



Europe and International Department

EVALUATION/ACCREDITATION OF FOREIGN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

SUPPORT GUIDE

November 2024



CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	3
2.	PROCESS OF EVALUATING AN INSTITUTION	4
2.1.	DESCRIPTION	4
2.2.	EVALUATION STANDARDS FRAMEWORK FOR THE EVALUATION OF AN INSTITUTION	5
2.3.	SELF-EVALUATION	6
2.4.	EXTERNAL EVALUATION	8
2.5.	ON-SITE VISIT	8
2.6.	EVALUATION REPORT	8
3.	PROCESS OF ACCREDITATING AN INSTITUTION.....	10
3.1.	DESCRIPTION	10
3.2.	ACCREDITATION CRITERIA	10
3.3.	ACCREDITATION DECISION	12
4.	SELF-EVALUATION FILE TO BE PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION	13
	TEMPLATE 1: CHARACTERISATION SHEET OF THE INSTITUTION	16
	TEMPLATE 2: SELF-EVALUATION REPORT	18

1. INTRODUCTION

For a Higher Education Institution (HEI), **evaluation** involves analysing its policy across its various areas of activity and examining its outcomes in line with a set of external standards in order to determine whether or not it has achieved its objectives since it was established or since it was last evaluated. Evaluation is a process involving two closely linked stages: first self-evaluation, then external evaluation.

Accreditation comes after the evaluation. It entails a recognised body officially recognising the quality of an institution, generally following an on-site visit. As with evaluation, accreditation is based on standards which define extremely precise requirements for anticipated objectives and actions performed, referred to as accreditation criteria.

The **accreditation commission** examines whether the actions of the entity comply with the criteria. Depending on the extent to which the actual conditions observed at a given time differ from the criteria requirements, the accrediting body issues an opinion and decides whether or not to accredit the institution.

Accreditation is optional and is only carried out at the request of the evaluated entity.

The main steps in the evaluation of an institution and its subsequent accreditation can be broken down as follows and are described in detail below:

EVALUATION & ACCREDITATION STEPS

	Timeline (months)
1. Preparatory visit : institution/Hcéres <i>Gathering of the University's expectations; presentation of the Hcéres methodology...</i>	(0)
2. Production of the Self-evaluation file: institution	(3-4)
3. On-site visit: Hcéres experts panel	(5-6)
4. Production of the evaluation report and accreditation proposal: Hcéres experts panel	(7-8)
5. Contradictory phase: institution/Hcéres <i>Statement of factual errors, omissions, etc.</i> <i>Official letter of comments signed by the Dean, to be published with the final report</i>	(9)
6. Accreditation decision: Hcéres Accreditation Commission	(12)
7. Publication of the evaluation report and the accreditation decision: Hcéres	(13-14)

2. PROCESS OF EVALUATING AN INSTITUTION

2.1. DESCRIPTION

The methodology and the standards for the evaluation of foreign higher education institutions established by Hcéres are in line with the European standards and guidelines 2015 (ESG). They result not only from the Hcéres' practice in evaluating programmes and institutions in France, but also from the collection of best practices of European agencies.

Prior to the procedure, contact will be made with the national agency in the country concerned, where such an agency exists, in order to keep it informed of what Hcéres is doing.

If several assessment and/or accreditation agencies are involved, an agreement will specify the terms of cooperation (e.g. recruitment of experts, standards framework, etc.). In the case of dual local and international accreditation, the institution is responsible for transmitting the necessary information to the competent authorities.

The evaluation procedure itself consists of three phases:

1. A **preliminary on-site visit** from an Hcéres project team.
This first on-spot contact between Hcéres and the institution is important. It allows Hcéres to gather the institution's expectations and to better understand its specific characteristics. Hcéres also presents the philosophy and methodology of the evaluation to the institution.
This provides an opportunity for the members of the exploratory mission to inform the institution if they are not yet ready for the accreditation process.
2. A **self-evaluation phase** prior to evaluation and conducted by the institution itself.
3. An **external evaluation phase** performed by a panel of experts (selected according to their experience and the specificities of the evaluated entity) with an on-site visit and publication of an evaluation report.

Throughout the whole process, a Hcéres project team (2 people) will be the permanent reference for the evaluated entity throughout the procedure. It is responsible for ensuring that the process goes smoothly and that external evaluation ethical principles are complied with. It will also support the panel of experts in its work and answer any questions that could be raised.

Institutions applying for reaccreditation

1. The preliminary visit will be replaced by a **virtual meeting** with the institution top management. This meeting will provide an opportunity to take stock of the progress made by the institution since the last Hcéres evaluation and to identify the areas to which the top management would like the panel of experts to pay particular attention. In addition, Hcéres will present any changes in the evaluation framework or methodology since the last evaluation.
2. The self-evaluation and external evaluation phases remain mandatory and may be modified according to circumstances.

2.2. THE EVALUATION STANDARDS FRAMEWORK FOR THE EVALUATION OF AN INSTITUTION

The evaluation process shown above (self-evaluation/evaluation/accreditation) is based on **external evaluation standards framework** as an essential tool. It allows a common language to be used between Hcéres, the institution and the expert panel.

Hcéres has defined **three fields** representing the two main sectors of activity and missions of higher education, in addition to strategy, governance, and management of the institution. The fields are declined into 17 standards that define the main topics to be covered by the evaluation:

1. Strategic and operational steering
2. Policy on research, innovation and the inclusion of science in society
3. Policy on teaching, student life and campus life.

These fields define the scope which first needs to be taken into account by the institution and later by the panel of experts. For continuity purposes, these three fields are also found in the final accreditation criteria.

At a level below, within each field, the **standards** define a set of values and/or objectives that will apply to institutions in a given context, depending on their missions and the expectations of their stakeholders. Within each standard, a non-exhaustive list of evaluation criteria provides elements to assess and explain each standard. They are therefore not necessarily covered.

The institution will endeavour to show how it defines a strategy in relation to its own issues and how it implements the necessary actions to achieve the chosen objectives. The expert panel will also assess the institution's ability to monitor and continuously improve its trajectory where necessary.

1. Strategic and operational steering

The evaluation is focused on strategy. This includes major policies, decisions and actions involved in the long-term development of the institution. The strategy is based on a vision for the institution that corresponds with its identity and values shared with its community in close connection with its environment and resources.

The institution's strategy itself is not likely to be questioned by the evaluation committee. However, the committee will endeavour to verify that the institution's internal organisation and the functioning of its governance bodies enable it to develop its strategy effectively at all levels and to share it internally.

Similarly, the committee will analyse how the institution has defined a partnership strategy at different levels (national and international academic partners, local authorities, economic and socio-cultural circles, etc.) and how it implements this strategy in an ongoing manner for the benefit of its community (multilateral cooperation in research, internationalisation of training, student and teacher mobility). The institution has financial, human, material and real estate resources that must allow it to operate in the long term. The management of these resources over a multi-year period, using effective tools (communication, integrated information system), guarantees their permanent adaptation to the institution's objectives and needs. Continuous improvement is part of the institution's strategy and its quality policy is an essential part of its operation. The institution's ability to know and monitor its activities, to implement improvement processes and to modify its objectives if necessary are guarantees of its long-term development. The institution is concerned with ethics in all areas of its activities.

2. Policy on research, innovation and the inclusion of science in society

The institution defines its ambitions and priorities in terms of research, innovation and the inclusion of science in society in line with its identity, and structures the organisation of its activities around these choices, if necessary by relying on structuring partnerships. It assesses the quality and trajectory of its scientific production in the national and international context of each scientific field. It identifies the major contributions and the main successes achieved during the reference period. The institution allocates a budget to research, innovation and the inclusion of science in society and is

able to analyse the effects on its activities and results. For each of these sectors, there is a support policy and mechanisms for monitoring, encouraging and helping setting up research projects.

3. Policy on teaching, student life and campus life

The institution defines its ambitions, orientations and thematic priorities in the field of teaching, in line with its identity, which structure its teaching offer. The human resources policy (recruitment, teaching, promotion and recognition of teaching activities) takes the needs of the courses into account. The programme's offer is built up by ensuring its overall coherence, its complementarity within each cycle and its articulation between the teaching cycles. The institution sets a framework to define teaching programmes that promotes coherence between the learning objectives, the teaching methods used and the methods of student evaluation. The institution ensures that its programmes are backed by research and takes the socio-economic needs of the region into account by defining its training offer. It diversifies its teaching methods and in particular defines a policy of partially or entirely distance learning, and it then provides itself with the infrastructures and digital tools adapted to this. The institution should set up a framework for the teaching of foreign languages and in foreign languages in the teaching programmes, and develop teaching methods to prepare for incoming and outgoing mobility. The institution must be able to analyse the evolution of applications and enrolments of different types of students, to monitor the evolution of success rates and to analyse the impact the support given on them, success assistance and curricular adjustments. It analyses the quality of professional integration with regard to the objectives of the training and the reality of the labour market. The institution is equipped with steering tools that allow it to develop the teaching offer in a continuous improvement process. In particular, it organises the evaluation of programmes and teaching by students and ensures that the results of these evaluations are taken into account in the development of programmes. The student life development policy in terms of living and studying conditions, social assistance and campus activities contributes to improving students' success.

Details on the use of the Evaluation framework in an international context

The aim of the institutional evaluation is to be useful and adapted to the applicant institution, taking into account its specific characteristics and the adaptations they require.

All standards are obligatory. On the contrary, some of the sub-criteria may be irrelevant because they do not apply to all institutions. At the request of the institution and in consultation with Hcéres, some references may be highlighted because they are of particular strategic interest to the institution. Similarly, some of them they may be adapted to the specific characteristics of the institution.

The standards comply with the quality standards and criteria required by Hcéres and the main European agencies. However, in addition to these basic areas, the evaluated entities have the possibility to request additional evaluation points, strictly linked to national legal requirements.

2.3. SELF-EVALUATION

Self-evaluation is part of the implementation of the quality approach of institutions. It provides the evaluated entity the opportunity to reflect critically and sincerely on its activities with the help of external criteria. The exercise will be useful for measuring its strengths and weaknesses and proposing improvements to the institution. Finally, it will help in the management of the institution.

Self-evaluation must be led by the institution's management bodies, without any externalisation of this operation. The practical arrangements for this self-evaluation are the responsibility of the institution itself and are entirely free (duration of the exercise, composition of the working groups, arrangements for reporting the results, etc.). The institution shall describe the adopted methodology in the self-evaluation report. The self-evaluation file is confidential and will be shared only with the experts' panel hired for the external evaluation.

Three main principles should guide its implementation:

1. the mobilisation of internal actors,
2. the formalisation and transparency of the chosen procedure,
3. a critical and objective reflection on the activities carried out during the reference period (the 4-year period prior to evaluation).

Four stages can be identified:

1. **The preparation and launch of the self-evaluation**, a stage which makes it possible to choose the methods of investigation and the actors mobilised to carry out this operation. If the top management team has a major responsibility in this process, it cannot act alone: it is usually associated with a group representing all the actors in the institution. This stage leads to the clarification of the various deliverables expected and their production schedule.
2. **Investigation and analysis**, which is the core of the self-evaluation process and is carried out by means of working groups, individual interviews, surveys, data processing and calls for contributions. It allows the collection of information and initiates the elaboration of analyses which can lead to a self-criticism of activities and results for the reference period, in the final self-evaluation report. As far as quantitative information is concerned, the self-evaluation process must highlight the data and indicators that are useful for the development of the critical analysis.
3. **The production and validation of the self-evaluation report**, a stage which makes it possible to bring together, at the level of the institution, all the elements of critical analysis resulting from the investigation phase. Various tools are usually used for drafting: summary sheets of results, activity reports, interim reports, data tables and activity indicators, Swot analyses (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats), etc., the most important of which will be included in the self-evaluation file. This essential stage leads to the production of the report and its appendices. The people involved in drafting the final dossier are clearly identified. Final validation normally takes place at the level of the institution's bodies.
4. **The presentation and internal dissemination of the self-evaluation file**, which makes it possible to inform the various actors involved and, more broadly, the entire institution's community of the results of the self-evaluation process. It encourages the appropriation of the work carried out during the entire process and facilitates the development of the new strategic project.

The self-evaluation file is the basis for the evaluation process. It must compile all the information required for the external evaluation carried out by independent experts. It will provide the evidence to prove the quality of the institution.

In its self-evaluation approach, the institution demonstrates its various analytical capacities:

- the ability to **situate itself in its local, national and international environment** ;
- the ability to **identify and qualify the results of its institutional strategy with regard to the resources mobilised** ;
- the ability to **assess the efficiency of its action and to quantify the path taken for each activity** ;
- the ability to **mobilise its community throughout the reference period** ;
- the ability to **express its strengths and weaknesses** for each of the major fields of the evaluation by explaining the analyses and factual elements that made it possible to identify them and by presenting the strategic options that emerged from them.

This last level of expectations concerning the institution's capacity for self-analysis is important. It is indeed an essential point for the experts who can, on the basis of the factual elements produced and analysed, assess the institution's maturity in terms of self-evaluation, as well as its level of responsibility and autonomy for the conduct of its institutional strategy.

The precise description of the self-evaluation file to be provided by the institution to Hcéres is to be found in part 4 of this document. A characterisation sheet for the institution must also be provided (Template 1).

2.4. EXTERNAL EVALUATION

Hcéres external quality assurance is based on the principle of peer review conducted in a collegial and transparent manner. Hcéres will create a panel of 4 to 8 experts, including one student. They are appointed based on the characteristics of the evaluated entity. The panel of experts will be selected in line with the ESGs. They shall therefore be chosen carefully, have the required aptitudes and skills, and have been appropriately trained or briefed.

The composition of the panel of experts must also comply with specific national expert profile requirements. The names of the experts shall be submitted to the institution for opinion in order to avoid any conflicts of interest.

If the evaluation request requires that two or more agencies work together, the experts must obviously be approved by all the agencies. However, one of the agencies shall be the "coordinating agency".

Before carrying out their on-site visit, the experts must first work off the self-evaluation file submitted. However, they may request additional documents when necessary. The institution shall respond to such requests as soon as possible using the most appropriate methods.

2.5. ON-SITE VISIT

The on-site visit must be carried out in line with Hcéres' recommendations. The institution shall cover the costs of the panel of experts and the Hcéres representative based on predefined arrangements. A qualified representative appointed by the institution shall be present to facilitate the whole visit.

The on-site visit by the panel of experts shall take place over two to three days. It should be limited to a single location, where the evaluation procedure can be carried out the most easily. The evaluating agency and the evaluated entity will jointly select the location. Hcéres and the institution will decide on the details of the on-site visit together long enough in advance to allow both parties to properly organise themselves.

The on-site visit will include face-to-face interviews with the people responsible for the steering and management of the institution, along with representatives of students, teaching staff, and administrative and technical staff of the institution's various sites. It will also include the main partners (professionals, scientists, etc.) working at the institution or that employ former students directly after graduation. However, videoconference interviews may be conducted when they cannot be present due to distance.

It is important that the various stakeholders of the evaluated entity are heard individually, without the presence of their supervising body. The Hcéres project team works closely with the institution to develop the program for the site visit.

There will be no official post-evaluation meeting with the institution's top management after the visit. However, a final meeting between the experts and top management of the institution will provide an opportunity to ask any remaining questions, request further details and thank the participants.

2.6. EVALUATION REPORT

Following the on-site visit, the chair of the panel of experts will submit a summary evaluation report that will close with the strengths and weaknesses of the institution and recommendations.

This provisional report will be sent to the evaluated entity to gather its observations, thereby beginning the response phase.

3. The factual errors mentioned by the institution are taken into account and processed by the chair of the panel of experts, together with the experts and the project team. The final evaluation report is then ready.
4. The institution's strategic observations are drafted in an official letter signed by the top management and will be published together with the final report.

This final report will be considered the official document of reference and be published on the Hcéres website at the end of the process.

3. PROCESS OF ACCREDITATING AN INSTITUTION

3.1. DESCRIPTION

The accreditation phase only occurs at the request of the institution once the evaluation phase has been completed and the final evaluation report for the institution has been published. In this case, the chair of the expert panel will issue a non-prescriptive opinion on the accreditation that will be submitted to the ad hoc commission.

The accreditation decision is made in compliance with the six accreditation criteria: they correspond to the three fields of the reference framework.

Field 1	CRITERION 1	Definition of the institution's strategy
	CRITERION 2	Governance and implementation of the strategy
Field 2	CRITERION 3	Research policy
	CRITERION 4	Innovation policy and societal impact
Field 3	CRITERION 5	Teaching policy
	CRITERION 6	Student and campus life

The accreditation decision will be made by the Hcéres President after consulting the standing accreditation commission. The commission is made up of at least 5 members: 3 members of the Hcéres Board, including one student, and 2 qualified figures. The commission's permanent rapporteur is the director of the Europe and International Department.

The commission meets on average three or four times a year and publishes its decisions on the Hcéres website.

The commission studies the two documents produced by the experts' panel:

1. the final evaluation report
2. the opinion on accreditation proposed as well as the institution's official comment letter.

The decision issued by Hcéres regarding the accreditation of the program corresponds to the awarding of a label to the evaluated entity.

This decision is independent of the accreditations carried out by the French State and therefore does not entail recognition in France of the degrees awarded by the evaluated entity.

3.2. ACCREDITATION CRITERIA

FIELD 1: STRATEGIC AND OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 1 - DEFINING THE INSTITUTION'S STRATEGY

The institution defines its institutional positioning at local, national and international level in accordance with its identity and values. In support of this positioning, it defines an institutional strategy that it applies to all its activities (education, research, innovation and impact on society). Its implementation is translated into operational objectives and action plans, enabling the institution to monitor its progress using relevant indicators. The institution's strategy is based, on the one hand, on structuring local, national and international academic partnerships, and, on the other hand, on economic, social and cultural actors that make the institution part of its environment and territory.

CRITERION 2 - GOVERNANCE AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGY

The governance of the institution is based on an organisation, a communication and an information system adapted to its strategy and including the various stakeholders.

The institution has a global quality policy, concerned with continuous improvement, and based on the results of internal and external evaluations. It steers the implementation of its strategy and ensures its financial sustainability by relying on monitoring, analysis and budget forecasting tools, while ensuring that an internal management dialogue is maintained.

The human resources policy supports the institution's strategy by developing measures for the recruitment, management, promotion and training of its staff which encourage the development of skills and social dialogue. The attention paid to parity and inclusion contributes to the quality of life at work.

The institution's strategy includes a real estate policy that meets its needs in terms of teaching, research and campus life, and supports its development.

FIELD 2: POLICY ON RESEARCH, INNOVATION AND THE INCLUSION OF SCIENCE IN SOCIETY

CRITERION 3 - RESEARCH POLICY

The institution defines structuring orientations in terms of research, articulated with those of its territory. It takes care to develop relevant research partnerships and to internationalise its activities by adopting a responsible practice, respectful of scientific integrity and ethics. It assesses the quality and trajectory of its scientific production in the national and international context of its scientific fields. A resource policy makes it possible to allocate a budget to research and to analyse its results, while a support policy accompanies professors and researchers in their research activities and in setting up projects.

CRITERION 4 - INNOVATION POLICY AND SOCIETAL IMPACT

The institution defines a policy on innovation and the inclusion of science in society, which is translated into an action plan. It assesses the impact of its activities, particularly the socio-economic impact of its partnerships. The institution's governance model ensures the management of its actions to integrate science into society, and promotes cultural and scientific mediation as well as knowledge sharing. The institution has a policy of resources and support that benefits its activities in terms of innovation and the inclusion of science in society.

FIELD 3: EDUCATION, STUDENT AND CAMPUS LIFE POLICY

CRITERION 5 - TEACHING POLICY

The institution has a quality teaching policy and offer, consistent with its positioning and strategy. The teaching programmes are backed by research, integrate the challenges of sustainable development and multidisciplinary, and promote the professional integration of graduates. The institution is developing a set of institutional mechanisms to ensure the pedagogical quality of its initial and continuing education programmes, contributing in particular to its international outlook. It analyses the attractiveness, performance, and relevance of its training offer, and supports students in their academic and professional orientation. Teaching management and evaluation systems, involving students, are used to continuously improve the teaching offer and ensure its economic sustainability.

CRITERION 6 - STUDENT AND CAMPUS LIFE

The institution pursues an inclusive student and campus life policy, ensuring the well-being of all and promoting the success of the greatest number of students. This policy is implemented thanks to appropriate financial and human resources, directed in particular towards the allocation of social aid and support for student associations, and making it possible to ensure a quality welcome for international students. The institution promotes student participation in its governance and democratic life.

3.3. ACCREDITATION DECISION

After deliberation, the Accreditation Commission gives an opinion. The President of Hcéres issues a duly reasoned decision, which is communicated to the institution by the Hcéres representative.

This decision may be:

- a five-year accreditation decision;
- a three-year accreditation decision, which may be extended for a further two years subject to follow-up, which may include an on-site visit. The application for extension must be submitted at least eighteen months before the expiry of the initial accreditation;
- an accreditation refusal.

There is an appeals procedure for accreditation decisions made by Hcéres.

The final evaluation report, the comments of the institution and the final accreditation decision are published by Hcéres on its website.

4. SELF-EVALUATION FILE TO BE PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION

4.1 PREPARING THE SELF-EVALUATION FILE

The evaluated entity is requested to prepare its self-evaluation file in line with the recommendations below.

The self-evaluation file (SEF) prepared by the institution should include the following 5 elements:

1. An **official document** from the institution requesting the evaluation or accreditation specifying the general strategy of the institution and the reasons for requesting the evaluation. It may also specify particular areas which the institution wishes the experts to examine.
2. A detailed **characterisation sheet** of the institution (see Template No. 1)
3. A **self-evaluation report (SER)** (see Template No. 2)

The SER, provided by the institution, must be prepared following the three fields and related standards of the External Evaluation Framework provided by Hcéres. It should not exceed 60 pages.

Elements of evidence are included as appendices to the file. The appendices serve to support the self-evaluation: as such, they should be cited in the SER to make them easier to look up.

The SER will start with **a context note** specifying the key characteristics and the position of the institution in its local, national or regional context (benchmark).

This introduction will be followed by **a description of the self-evaluation process**.

The evaluated entity is invited in the SER to highlight its specificities in order to help the expert panel in its preparation work prior to the visit. It is therefore recommended for the evaluated entity to highlight important additional points that are not included in the criteria covered by the standards

4. **Three SWOT analysis related to each field of the standards framework** identifying the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats related to the institution.
5. The self-evaluation report will include the **evidence** (or appendices) listed below. The figures will be presented in summary form for each of the years of the reference period in order to illustrate the institution's trajectory.

In the case of a re-accreditation application only:

6. **A letter of observations on the follow-up of recommendations.** This synthetic document (<3-4 pages) will take into account only the recommendations made in the previous accreditation notice. For each of the recommendations, a critical assessment of their follow-up will be made by the institution: achieved, in progress, not achieved. Where applicable, the institution will specify any external factors affecting the implementation of recommendations (e.g. national jurisdiction, etc.).

4.2 EVIDENCE REQUESTED BY HCÉRES

STRATEGY AND GOVERNANCE

- Detailed functional organizational chart of the institution: governance, administrative, research and teaching functions as well as the functional links with the faculties and/or Campuses associated with the institution.
- Statutes and missions of the institution.
- Leadership team: mandate period and short description of the missions of the vice-presidents/rectors.
- Detailed composition and missions of the Board/Council of the institution: quality of members (external and internal to the institution)
- Different statutory councils: missions.
- Meeting minutes, or at least record of decision, of the main councils, over the last academic year
- The institution's strategic plan, broken down into areas (teaching, research, human resources, etc.).
- Target agreements, roadmaps, or any other document existing between the central entity and its components (faculties, schools, institutes, delocalized campuses, etc.)

MANAGEMENT OF THE INSTITUTION

- Key performance indicators for the institution management for the 3 different areas of the framework.
- Status of the various types of teaching and non-teaching staff: contract, missions and tasks, workload, annual plan for recruitment.
- Teaching offer: the general mapping of the programmes and their connections with the research laboratories.
- Research: list of the research entities, platforms and equipment.
- Researchers and staff potential (% of Phd).
- Annual and multi-annual budget: amount and nature of income/expenditure.
- Real estate policy: type and state of real estate, ongoing loans, maintenance budget.
- Master plan for the IT system: digital resources used for managing the institution (HR, financial, administrative), for teaching and research, for document resources and internal/external communication. Link between the data. Related staff.
- Quality assurance: staff, processes and documents.

STATISTICS AND DATA

- Statistics on student numbers and type, breakdown according to: i) Faculties or campuses ; ii) area of study; iii) level of programs (bachelor/master/Phd) ; iv)gender (Female/male students)
- Student achievement: i) student success rate (bachelor/master); ii) students with grants or bursaries rate; iii) in and out students rate (exchange, double or joint programs), iv) number of foreign students and out-of-town students; v) on-site or distancial initial learning/apprenticeship/long-life learning; vi) integration into the job market.
- Statistics on teaching and non-teaching staff, breakdown according to: i) faculties or campuses; ii) number of foreign professors and researchers (invited or permanent staff), iii) number of professors and researchers on short/long stay abroad (destinations).

- List of living academic and industrial partnerships (contracts): at national and international level.

The expert panel will also consider any other document (presented in a concise manner) that the institution considers useful for the evaluation.

TEMPLATE 1: CHARACTERISATION SHEET OF THE INSTITUTION

The information requested in this form will be presented in summary (< 4-5 pages)

INSTITUTION SUBMITTING THE FILE

- Name of the institution:
- Component, faculty or department concerned:
- Year established and context:
- Legal status:
- Location of the institution:
 - o Town(s)/city(jies):
 - o Campus

INSTITUTION'S PRESIDENT/RECTOR OR DIRECTOR

- Surname, first name:
- Profession and grade:
- Main subject taught:
- Mandate dates:

RESULTS OF PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS/ACCREDITATIONS

- At a national level :
- At an international level :

CONTEXT NOTE EXPLAINING THE POSITIONING OF THE INSTITUTION IN ITS LOCAL, NATIONAL OR REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT

INTERNAL ORGANISATION: rectorate, faculties or colleges, departments, administrative units. Please provide an organization chart and its description.

STRUCTURE OF THE TEACHING OFFER

- number and type of programmes delivered by faculty and level of study (B/M/PhD) and results of previous evaluations/accreditations

STRUCTURE OF THE RESEARCH ORGANISATION AND CAPABILITY

- body in charge of the institutional research policy,
- priority research themes,
- number and type of research entities,
- human resources dedicated to research (researchers and support staff)

QUALITY SYSTEM IMPLEMENTED

- Description of the system
- List of available indicators used for the institutional steering

FINANCIAL, MATERIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES OVER THE LAST 4 YEARS

1. **Human resources** breakdown by status (permanent/temporary/vacant/guest) and staff category :

- ✓ Teachers (full professor, associate professor, lecturer...) & researchers numbers
- Working load for each status

- Degrees (PhD, Master, others)
- Gender
- Nationality

✓ Administrative and technical staff (same items)

2. **Annual and multi-annual budget:** amount and nature of income/expenditure
3. **Property assets:** typology and condition of the real estate (campuses, equipment, university dormitories, laboratories...)

STUDENT NUMBERS AND TYPOLOGY OVER THE LAST 4 YEARS

Breakdown of students according to:

- Different campuses
- Colleges
- Programme level (Bachelor/Master/PhD)
- Gender (female/male students)
- Rate of students with grants or scholarships
- Rate of foreign students and out-of-town students
- Initial/apprenticeship/continuing teaching.

ACTIVE SOCIO-ECONOMIC PARTNERS AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

- Significant activities and results

ACTIVE ACADEMIC PARTNERS AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

- Significant activities and results

Any other information that the entity considers useful.

TEMPLATE 2: SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

General advice:

The self-evaluation report should remain concise and **not exceed 60 pages** (excluding appendices).

The report is based **on a genuine critical analysis, limiting the descriptive approach to the minimum necessary** to understand the organization of activities.

This analysis is designed to set out, over a **reference period fixed by default at 4 years**, the objectives that have been pursued, the resources that have been mobilized and the objectively verifiable results that have been obtained.

INTRODUCTION

The entity being evaluated is invited to explain **the context of higher education** in the country and its own **positioning** in its local, national or regional environment since its creation (benchmark). It is recommended that the specific features of the institution be highlighted to help the experts' committee prepare for the visit (1 page).

DESCRIPTION OF THE SELF-ASSESSMENT APPROACH

The entity being evaluated is invited to briefly describe the chain of responsibilities and methodology adopted (timetable, mobilization of committees and working groups, data collection). The institution may highlight additional points of importance which do not appear in the areas covered by the standards. (0,5 page)

EVALUATION

FIELD 1: STRATEGIC AND OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT

A **critical analysis** will be formulated for each standard,

Please note: the sub-criteria (C1, C2, C3, etc.) are elements for understanding the standards and not elements that the institution must complete one by one.

The institution is free to organise its arguments within each standard, avoiding redundancy of information as much as possible. Each argument should be accompanied by duly referenced evidence.

- Standard 1. The institution defines its institutional positioning at local, national and international level.
- Standard 2. Based on its positioning, the institution defines a strategy at local, national and international level, which it translates into operational objectives and which it monitors.
- Standard 3. The institution is involved in its environment and develops a partnership policy as part of its strategy.
- Standard 4. The governance of the institution is based on an organisation, communication and information system adapted to its strategy.
- Standard 5. The institution has a comprehensive quality policy.
- Standard 6. The institution steers the implementation of its strategy by relying on forecasting tools, budget planning and a structured internal management dialogue.

- Standard 7. The human resources policy and the development of social dialogue reflect the institution's strategy and contribute to the quality of life at work of its staff.
- Standard 8. The institution integrates a real estate policy that supports its development into its strategy.

SWOT FIELD 1	
STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS

FIELD 2: POLICY ON RESEARCH, INNOVATION AND THE INCLUSION OF SCIENCE IN SOCIETY

- Standard 9. The institution's research policy defines structural guidelines.
- Standard 10. The institution has a policy resource and support for research.
- Standard 11. In its policy of innovation and inclusion of science in society, the institution defines structuring guidelines.
- Standard 12. The institution pursues a policy of resources and support that benefits its activities in terms of innovation and the inclusion of science in society.

SWOT FIELD 2	
STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS

FIELD 3 : EDUCATION, STUDENT AND CAMPUS LIFE POLICY

- Standard 13. The institution has a high-quality teaching policy and teaching offer, consistent with its positioning and strategy.
- Standard 14. The institution develops a set of institutional mechanisms to ensure the pedagogical quality of its teaching offer.
- Standard 15. The institution analyses the attractiveness, performance and relevance of its educational offer and promotes student success from orientation to professional integration.
- Standard 16. The institution monitors the development of its programme offering and ensures that it is sustainable, by relying on a human resources policy consistent with its teaching policy and by implementing a continuous improvement approach.
- Standard 17. The institution supports the development of student and campus life, student engagement in governance, and promotes student well-being.

SWOT FIELD 3	
STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS