



Département Europe et International

# EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION OF FOREIGN STUDY PROGRAMMES

**SUPPORT GUIDE**

October 2024

## CONTENTS

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	3
<b>2. Evaluation process of a study programme</b> .....	4
2.1. Description .....	4
2.2. The evaluation framework of the study programme .....	4
2.3. Self-evaluation .....	7
2.4. External evaluation .....	7
2.5. On-site visit .....	8
2.6. Evaluation report .....	8
<b>3. Accreditation process of a study programme</b> .....	9
3.1. Description .....	9
3.2. Accreditation criteria .....	9
3.3. Accreditation decision.....	10
<b>4. Self-evaluation file for accreditation of a study programme</b> .....	11
<b>TEMPLATE 1: Characterisation sheet of the programme</b> .....	13
<b>TEMPLATE 2: Self-evaluation report</b>	
<b>SWOT analysis</b> .....	15

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For a university, study programme **evaluation** involves characterising and analysing the programme 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 last evaluated.

**Accreditation** comes after evaluation. It entails a recognised body officially recognising the validity of a study programme, based on the results of its evaluation. As with evaluation, accreditation is based on standards which define extremely precise requirements for expected 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 Commission issues an opinion and decides whether or not to accredit the study programme.

**Accreditation is optional and is only carried out at the request of the evaluated entity. The final decision is made by the Hcéres President and made public.**

The decision issued by Hcéres regarding the accreditation 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 Institution's diplomas.

Here are the main steps of the evaluation and accreditation process:

	Timeline (months)
<b>1. Preparatory visit :</b> Study programme leaders/Hcéres <i>Gathering of the University's expectations; presentation of the Hcéres methodology...</i>	(0)
<b>2. Production of the Self-evaluation file:</b> Study programme leaders	(3-4)
<b>3. On-site visit:</b> Hcéres experts panel	(5-6)
<b>4. Production of the evaluation report and accreditation proposal:</b> Hcéres experts panel	(7-8)
<b>5. Contradictory phase:</b> Study programme leaders/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)
<b>6. Accreditation decision:</b> Accreditation Hcéres Commission	(12)
<b>7. Publication of the evaluation report and the accreditation decision:</b> Hcéres	(13-14)

## 2. EVALUATION PROCESS OF A STUDY PROGRAMME

### 2.1. DESCRIPTION

The methodology and the standards for evaluation of foreign programmes implemented by Hcéres are in line with the 2015 European Standards and Guidelines (ESG). They are based on Hcéres experience when evaluating study programmes and institutions in France, but also on best practices gathered from a number 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, and possibly involved in the Hcéres process.

If several evaluation agencies are involved, an agreement will specify the terms and conditions of cooperation (e.g. expert recruitment, standards, etc.). In the case of a joint local and international accreditation, the institution under evaluation is responsible for transmitting the necessary information to the relevant authorities.

**The evaluation process itself consists of three phases:**

1. A **preliminary visit**, also called “exploratory visit”, either on-site or on-line, from an Hcéres project team. This first meeting between Hcéres and the study programme leaders is important. It provides an opportunity for the Hcéres representatives to understand the expectations of the institution and its specificities. The Hcéres will also present the evaluation philosophy and methodology. The Hcéres team may also inform the study programme leaders if they do not seem to be ready for the accreditation process.
2. A **self-evaluation phase** prior to evaluation.
3. An **external evaluation phase** performed by a panel of experts (selected upon their skills and the characteristics of the programme under evaluation) with an on-site visit and publication of an evaluation report.

Throughout the process, the Hcéres project team will be the permanent contact for the entity being evaluated. It will ensure that the process runs smoothly and in accordance with the ethical principles of external evaluation, support the expert committee in its work and answer any questions that may arise.

#### **Programmes applying for reaccreditation**

1. The preliminary visit will be replaced by a **virtual meeting** with the study programme leaders. This meeting will provide an opportunity to take stock of the progress made by the programme since the last Hcéres evaluation and to identify the areas to which the study programme leaders 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 FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

Education and research are the two main missions of higher education institutions. Their policy in these areas must enable each graduate to find a job at a level corresponding to his/her qualification – whether in a national or international environment. The study programme may also lead students to further studies, depending on their choices and abilities.

The evaluation process (self-evaluation/external evaluation/accreditation) is based on an essential tool: the external evaluation framework. It allows a common language to be used between Hcéres, the team in charge of the programme and the committee of experts.

The framework is divided into four fields, which are subdivided into 15 references:

1. Teaching policy and characterisation of the study programme
2. Pedagogical organisation of the study programme
3. Students' pathways
4. Academic programme management and continuous improvement.

These areas define the scope to be considered upstream by the team in charge of the programme (self-evaluation phase) and downstream by the experts committee (external evaluation phase). These four areas also provide the framework for the four final accreditation criteria.

Within each area, the standards define a set of values and/or objectives to be applied to study programmes in a given context, according to the missions of the College/Department and the expectations of their stakeholders.

Within each reference, a non-exhaustive list of evaluation criteria provides elements to assess and explain each reference. They are therefore not necessarily covered.

Hcéres has defined four areas (or fields) to be taken into account by the institution and the panel of experts, which are shared by both the evaluation standards and the accreditation criteria.

---

---

### **Field 1: The teaching policy and the characterization of the study programme**

The Hcéres expects the team responsible for the programme to be able to define, explain and justify the programme's position in the institution's educational offering and its relevance to the institution's educational strategy. The programme is consistent with and complementary to other programmes and is positioned in the local, national or international teaching offer. It cannot ignore its scientific and socio-economic environment. It takes into account the socio-economic needs to define and publicize its job opportunities, its purpose and its content. The quality of the supporting research laboratories and their involvement in the programme ensure that the programme is backed by research. The programme also benefits from partnerships with companies or institutions involved in related activities. Agreements with foreign higher education institutions are encouraged in order to offer mobility opportunities to its students.

### **Field 2: The pedagogical organisation of the study programme**

The objectives of the programme are clearly stated, in particular the professional integration of future graduates. The community is aware of the careers or further studies to which the programme may lead, and the structure of the programme and its content are designed to be consistent with these objectives. This implies that, in addition to the acquisition of academic knowledge, the development of skills (also called transversal competencies) and additional competencies (computer literacy, foreign languages, communication, etc.) must be carried out in each programme and discipline. The teaching methods used must be defined according to the expected learning outcomes and skills: they include internships and project work and make use of information and communication technologies. Students are prepared for international mobility, in particular through the acquisition of language skills, and benefit from tools for successful programme completion or from "bridges" in the event of reorientation.

### **Field 3: The students' pathway**

This area allows us to assess the trajectory of a study programme evaluated at three different points in time (before/during/after) of the students' pathway.

The programme must be able to monitor and improve its attractiveness to its various publics by analysing the evolution of applications and enrolments of different types of publics. It puts in place measures to encourage the success of its various students and analyses the impact of these measures by monitoring the evolution of the success rates that it makes public. The programme ensures the quality of professional integration and the nature of the studies pursued by its graduates with regard to its objectives and the job market, using surveys to monitor professional integration and cohorts. These data are made public.

#### **Field 4: The management and continuous improvement of the study programme**

The quality of a study programme also depends largely on its management and the monitoring of its objectives. For this purpose, it has its own human, material and financial resources, or those shared within a larger structure, which are known to the community. A quality policy is defined and shared: the programme defines an evaluation process that allows it to evolve in a continuous improvement process, in particular through a regular evaluation of the teaching by the students and the periodic meeting of a consultation body including students and representatives of the socio-economic world.

---

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

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

**All 15 references are obligatory.** On the other hand, the sub-criteria only provide guidelines and explain each reference. Some of them may be irrelevant because they do not apply to all study programmes, or they may be adapted to the specific characteristics of the programme. 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.

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

The self-evaluation is part of the internal quality assurance system of the institutions. It provides the evaluated entity with an opportunity to carry out a critical and sincere analysis of its activities with the help of external criteria.

For each study programme, the self-evaluation called for here must be directed by the bodies responsible for managing the programme based on a file completed by the teaching team, without outsourcing the operation. This will prove to be a useful exercise for measuring strengths and weaknesses and recommending improvements to the programme. Finally, it will also help with the management of the institution's overall range of study programmes.

Ultimately, this will enable the institution and the teaching team to benefit from the self-evaluation. It should be considered as a learning process for the benefit of the entire community.

The practical aspects of the self-evaluation depend on the institution itself and are completely flexible (period of self-evaluation, composition of working groups, methods of presenting results, etc.). The self-evaluation is a process that should include as many of the relevant people or bodies as possible (management, teachers, non-teaching staff, students, external partners, etc.). The file must be prepared jointly by the partners involved in the study programme. The self-evaluation file is confidential and will be communicated only to the panel of experts in charge of the external evaluation.

### **The main goals of the self-evaluation are as follows:**

1. *Perform a self-critical review of the services provided by the programme , including a SWOT analysis;*
2. *Provide a solid basis for external evaluation;*
3. *Initiate a quality improvement process by creating innovation dynamics.*

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 study programme.

The precise description of the self-evaluation file to be delivered by the team in charge of the programme is to be found in Part 4 of this document. An Identity sheet must also be delivered (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 5 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 team 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 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 team responsible for the study programme (Dean, Head of department, Director of the study programme ...), along with representative panels of students, teaching staff, and administrative and technical staff of the various sites where the programme is taught. The main partners (professionals, scientists, etc.) working with the institution or that employ former students directly after graduation will be also invited. 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 be heard individually, without the presence of their managers or supervising body. The Hcéres project team will examine the draft agenda for the on-site visit with this in mind and may ask the evaluated entity to make changes accordingly.

There will be no official feedback meeting with the study programme leaders after the visit. However, a final meeting between the experts and the programme leaders will provide an opportunity to clarify any points that remain unclear at the end of the visit.

## 2.6. EVALUATION REPORT

Following the on-site visit, the chair of the panel of experts will submit a provisional evaluation report that will close with the strengths and weaknesses of the programme and recommendations for the evaluated entity.

This provisional report will be sent to the evaluated entity for comment, thereby beginning the response phase:

1. Factual errors pointed out by the Head of the programme are taken into account and dealt with by the committee chairman with the support of the experts and the Hcéres project team. The report then becomes final.
2. Observations of a strategic nature are the subject of an official letter from the programme top management (signed by the Dean or Rector), which will be published with the final report.

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



## 3. ACCREDITATION PROCESS OF A STUDY PROGRAMME

### 3.1. DESCRIPTION

The accreditation procedure begins upon request of the programme leaders at the end of the evaluation phase. In this case, the chair of the panel of experts will issue a non-prescriptive opinion on the accreditation that will be submitted to the ad hoc commission.

The accreditation decision is made according to the 4 accreditation criteria, aligned with the four fields of the Evaluation framework (see 3.2):

The accreditation decision will be made by the Hcéres President after advice from the international accreditation Commission. This permanent Commission is made up of at least 5 members: 3 members of the Hcéres board, including one student, and 2 qualified external specialists. The Commission's permanent rapporteur is the director of the Europe and International Department.

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

The Commission studies the two documents produced by the panel of experts:

1. the final evaluation report,
2. The opinion on accreditation proposed along with the official observations letter from the programme top management.

The accreditation decision taken by the aforementioned Commission corresponds to the award, on behalf of Hcéres, of a label to the evaluated programme.

**This decision is independent of the accreditations issued by the French State, and does not imply recognition in France of the diplomas awarded by the accredited institution.**

### 3.2. ACCREDITATION CRITERIA

#### CRITERIA 1: TEACHING POLICY AND CHARACTERISATION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

The study programme is in line with the teaching strategy of its institution. It is consistent with and complementary to other study programmes, and is aware of its position in the local, national or international teaching offer. It takes into account the socio-economic needs to define and publicize its job opportunities, its outcomes and its contents. The quality of the supporting research laboratories and their involvement in the programme attest to the fact that it is backed by research. The programme benefits from relevant partnerships with companies or institutions involved in related activities. Agreements with foreign higher education institutions are encouraged, in order to offer mobility prospects to its students.

#### CRITERIA 2: THE PEDAGOGICAL ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

The study plan and its contents are built in coherence with the objectives of the programme, in particular the professional integration of the future graduates. The teaching methods used are defined according to the expected skills: they include internships and project work, and make use of information and communication technologies. The students are prepared for international study, in particular through the acquisition of language skills, and benefit from tools to help them succeed or from bridges in the event of reorientation.

### CRITERIA 3: THE STUDENTS' PATHWAY

The programme ensures the quality of its attractiveness to its various target groups, by analysing the evolution of applications and enrolments of different types of target groups. It sets up measures to encourage the success of its various students, and analyses the impact of these measures by monitoring the evolution of the success rates. The programme ensures the quality of the professional integration and the nature of further studies undertaken by its graduates with regard to its objectives and the job market, using surveys to monitor professional integration and cohorts. These data are made public.

### CRITERIA 4: MANAGEMENT AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

The programme has sufficient human, material and financial resources. An identified teaching team, whose responsibilities are clearly defined, manages the programme. A quality policy has been implemented: the programme defines an internal and external evaluation process, allowing it to evolve in a continuous improvement process. Transparent student recruitment procedures, regular evaluation of teaching by students, periodic meetings of a consultative body, and anti-abuse and anti-plagiarism measures are in place.

## 3.3. ACCREDITATION DECISION

After deliberation, the accreditation Commission issues an opinion. The President of Hcéres issues a duly reasoned decision, which is communicated to the institution by the project team. There are three types of accreditation decision:

1. a five-year accreditation decision;
2. 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;
3. an accreditation refusal.

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

The final evaluation report, the comments of the programme leaders and the final accreditation decision are published by Hcéres.

## 4. SELF-EVALUATION FILE FOR ACCREDITATION OF A STUDY PROGRAMME

### 4.1 PREPARATION OF THE SELF-EVALUATION FILE

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

The file prepared by the institution should include the following 5 elements:

1. An **official document** from the institution (Rector or Dean) requesting the evaluation or accreditation specifying the reasons for requesting the evaluation. It may also specify particular points of interest which the institution wishes the experts to focus on.
2. A detailed **characterisation sheet** (ID sheet) of the programme - see Template No. 1
3. A **self-evaluation report** (SER) – see Template No. 2

The SER itself should not exceed **30 pages**. It must be prepared following the External Evaluation Framework provided by Hcéres (4 fields broken down in standards). It will open on a **description of the self-evaluation approach of the programme**.

However, these guidelines are a minimum requirement which the evaluated entity can expand on to include further specifics: It is therefore recommended that the evaluated entity highlights important additional points that are not included in the criteria covered by the standards.

4. A **SWOT analysis** identifying the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats related to the programme (see Appendix No. 3)
5. Pieces of evidence, as listed below. They serve to demonstrate the compliance with the standards and support the self-evaluation: as such, they should be cited in the SER to make them easier to look up. When quantitative data are requested, they must be provided **over the last 4 years** to show the development of the programme.

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 p) 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 study programme leaders: 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

#### OVERALL PRESENTATION

- A short narrative overview of the unit in charge of the programme (either University, College, School): historical background, opening year, needs of the job market, main characteristics, campuses, evolution and trend over the last years.
- A context note about the Higher Education situation in the country (challenges, economic and social/cultural background, role of the HE Ministry, compulsory evaluation/accreditation, competition between public/private universities...) and the position of the university (benchmark) in such a context.
- Organisational chart, specifying the functional links between central governance, administration, research and teaching entities.

#### FIELD 1: THE POLICY AND THE CHARACTERISATION OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMME

1. Mapping of similar or similar programmes in the local or national context

2. List of the university research labs supporting the programme focussed on the implemented activities and achieved results
3. List of national or international research labs supporting the programme focussed on the implemented activities and achieved results
4. List of the national business, cultural or industrial partners actively involved in partnerships with the programme focussed on the implemented activities and achieved results.

## FIELD 2: THE PEDAGOGICAL ORGANISATION OF THE PROGRAMME

1. Student handbook
2. Study programme regulations
3. Detailed study plan (for each semester with number of hours and teaching modalities: lectures, tutorials, practical work ...)
4. If available, the expected skills of the programme
5. 2 examples of courses syllabuses included in the programme
6. Digital resources available for the students (pedagogical platform, internet access...), and library resources.
7. Internships: duration, position in the programme, mandatory or not? A table may be delivered specifying the titles of the internships and the student reports.
8. International academic partnerships allowing students mobility and/or the continuation of further studies abroad: implemented activities and achieved results.
9. Student mobility table over the last 4 years, specifying the countries.

## FIELD 3: THE STUDENTS' PATHWAY

1. Attractiveness indicators:
  - Number of applications, number of students enrolled (for each year).
  - Statistics on students over the last 4 years, breakdown according to :
    - o Female/male students
    - o Students with grants or funding
    - o In and out students (from the area or foreign students)
    - o Initial/apprenticeship/long-life learning
2. Performance indicators:
  - Student success rate at the end of each year, over the last 4 years, for male/female students.
3. Relevance indicators
  - Number of graduated students, continuing studies at superior level
  - Number of graduated students integrated on the job market (table of occupied positions).
  - Number of graduated students still not employed

Please specify the modalities and the timing of the survey (eg. 12 or 18 months after the graduation) and the number of people who answered.

## FIELD 4: MANAGEMENT AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

1. Organisational chart of the bodies in charge of the programme
2. Management and advisory boards and councils of the programme: members, missions, frequency of meeting. Please provide the records of decisions over the last 2 years.
3. Digital resources for the management and the follow-up of the programme as well as for the external/internal communication
4. Classrooms and technical equipment
5. Examination methods and processes
6. Supervision ratio (student/teacher ratio)
7. Quality assurance policy: staff, processes and documents.
8. Ethics policy

**The expert panel will also consider any other document that the institution considers useful for the evaluation.**

## TEMPLATE 1: CHARACTERISATION SHEET OF THE PROGRAMME

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

### INSTITUTION APPLYING FOR EVALUATION

- Name of the Institution :
- Component, faculty or department concerned:
- Year of creation :
- Legal status :
- Organizational chart (to be attached)
- Place(s) where the institution is located:
  - o City(ies):
  - o Campuses:

### PROGRAMME SUBJECT TO EVALUATION

- Precise name :
- Level and duration of studies:
- Year of creation and context:
- Places where the programme is taught:

### PERSON IN CHARGE OF THE PROGRAMME

- Surname, first name:
- Position held:
- Field:
- E-mail:

### RESULTS OF PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS/ACCREDITATIONS

- On a national level:
- On an international level:

### Key figures over the last 4 years

#### HUMAN RESOURCES: NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION BY STAFF STATUS AND CATEGORY

1. Professors and researchers:
  - Status and service charge for each category: full professors, associate professors, assistant professors, invited professors
  - Diploma(s)
  - Gender
  - Nationality
2. Administrative and technical staff: full/part-time, civil servant/contract staff.

#### STUDENT NUMBERS AND TYPE OVER THE LAST 4 YEARS

- Number of applications and percentage of admissions
- Number of students enrolled by year of study
- Number of graduates at the end of each year
- Boys/girls
- Nationals/foreigners

Example of presentation for a master's degree (add blocks of lines for courses of more than 2 years).

		2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022
1 <sup>st</sup> year	Male				
	Female				
	Nationals				
	Foreigners				
	Total				
2 <sup>nd</sup> year	Male				
	Female				
	Nationals				
	Foreigners				
	Total				
Graduates	Male				
	Female				
	Nationals				
	Foreigners				
	Total				

**Important note: only programmes with at least 2 complete cohorts of graduates, and of which at least one of them has been the subject of a follow-up (professional integration / further studies) can be evaluated by the Hcéres.**

#### QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM IMPLEMENTED AT EVALUATED ENTITY OR FACULTY LEVEL

- Process and management description
- Key Performance Indicators

**Any other information deemed useful by the Institution.**

## TEMPLATE 2: SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

General advice:

The self-evaluation report should remain concise and **not exceed 30 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. It is recommended that the specific features of the study programme be highlighted to help the expert 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 study programme leaders may highlight additional points of importance which do not appear in the areas covered by the standards. (0,5 page)

### EVALUATION

#### FIELD 1: TEACHING POLICY AND CHARACTERISATION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

- Standard 1: The study programme is consistent with the institution's teaching strategy.
- Standard 2: The study programme is open to international students in line with the priorities defined by the institution.
- Standard 3: The study programme benefits from research links that are coherent with its outcome
- Standard 4: The study programme maintains links with the socio-economic world.

#### FIELD 2: PEDAGOGICAL ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

- Standard 5: The structure of the study programme and the teaching methods used are adapted to the target skills.
- Standard 6: The study programme develops and diversifies its teaching practices to foster student success.
- Standard 7: The study programme's content and mechanisms are adapted to its effective international dimension.
- Standard 8: The study programme content is consistent with the needs of the socio-economic sector and lifelong learning

#### FIELD 3: STUDENTS' PATHWAY

- Standard 9: The study programme ensures the quality of its student guidance and recruitment, as well as its attractiveness to its different target groups.
- Standard 10: The study programme ensures the quality of student success.

- Standard 11: The study programme ensures the quality of the professional integration and further study of its graduates in relation to its objectives and the labour market.

**FIELD 4: ACADEMIC PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

- Standard 12: The study programme is managed and implemented by a formally identified teaching team
- Standard 13: The study programme has the resources required to achieve its objectives.
- Standard 14: The study programme defines an evaluation process that facilitates its development in a process of continuous improvement.
- Standard 15: The study programme is based on a quality- and ethics-based approach.

**SWOT ANALYSIS**

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS