessing their institutional goals and sharpening their missions. The evaluation report highlights the good practices identified by the team, but it also provides the University with recommendations for further improvement in order to achieve its mission and goals. The recommendations are specifically tailored to the context of each respective University.

In the context of the QA Connect project, the IEP approach will be further refined and developed in cooperation with African regional associations committed to promoting institutional development.

More information: www.QAConnect-Africa.eu

The project consortium

The Europe-Africa Quality Connect project is coordinated by the European University Association and the African Association of Universities, in partnership with the University of Aveiro in Portugal and the Irish Universities Quality board in Ireland. I

Annex 2

Terms, conditions and financial guidelines

1. Timing of the site visits

Timeline for the evaluation process, and more specifically the dates of the first site visit, will be agreed upon in the beginning of the process through a dialogue between the institution, EUA secretariat and the members of the evaluation team. After the dates have been set and communicated to all parties, the evaluation team members usually book their own travels. If, for one reason or another, the dates have to be changed after this, the party who initiates the change is responsible for covering the additional costs caused by the change.

There should be no more than 2 months before the first and the second site visit as 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. Ideally, the first visit should take place in September 2011.

The whole evaluation process, including the production of the report, should be terminated by February 2012.

2. Logistics during the site visits and financial guidelines

The university will be in charge of organising the meetings during the two site visits according to the draft programme of the visits agreed between the university and the team.

The university will also make logistical arrangements for the accommodation, meals and local transportation (including airport pick-up) for experts during the two site visits. The university will liaise with the EUA secretariat and the team coordinator so to ensure a smooth planning and communication on travel plans. The university will also assist the experts in visa requests, should the need arise.

So as to anticipate the costs of the visits, universities will be asked to provide the EUA Secretariat with an estimate of the costs they expect to be reimbursed. This includes quotes for accommodation, meals, local transport and other arrangements related to the visits, and should be submitted to Alicja Ziubrzynska at the EUA secretariat (Alicja.Ziubrzynska@eua.be) ***at least three weeks*** before the visit takes place.

Two dinners and two lunches should be organised during the first visit, and three dinners and three lunches should be organised during the second visit (see annex 5 for a detailed sample schedule of visits). In order to save time and avoid transfers, lunches could take place at the institution's canteen or similar facility, or in the close vicinity.

Please note that there is a **maximum daily ceiling per expert** for costs related to accommodation, meals and local transportation. The project will unfortunately not be able to reimburse costs that exceed these ceilings:

Country	***Maximum daily allowance (meals, local transportation)***	***Maximum hotel price per night***
Gabon	EUR 75	EUR 115
Ghana	EUR 70	EUR 140
Kenya	EUR 60	EUR 165

Namibia	EUR 50	EUR 85
Nigeria	EUR 50	EUR 185

These ceilings follow the Guidelines of the Erasmus Mundus Programme and cannot be modified.

The university will be asked to cover the upfront costs related to the experts' accommodation, meals and local transportation, and invoice EUA accordingly. **The university should prepare a final invoice with the breakdown of expenses and all receipts to be submitted within five weeks of the last visit.**

Reimbursement will only be done it the following is submitted:

- An invoice from the university
- Copies of all receipts or invoices covered by the university and for which reimbursement is claimed (hotel and meal receipts, invoice from local transportation company…)

To:
EUA
Att. Alicja Ziubrzynska
Avenue de l'Yser, 24
B -1000 Brussels - Belgium

Reimbursement will be done in Euros, according to the monthly exchange rates of the European Commission posted on InforEuro (http://ec.europa.eu/budget/inforeuro/).

Universities should note that the hotel costs for the experts may be invoiced directly to EUA if more convenient, and if the hotel is willing.

Annex 3

Checklist for self-evaluation process

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

This section discusses institutional norms and values. It analyses the mission and goals of the institution. The 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 policies in place?
  - ✓ Does the institution have an institutional quality assurance policy in place?
- ✓ Academic profile
  - ✓ What balance is the institution aiming to achieve with its teaching, research and service to society?
  - ✓ What are the institution's academic priorities, i.e. which teaching programmes and areas of research are emphasised?
  - ✓ To what extent is a student-centred approach, implemented in the teaching of the institution?
- 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: How does the institution see its relationship with its funding agencies (public and others, such as research contractors or donors)?
- What balance is the institution aiming to achieve in terms of its local, regional, national, and international positioning?
- What is the rationale of the strategic choices made by the institution?

II. Governance 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? Who decides the following:
    - ➢ 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 service to society
  - ✓ 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., gender policy, age profile, recruitment, promotion, redeployment and staff development);
  - ✓ 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?
- 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 service to community, etc. This can be brief, unless some activities deserve specific mention
  - ✓ 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?

✓ Student support services:
  - ✓ Is the organisation and content of student support services adequate to meet the goals set?

- ✓ How effective are student support services in enhancing the achievement of students?

- ✓ 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, donors etc.)?
    - ✓ Is the state allocation a lump sum, or, if not, what percentage of this allocation is ear-marked?
    - ✓ 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 assessment processes and practices available and operative in the institution.

- Does the institution have an internal quality assurance policy or handbook?
- Does the institution conduct internal evaluations of programmes, department, research etc.?

However, the institution should not limit this section merely to teaching and learning, but examine also monitoring and enchancement processes of other activities, such as research activities, administrative processes and service to society.

These quality assessment processes include data gathering and an evaluative judgement concerning the institution's activities, but the institution should also tackle questions such as:

- How have the results of the data gathering and evaluation results impacted the activities?
- How is the link between these results and institutional planning and development processes ensured?
- How well do the current practices relate to the strategic choices presented in the section I?

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?

Annex 4

Proposed structure and content for the self-evaluation report

Introduction

Brief analysis of the self-evaluation process:

- Who are the self-evaluation group 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?

Institutional context

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
- A context and a brief explanation of the national quality assurance system

Body of the report

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, values, mission and goals: What is the institution trying to do?
- Section II: Governance and activities: How is the institution trying to do it?
- Section III: Quality assessment 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?

As mentioned in section 2.2, 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 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.

Conclusion

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

Appendices will typically include the following:

- A brief "Facts and figures" sheet, including a broad description of the university through some key figures (number of students and staff...)
- The current Institutional Strategic Plan (if one exists) or preferably, an Executive Summary (in English, if that exists)
- 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, 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; national strategies or development plans where universities are talking part, etc.
- 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); condition of the facilities
- Handbook for prospective international students (if one exists).

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

Beyond these appendices, 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.

Annex 5

Sample schedules for the site visits

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 – 11.30	**Introduction meeting and meeting with self-evaluation group** Self-evaluation steering group, evaluation team, liaison person	Introduction to the institution: structures, quality management and strategic management; national higher education and research policies; student issues. 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?
11.30 – 12.30	**Tour of the campus**	To get to know the campus and paying special attention to student facilities.
12.30 – 14.00	**Lunch** Evaluation team, liaison person	Reflect upon impressions of first meetings and complete information as necessary

14.10 – 15.00 **parallel** Evaluation team may split into pairs to visit two faculties	**Visit to faculties A & B** Dean and possibly vice-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
15.10 – 15.50 **parallel** Evaluation team may split 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.
16.00 – 16.40 **parallel** Evaluation team may split 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 – 9.50 **parallel** Evaluation team may split into pairs	**Visit to faculties C & D** Dean and possibly vice-dean	as in faculties A and B (adapt as appropriate)

10.00 – 10.40 **parallel** Evaluation team may split into pairs	**Visit to faculties C & D** Academic staff representatives	as in faculties A and B (adapt as appropriate)
10.50 – 11.30 **parallel** Evaluation team may split into pairs	**Visit to faculties C & D** Students	as in faculties A and B (adapt as appropriate)
11.40 – 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 with); 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	

SAMPLE SCHEDULE FOR THE SECOND 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 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 – 9.50 **parallel** Evaluation team may split into pairs	**Visit to faculties E and F** Dean and possibly vice-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 – 10.40 **parallel** Evaluation team may split 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.
10.50 – 11.30 **parallel** Evaluation team may split 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