Experimental phase: joint institutional evaluation

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

_____

June 2024

FOREWORD

At the Yaoundé conference (14-17 May 2024), several components of the experimental phase to be deployed as part of the *JOINT QA AFRICA* project were presented to the partners and submitted for their approval. Three so-called consultation sessions were organised:

- The CARTOGRAPHY report, its main messages, and questions

- The joint institutional repository

- The institutional evaluation model

These sessions were an opportunity to discuss the elements presented and to add to them with the help of proposals put forward by the partners.

All the presentations and summaries of the discussions were sent to participants after the conference.

Also in Yaoundé, the objectives and content of the study visit to Belgium (17-19 June 2024) were discussed, and finally, one external national quality assurance authority per country was identified and included in the June training programme and in the observations of the evaluation visits (see below).

These are:

- Mr Zoungrana Moumouni (Burkina Faso)

- Mr Albert Eyike (Cameroon)

- Mr Alain Sanogo (Ivory Coast)

The purpose of this methodological note is to outline the aims of the institutional evaluation pilot phase, to describe in detail the various stages involved and to specify the roles and tasks of the partners in the implementation of this phase.

However, this document does not include any methodological guidance for setting up a quality policy and processes at the level of a higher education institution. This is because, in accordance with the principle embodied in the ASG-QA that higher education institutions have primary responsibility for the quality of their provision and for assuring it, the establishment of a quality policy and processes is their responsibility. The experts commissioned to carry out the external institutional evaluation are expected to take account of the strategic and methodological choices made upstream by the universities. Thus, AEQES and CAMES wish to encourage universities' creativity in terms of institutional management and to respect their specificities, particularly in the exercise of their autonomy.

Table of contents

Introduction

Education, including higher education and research, plays an essential role in the economic and social development of nations, as illustrated by several recent UNESCO studies[1]. The 2021 report "*Reimagining Our Futures Together: A New Social Contract for Education*" stresses that education is a crucial public good for shaping just and sustainable futures, highlighting the need for quality assurance to adapt education systems to the changing needs of society.

In French-speaking Africa, despite the many structural reforms undertaken, the higher education and research continues to face several challenges, including the massification of enrolments, the emergence of the private sector with limited support from governments and international partners, the rise of cross-border education, the competitiveness of the system in a context of increasing globalisation and health and environmental crises.

To meet these challenges, a few initiatives have been taken at various levels, notably at continental level with the initiative for the Harmonisation of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education in Africa (HAQAA), promoted by the African Union. In the French-speaking region, institutions such as the Conseil Africain et Malgache pour l'Enseignement Supérieur (CAMES) are implementing strategic plans to promote a culture of quality in higher education and research institutions.

However, despite these efforts, weaknesses persist, particularly in terms of consistency between national and regional strategies, and in the involvement of all stakeholders. This highlights the urgent need to finalise the process of harmonising practices, in particular through the regional quality assurance framework promoted by CAMES in French-speaking Africa.

Against this backdrop, the *Joint QA Africa* project has emerged as a concrete response to these challenges. Collaborating with national authorities and higher education institutions, this project aims to build a collaborative model for evaluation and accreditation, based on a joint and complementary approach at national, regional, and continental level.

The project's pilot countries, Burkina Faso, Cameroon and Côte d'Ivoire, share similar challenges in terms of quality assurance in higher education. As such, this project has a dual purpose: to contribute to the operationalisation of the Regional Directive on Quality Assurance and Accreditation, adopted by the CAMES Council of Ministers in 2022, and to be part of the wider process of transforming higher education in Africa through the deployment of the Pan African Quality Assurance Framework (PAQAF), while strengthening the regional quality assurance mechanisms supported by CAMES.

By focusing on the collaboration and articulation quality assurance, this project's aim is to improve the quality and relevance of higher education in French-speaking Africa, while

---

[1] https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/higher-education-paving-way-sustainable-development-global-perspective

promoting the mutual recognition of qualifications and contributing to sustainable growth and job creation.

In this context, the *JOINT QA Africa* project is planning to implement a pilot institutional evaluation based on a common reference framework through two volunteer universities per partner country.

Challenges of the experimental phase of a joint institutional evaluation

1. ROLES OF PARTNERS AND EXPECTED BENEFITS

In the experimental phase, the first stage will be an institutional evaluation conducted jointly by CAMES and AEQES at the six partner universities:

- BURKINA FASO: Norbert Zongo University and Thomas Sankara University

- CAMEROON: University of Douala and University of Dschang

- IVORY COAST : Institut National Polytechnique Félix Houphouët-Boigny and Université Alassane Ouattara

By committing to this pilot phase, the six partner universities are contributing to a stage of co-construction of the model and establishing a <u>concrete dialogue between internal quality assurance (IQA) external quality assurance (EQA)</u>. The institutional evaluation will provide them with the opportunity to reflect constructively on their internal quality assurance practices (in particular, strengthening the capacities of the internal quality assurance units (CIAQ)) and on the quality policy developed at institutional level to serve the university's strategic positioning.

The national authorities of the three partner countries - where the legal provisions for creating and setting up quality agencies are in place - are actively involved in the pilot phase. In practical terms, <u>one representative per national authority will function as an observer during</u> <u>the first visits and will then take on a more active role in coordinating the evaluation during subsequent visits</u> (while still benefiting a form of mentoring from EQASA and CAMES). The presence and concrete involvement of the national authorities are essential in order to understand the methodological dimensions of the pilot phase with regard to their respective contexts, to provide the identified actors (in particular the observers) with an opportunity to strengthen their capacities in terms of external quality assurance, and to build a space of trust between the three countries and between the three countries and CAMES.

Here, AEQES and CAMES are <u>facilitators in the implementation of external quality assurance processes</u> because they are experienced operators in their respective contexts. In fact, AEQES has been conducting EQA processes for several years, either on its own or in partnership with

other quality agencies in French-speaking Belgium and is part of a regular cycle of assessments by ENQA (it has been on the EQAR register since 2012). CAMES, for its part, has extensive experience of evaluations and accreditations throughout the CAMES area and, through its numerous activities throughout this area, benefits from in-depth knowledge of the contexts of its partner countries and of African higher education in general.

The crucial role of CAMES and AEQES within the project is to work together to harmonise the institutional evaluation process, by proposing a joint model that is enriched by their respective experiences.

Finally, the assessors selected for the six institutional visits will also contribute their expertise and skills to the model being tested and will participate, in their own way, in the overall strengthening of quality assurance capacities. What is the *joint* dimension of the experimental model?

- institutional evaluation reference framework, which is the result of the analysis work conducted by the Reference Frameworks Working Group, constitutes a common base for various reference frameworks (including the ASG-QA). As such, it is a joint reference framework.

- The institutional evaluation model (the stages of which are described below) is the negotiated outcome of quality assurance practices (themselves analysed in the preparatory work embodied in the CARTOGRAPHY report).

- Hosting three observers (one from each country) throughout the experiment contributes to a shared vision of the purpose and scope institutional university evaluation. It should be noted that the observation process will involve cross-fertilisation between the countries involved in the project.

In concrete terms, this collaborative work (which has already begun in the preparatory work) will lead to an exchange of good practice and harmonisation quality assurance practices (IQA and EQA), while at the same time ensuring capacity-building for all the players involved.

2. PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND STANDARDS USED

Before going into detail about the various stages involved in conducting this institutional evaluation, it is important to specify its definition and scope, and to present the areas and references of the joint evaluation reference framework.

2.1. DEFINITION OF INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION

Institutional evaluation examines to what extent and in what way the institutional quality policy and its associated processes and, more generally, the operation of the governance of a higher education institution are adapted to its objectives and profile.

2.2. SCOPE OF INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION

The institutional evaluation covers:

- A scope of evaluation that covers all or part of the institution's activities. In this case, the areas identified are governance and quality, education policy, research policy, university life, ethics, and social responsibility.
- An analysis of the ways in which the institution's strategy is drawn up and its operational implementation (strategic plan, institutional development plan, etc.).
- An analysis of the institution's quality policy, quality system and quality culture.
- An analysis of the institution's modes of governance and its ability manages its activities, in line with its strategy and supported by a quality assurance policy.

Quality policy, including in particular: quality objectives, the approach or definition of quality chosen by the institution, the values and priorities underlying IQA, links with the institution's mission and strategy.

Quality system: includes the concept of components and the interaction between components: quality objectives, different approaches (or processes) put in place to achieve the objectives, interactions between these processes, relationships with strategy, responsibilities, the information systems development methods.

Quality culture: serving the continuous improvement of the institution's activities, based as much on the individual and collective commitment of all stakeholders as on identified procedures and tools. In other words, how the institution is explicitly committed to establishing a culture that recognises the importance of quality and its management through appropriate processes that include internal and external stakeholders.

2.3. JOINT INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The "repositories working group set up as part of the project has developed a joint repository for institutional evaluation. The methodology used to develop it, together with a detailed presentation of the framework and its accompanying guide, can be accessed and downloaded from the JointQA project website: h https://jointqa.obreal.org/.

In this integral document - and following the example of the ASG-QA - the benchmarks are common minimum requirements that must be met. They are supplemented by that describe how to achieve the benchmarks and provide examples of good practice and evidence to support the achievement a level of quality. These lists examples are not exhaustive.

Below is a summary of the joint reference framework, which includes fourteen evaluation standards grouped into five areas:

AREA 1: GOVERNANCE AND QUALITY

Standard 1.1 Vision, missions, and strategic objectives

The institution develops and makes public a vision and mission statement that reflect its commitment to continuous quality improvement, strategic objectives, and a quality policy and associated procedures in line with its vision and mission statement. This vision positions the institution in its local, national, regional, and international context.

Standard 1.2 Management, operation, and exercise of autonomy

The institution has clearly defined governance and management structures that make use of its margin of autonomy while respecting its legal mandate. It promotes participative, sound, and ethical governance and management, and its organisation is adapted to the fulfilment of its missions, including robust quality assurance practices supporting the fulfilment of its mission and legal mandate.

Standard 1.3. Management of human, financial and logistical resources

The institution has inclusive human resources policies that ensure the recruitment and retention of an adequate number of qualified and competent staff to conduct its mission and legal mandate. The institution has adequate financial resources and prudent financial management that are aligned with its mission, objectives, and mandate to provide quality services. The institution has adequate and appropriate infrastructure and resources to support teaching, learning and research activities. Reference 1.4. Information and communication policy

The institution shall ensure that it collects, analyses, and uses relevant information for the effective management of its study programmes and other activities.

The institution publishes information on its activities, including its programmes, in a clear, accurate and objective manner, and ensures that this information is up-to-date and accessible. The company shall ensure that its programmes are promoted fairly and ethically in accordance with good practice and in compliance all applicable legislation.

AREA 2: TRAINING POLICY

Standard 2.1. Training provision and management

The institution has effective steering structures for its training programmes and provides an educational offering that is in line with its missions, its strategic plan, and its local, national, and international environment. The training programmes are adapted to the institution's resources and comply with the requirements of the LMD system, adopting a student-centred approach.

Standard 2.2. Programme evaluation and revision

The institution puts in place mechanisms for the regular evaluation of its training programmes to ensure their relevance and quality. It also ensures that its staff's pedagogical skills are regularly enhanced, thereby promoting the continuous improvement of educational practices and the quality of the teaching provided.

Standard 2.3. Assessment of student knowledge and learning

The institution implements a policy/mechanisms/procedure for the validation of learning throughout the course, including placements, ensuring that the assessment tests are consistent with the learning objectives. Assessments are conducted objectively, fairly, and reliably, and the results are communicated transparently to students.

Standard 2.4. Doctoral training

The institution is implementing a relevant and well-defined doctoral training strategy, backed up by adequate resources for supervising doctoral theses. This strategy aims to guarantee the quality and relevance of doctoral research, while ensuring appropriate support for doctoral students through qualified supervision and sufficient resources.

Standard 2.5. Students: reception employability

The institution implements a global strategy for student guidance and support, including reception, guidance, counselling, and services adapted to specific needs, such as those of disabled students or athletes and women. It facilitates access to relevant documentation and offers teaching support services to students to help them succeed academically. In addition, it actively encourages student participation in institutional life and is developing systems to monitor their integration into the world of work, as well as a strategy to increase their employability after graduation.

AREA 3: RESEARCH POLICY

Standard 3.1. Organisation and structuring of research

The institution is establishing effective structures and mechanisms to steer and implement its research, aligning its priorities with national and international development goals. It actively encourages research and innovation, promoting interdisciplinary collaboration and the emergence of innovative ideas. It also ensures that its research priorities are implemented and organises internal evaluations to assess the quality and impact of its research.

Standard 3.2. Promoting research

In line with its strategy, the institution is putting in place an integrated policy for communicating and disseminating its scientific output, as well as a policy for promoting and transferring research results.

AREA 4: UNIVERSITY LIFE

Standard 4.1. Living conditions conducive to the personal and psychosocial development of all the players

In line with its strategy, the institution implements a comprehensive policy for the development of cultural, artistic, and sporting activities, providing a fulfilling environment for its members. In addition, it takes an appropriate approach to health issues for its members and effectively manages health and safety aspects in the workplace, ensuring a safe and healthy working environment for all.

AREA 5: ETHICS AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Standard 5.1. Ethics and professional conduct

The institution actively integrates the principles and rules of ethics and professional conduct into all its activities and ensures that these standards are respected by all its members. It also rigorously applies the principles equal opportunities, guaranteeing fair access to educational and professional opportunities for all its students and staff, regardless of their origin, identity, or personal characteristics.

Standard 5.2. Corporate social responsibility

The institution actively promotes and supports civic activities, exchanges, and societal debates within its community, demonstrating its commitment to active citizenship and participatory democracy. It also integrates the environmental dimension and promotes sustainable development through its facilities, equipment, and practices, thereby helping to preserve the environment and create a more sustainable future.

Stages in the implementation of the institutional evaluation

1. OVERVIEW

This pilot phase will be conducted within the time constraints of the project. At the end of the experiment, the "time dimension will also need to be analysed to determine a realistic and effective method for modelling. The table below provides a schematic overview of the main operational stages of this pilot phase.

	PREPARATION	Universities	AEQES/CAMES	CoPIL
June 2024	Validation of the joint institutional reference framework Validation of the methodological note Study visit to Belgium			
July	Official launch of the self-assessment (5/7/2024)			
August				
September	Experts: call for applications			
October	Planning visits (top)			
November	Expert selection (top)			
December	2e self-assessment meeting-AEQES/CAMES			
January 2025				
February	Contractualisation experts			
March	DAEI filing for 4 universities			
April			Screening DAEI	
May	Expert training Pre-interviews (4)		+ experts	
	PRODUCTION			
May/June	Institutional assessment visits (4)		+ experts	
July	DAEI deposit for 2 universities		Screening DAEI	
August	Report production process evaluation (first 4)		+ experts	
September	Expert training (bis)		+ experts	
October	Pre-interviews (2)			
November	Institutional assessment visits (2)		+ experts	
December	Publication of assessment reports (4)	+ right to answer	+ experts	
January 2026	Report production process evaluation (2)		+ experts	
February				
	FOLLOW-UP			
April				
May	Publication of assessment reports (2)	+ right of reply	+ experts	
June	Publication of action (4)			
July	Activities to disseminate EI results			
December	Publication of action (2)			

2. PREPARATION PHASES

2.1. STUDY VISIT TO BELGIUM

From 16 to 19 June 2024, a study visit to the project's Belgian partners will take place. Two representatives from each of the African partner universities, together with three observers from the national authorities (Burkina Faso, Cameroon and Côte d'Ivoire) and a representative of CAMES, will be welcomed at the Université de Liège and then at the Université Catholique de Louvain, for a total of three days during which workshops and plenary meetings will follow one another to encourage interaction. ENQA and AEQES are associated with this study visit.

The aim is twofold:

- prepare for institutional self-evaluation (familiarisation with the reference framework and exchange best practice on self-evaluation methods and tools).

- exchanging best practice to consolidate quality assurance in-house.

2.2. LAUNCH MEETING

A kick-off meeting is being organised by AEQES and CAMES for the authorities and quality managers of the 6 African partner universities to officially mark the start of the self-assessment of this pilot phase. This meeting will be held by videoconference. The objectives, phases and tools of the pilot phase will be presented, together with the provisional timetable.

AEQES/CAMES coordination will ask each university to complete an information sheet containing some factual data[2]. This information will enable AEQES and CAMES to better understand the context of each university.

To ensure a participatory approach to the self-assessment process and to involve as many members of the university community as possible, CAMES will support the universities in the dissemination stages, in face-to-face internal meetings, according to the needs expressed by the partners.

It should be noted that a second meeting between the agencies and the universities may take place a few months after the launch of the self-evaluation, to review the progress of the work and to share good practice and any difficulties encountered. This videoconference meeting could take place around December 2024.

---

[2] Example data: name of institution, name and contact details of contact person, quality manager, number of courses offered and student populations enrolled in these courses, number of staff (in ETYP), by category of staff, information any EQA procedures such as accreditation, labelling (which bodies, what results), specific issues identified for institutional evaluation + institutional strategic plan (in appendix).

2.3. SELF-ASSESSMENT BY EACH UNIVERSITY

It is worth emphasising the importance of the university's strategic management: with a view to fitness for purpose, the joint benchmark of the institutional evaluation will be set against the deployment of the vision, mission, and strategy of the university.

These are formalised in documents such as the "Strategic Plan" or "Institutional Development Plan. This is why these documents are requested from the start of the external evaluation process.

The university sets up a self-evaluation commission or self-evaluation steering committee (or entrusts this task to an existing body) and appoints a contact person who will function as the interface between the EQSA and CAMES coordinators throughout the process.

AEQES and CAMES stress importance making self-evaluation part of a participatory approach. Good practice and sound advice for conducting high-quality self-evaluation work have been brought together in a recent publication produced jointly by the AUF and CAMES[3].

The self-assessment process will take the form of a self-assessment dossier. (DAEI). This must include:

HEADING	CONTENTS
Introduction	Contextual presentation of institution, with some factual data and figures on the range of on offer, the students, and the staff. personal.
Process self-assessment	Section describing and commenting on the self-assessment process itself (reflexive feedback).
Strategy and governance	a section describing the institution's vision, missions and values, documented by its main strategic orientations (of a nature specific to the university's missions or of a cross-cutting nature, for example: ethics and sustainable development, internationalisation, links with business, social dimension and inclusion, teaching/research links, etc.) and a general presentation of governance and the main decision-making processes in relation to the university's missions. various university activities.
Policy quality and associated procedures	Section presenting - in its current form - the quality policy, its associated procedures, its results in terms of improvement and explaining how this policy forms an integral part of the establishment's strategic management. Particular attention will be paid to the links between the centralised levels (institutional policy) and the decentralised levels. decentralised entities (faculties, categories, sections, etc.).

---

[3] AUF – CAMES Methodological guide self-assessment based on the CAMES reference frameworks - Revised version 2022 (13 January 2023)

The fourteen references grouped into five areas	Analysis of how the university meets each of the fourteen benchmarks in the five areas included in the joint evaluation framework institutional.
SWOT and action	Overall SWOT analysis and forward-looking thinking translated into an action plan. This action plan includes at least the actions, the people responsible, the links with the institution's strategic priorities, the deadlines, the indicators for measuring the achievement of the objectives and a level of priority.
Appendices	More factual information (additional documentation, regulations, etc.), , legal references, internal scorecards, etc.) will be included in the appendix.
Glossary	List of acronyms and key or specific terms.

In a self-evaluation process, it is important to draft a dossier that is more analytical than descriptive: the more in-depth the analysis in the DAEI, the more relevant the work of the experts will be, as they will not have to spend time looking for information (analyses and actions already taken by the university to remedy the weaknesses or risks detected). It is recommended that the analysis be carried out bearing in mind three levels of response to the question "How does the university meet the 14 benchmarks", i.e. those relating to description ("What are we doing, how are we doing it?"), those relating to evaluation ("How do we judge the achievement of our objectives in this respect?") and those relating to action ("How can we improve what we are doing?"). It is recommended that these three areas be used explicitly - wherever appropriate.

institutional self-evaluation file is validated by the academic authorities and by the members of the steering committee before being sent to EQASA and CAMES. The latter provide for a formal analysis of the dossiers before they are sent to the experts concerned, with a return to the university if necessary.

Deadline:

The DAEI for the following universities is due by 31 March 2025

BURKINA FASO: Norbert Zongo University and Thomas Sankara University

IVORY COAST : Institut National Polytechnique Félix Houphouët-Boigny and Université Alassane Ouattara

The DAEI for the following universities is due on 4 July 2025 CAMEROON: University of Douala and University of Dschang

2.4. SETTING UP EVALUATION COMMITTEES

For AEQES and CAMES, the procedures for recruiting and selecting experts and setting up evaluation committees, as well as the training of contracted experts, are an important preparatory stage. This takes place at the same time as the partner universities' self-evaluation phase.

Between June and August 2024, the two agencies agree on the tools for these stages (such as the application form to be completed, the grid for analysing applications and the composition of the committees, elements of case law - particularly with regard to the notion of conflict of interest, etc.). They draw up a formal call for applications to be launched in September 2024 and plan the meetings needed to analyse the applications and set up the committees.

Based on the definition given to the pilot institutional evaluation (see below) and the areas and fields to be investigated, here is the expertise expected of the members of the external evaluation committees:

GOVERNANCE	A person with expertise in governance and management
	strategic direction of a higher education institution or organisation
MANAGEMENT OF QUALITY	Someone with experience in quality management and of its teaching tools
PEDAGOGY	A person with experience in pedagogical practice in higher education (e.g. pedagogical coordination, consultancy, etc.). pedagogy, pedagogical research, project management, quality approach, success support, e-learning, etc.).
EXPERIENCE STUDENT	Person studying at time of external evaluation or graduated no more than one year ago
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE	Anyone with experience, outside higher education, the links between teaching, research, and the needs of the sector. business world

The experts will have up-to-date experience in their areas of expertise and an in-depth understanding of the challenges of higher education and quality assurance at African and international level.

It should be noted that the demarcation between these different profiles is not rigid, with each skill can be covered by one or more experts.

The pilot institutional evaluation provides for each committee to be made up of four people (a priori 3 African experts and 1 European expert per committee). One of the committee members will be an expert who will chair the committee.

Chairperson of the evaluation committee: a person with one of the aforementioned areas of expertise

(excluding student experience) and meets the criteria below:

- Experience of governance/strategic management,
- An experiment institutional evaluation,
- Experience in quality management, - Excellent written and oral expression, - Team skills.

Once the evaluation committees have been set up and the experts contracted, AEQES and CAMES will jointly organise the training of the experts. This training, offered in the form one or more videoconference modules, will cover the context of the pilot phase (the challenges of harmonising quality assurance practices in Africa, the aims of the project and the specific characteristics of the six partner universities), adoption of the joint institutional evaluation reference framework, the appropriation of methodological principles (such as the formative approach, the "observation-analysis-recommendation" reflex for a substantiated evaluation, the critical friend posture) without forgetting the launch of a group dynamic within the evaluation committees and the sharing of a reflection on collaborative work (roles and tasks of each, complementary expertise and involvement).

2.5. PRELIMINARY INTERVIEW

A preliminary meeting between the Chair of the Evaluation Committee and the university representatives may be organised (on request and by videoconference) prior to the visit to prepare for it as well as possible. The objectives are to establish initial contact between the committee chairman and the university representative(s), to outline the main thrusts of the external evaluation and, if necessary, to discuss the university's specific characteristics, set out the programme for the visit, go back over organisational aspects if necessary and outline the stages that will follow the visit.

3. CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION VISIT

The duration of evaluation visit was set at three full days (including the restitution, i.e. the summary report of the initial results of the evaluation provided by the chairperson of the evaluation committee before left the university).

For the visit schedule, the universities are invited to propose the interview or organisational formats that they feel are most appropriate. The visit programme (structure, themes, types of players, etc.) must be drawn up considering the diverse contexts of the institutions.

However, a number of invariants are to be expected:

- Meeting(s) with <u>the highest academic authorities </u>o management and members of the management body (Board, etc.)

- Where appropriate, meetings with <u>middle management </u>(departmental management). department, area management, head of continuing education...)

- Meeting with <u>the quality unit/department</u>: institutional quality managers and CIAQ members

- Meetings with <u>students:</u> Possibility of scheduling a specific meeting with student representatives.

    institutional (student association, student council, etc.)

    o Meetings with a sample of students not involved in the institutional councils (by sector, level of study, etc.), representative of the range of courses offered by the university (initial and continuing education, where applicable, etc.).

- Specific meetings with graduates (maximum 5 years after the last diploma obtained)

- Meeting(s) <u>teachers </u>(representative sample) o Depending on the size of the school, several meetings may be organised (by sector or level of education - baccalaureate, masters, continuing education, etc.).

- Meeting(s) with <u>external stakeholders:</u> Representatives from the professional world, recruiters, internship sites, members

    of advisory committees *(Advisory Board...)* other than *alumni*

- Meeting(s) with managers and/or members of support services / central services

- The visit programme also includes:

    o an optional meeting organised during the visit if the committee so requests (allow for a free slot which the committee can complete no later than three weeks before the visit).

    o one or more areas for consulting the documentation available.

    o a meeting at the beginning (brief presentation) and at the end (feedback).

The university provides access to the teaching platform and/or the intranet (a demonstration is not necessary).

The university can offer other meeting formats, themed meeting(s) of its choice (ethics and sustainable development, internationalisation, links with business, social dimension and inclusion, teaching/research links, etc.), in line with its own strategic orientations and concerns.

From a practical point of view, establishments will ensure that:

- not to exceed the number of three days planned per visit; - not to exceed the 9am-6.30pm time slot; - to allow 15 minutes for the evaluation committee to debrief between each interview, as well as a 45-minute lunch break.

A few best practices:

- Interviews last around an hour. When the meeting concerns one or two people, the duration is more like 1/2 hour.

- interviews are dialogues (no presentations, except for the interview with the academic authorities, which may include a brief presentation, e.g. updating the self-assessment file submitted, etc.).

- the groups are composed based on a representative sample (teachers at the beginning of their career and more advanced, students at the beginning and end of their career, etc.) and include 6 to 8 people per interview, who have no hierarchical link between them.

- Individuals are met only once (with some exceptions: it is possible to schedule two

meetings with the education authorities and the quality coordinator).

- the quality co-ordinator will be available to the evaluation committee (at least one day a week).

hourly per day)

- the institution invites all the stakeholders met during the visit (or the visit itself) to attend.

university community

- the feedback is experienced as a shared moment of "celebration" of the process continuous improvement...

The generic planning proposal (not completed with the names of the participants) is sent to EQTA and CAMES at the same time as the self-assessment file.

4. INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION REPORT DRAWN UP BY THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

A preliminary institutional evaluation report will be drawn up collectively by the experts and sent to the institution so that it can, if necessary, exercise its right of response. The report will then be published, *as a minimum,* on the JOINT QA project website. It will include any right of reply.

5. FOLLOW-UP TO INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION

Institutions are expected to draw up a draft action plan as early as the self-assessment phase (see above) and to publish this finalised action plan on their website.

no later than six months after the publication of the report on the institutional evaluation of the experts on the *JOINT QA AFRICA* project website.

Dissemination seminar: organisation of a half-day work and exchanges with the universities. The aim of this day is to enable establishments to share best practices that have contributed to their development.

IN THE EVENT OF COMPLAINTS

In the event of complaints from universities, an *ad hoc* committee will be set up to deal with these complaints independently. This committee will be made up of three members, one appointed by the complaining university, one appointed by the "associated partners" of the Joint QA Project, and one appointed jointly by these two parties.

A complaint is deemed admissible if it:

- concerns non-compliance with the code ethics, an evaluation procedure, and/or the expertise contract.

- is submitted in writing within thirty calendar days of the alleged breach.

- is based on facts and is documented.

- is signed by the university's highest authority.

- relates to a specific aspect of the evaluation procedure.