Annex 3

Checklist for self-evaluation process

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

This section discusses institutional norms and values. It analyses the mission and goals of the institution. The IEP evaluation team will be particularly interested in the strategic choices the institution has made with regard to its scope and specific mission.

- ✓ Governance and management
    - ✓ What is the degree of centralisation and decentralisation that the institution aims for?
    - ✓ Does the institution have human resources policies in place?
    - ✓ Does the institution have an institutional quality assurance policy in place?

- ✓ Academic profile
    - ✓ What balance is the institution aiming to achieve with its teaching, research and service to society?
    - ✓ What are the institution's academic priorities, i.e. which teaching programmes and areas of research are emphasised?
    - ✓ To what extent is a student-centred approach, as promoted by the Bologna Process, implemented in the teaching of the institution?

- ▪ Academically-related activities: what are the institution's goals for its relationship to society (external partners, local and regional government) and its involvement in public debate?

- ▪ Funding: how does the institution see its relationship with its funding agencies (public and others, such as research contractors)?

- ▪ What balance is the institution aiming to achieve in terms of its local, regional, national, and international positioning?

- ▪ What is the vision of the institution with respect to its present and future positioning in the broader international HE landscape?

- ▪ What is the rationale of the strategic choices made by the institution?

II. Governance and activities: *How is the institution trying to do it?*

In practice, the institution manages its activities (teaching, research, and service to society) in order to realise its mission and goals, while taking account of the specific opportunities and constraints it faces. The inevitable discrepancy between what ought to be (norms and values) and what actually exists (organisation and activities) is an indicator of the institution's strengths and weaknesses. It is the analysis of strengths and weaknesses that constitutes the next phase of the self-evaluation.

The issues addressed in Section I should be re-visited but, rather than stating objectives, Section II will reflect upon the institution's strategy in terms of each of these issues and how they are achieved, and will analyse the extent to which the institution takes full advantage of its autonomy. Moreover, each subheading in this section should also contain concrete proposals on how identified weaknesses could be remedied and strengths could be further enhanced.

- Governance and management: Re-visit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
  - ✓ Analysis of management practice: what are the respective roles of central-level administrators, offices and faculties/institutes? Does co-ordination among faculties/institutes take place, and if so how? What does the institutional leadership control and decide? Who decides the following:
    - ➢ Academic activities and policies (teaching and learning, research)
    - ➢ Funding issues
    - ➢ The selection and promotion of academic and administrative staff
    - ➢ The selection of students
    - ➢ Development of service to society?
  - ✓ How does the institution involve students and external stakeholders in institutional governance?
  - ✓ How adequate are the institution's human resources, human resource policy and practice for current and future needs (e.g., gender policy, age profile, recruitment, promotion, redeployment and staff development)?
  - ✓ How does the institution's involvement in inter-institutional cooperation (at regional, national or international level) reflect its positioning as identified in Section I?
  - ✓ How do the actual management policies reflect the institution's mission and goals, and how could discrepancies between the goals and reality be amended and strengths be reinforced?

- Academic profile : Re-visit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
  - ✓ Analysis of educational and research approaches. This can be brief unless some programmes or approaches, teaching or research units deserve specific mention because they reflect the institution's academic profile (e.g., special didactic approaches, a unique and/or very large research institute, e-learning etc.)
  - ✓ Analysis of educational programme design and organisation of research activities
  - ✓ How do the study programmes and research activities reflect the mission and goals, and how could discrepancies between the goals and reality be amended and identified strengths be reinforced?

- Academically-related activities: Re-visit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
  - ✓ Analysis of research and technology transfer, continuing education, regional and service to community, etc. This can be brief, unless some activities deserve specific mention.
  - ✓ How do the various academically-related activities reflect the institution's mission and goals, and how could discrepancies between the goals and reality addressed and strengths be reinforced?

- ✓ Student support services:
  - ✓ Is the organisation and content of student support services suitable to meet the goals set?
  - ✓ How effective are student support services in enhancing the achievement of students?

- ✓ Funding: Revisit questions in Section I by taking the following issues into account:
  - ✓ What is the total budget of the institution, including salaries, contracts, etc.?

✓ What percentage is allotted by the state or other public authorities, formed by student fees, by private sources (research contracts, foundations, etc.)?

✓ Is the state allocation a lump sum, or, if not, what percentage of this allocation is ear-marked?

✓ What are the amounts allotted to faculties and departments, and according to which criteria are they distributed? Are these amounts decided by the institution?

✓ What are the allocation procedures within the institution? Who decides what and how?

✓ What percentage of the budget can be used by the institutional leadership to implement new initiatives?

✓ Is the institution able to calculate the full costs of teaching and research activities?

✓ What does the institution perceive as strengths and weaknesses in terms of its funding, and how could weaknesses be remedied and strengths be further enhanced?

III. Quality assessment practices: *How does the institution know it works?*

The question "How does the institution know it works?" refers to the internal quality assessment processes and practices available and operative in the institution.

- Does the institution have an internal quality assurance policy or handbook?

- Does the institution conduct internal evaluations of programmes, departments, research etc.?

Processes related to teaching and learning are enshrined in part 1 of the "Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area" (ESG), which were adopted by ministers in Bergen (2005)[5].

- To what extent has the institution implemented these European Guidelines?

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

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

- How have the results of the data gathering and evaluation results impacted the activities?

- How is the link between these results and institutional planning and development processes ensured?

- How well do the current practices relate to the strategic choices presented in Section I?

IV. Strategic management and capacity for change: *How does the institution change in order to improve?*

Once the self-evaluation group has gone through all the above questions, it will come up with a SWOT analysis that will assess the capacity of the institution to change in order to improve:

- How responsive is the institution to the demands, threats and opportunities present in its external environment?

---

[5]   Annex 7 and http://www.enqa.eu/pubs.lasso

- How are representatives from the external environment involved in the institution's strategic management?

- To what extent does the institution take full advantage of its autonomy?

- Which changes can be expected to be made towards the institution's aims?

- How can a better match be attained between the current and future mission and goals and the activities (study programmes, research, service to society)?

- What role do quality monitoring and quality management play in these developments?

Annex 4

Proposed structure and content for the self-evaluation report

<u>Introduction</u>

Brief analysis of the self-evaluation process:

- Who are the self-evaluation group members?

- With whom did they collaborate?

- To what extent was the report discussed across the institution?

- What were the positive aspects, as well as the difficulties, encountered in the self-evaluation process?

<u>Institutional context</u>

Brief presentation of the institution in its context:

- Brief historical overview

- Legal status of the institution (public, private non-profit, private for-profit. If private who are the owners and what is the legal form)

- Geographical position of the institution (e.g., in a capital city, major regional centre, concentrated on one campus, dispersed across a city)

- A brief analysis of the current regional and national labour-market situation

- Number of faculties, research institutes/laboratories, academic and administrative staff and students

<u>Body of the report</u>

The body of the self-evaluation report strives to strike a balance between description and critical analysis (i.e., identify the strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats) and should have the following sections, which follow the four sections in the checklist:

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

- Section II: Governance and activities: How is the institution trying to do it?

- Section III: Quality assessment practices: How does the institution know it works?

- Section IV: Strategic management and capacity for change: How does the institution change in order to improve?

As mentioned in section 3.2, the body of the self-evaluation report should not be simply descriptive, but *analytical, evaluative and synthetic* as well. It should assess strengths and weaknesses, identify threats and opportunities and show how the various elements of strategic and quality management are interconnected. In addition, the analysis should take into account changes that have taken place in the recent past as well as those that are anticipated in the future.

<u>Conclusion</u>

The conclusion summarises the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and **offers a specific action plan to remedy weaknesses and to develop strengths further.**

A useful conclusion has the following characteristics:

- Since the goal of the evaluation is to promote ongoing quality and strategic development, the report should be honest and self-reflective. Therefore, strengths and weaknesses need to be stated explicitly; specifically, it is best to avoid playing down or hiding weaknesses.

- Strengths and weaknesses that are not discussed in the body of the report should not appear in the conclusion since they would be unsubstantiated.

- Strengths and weaknesses that are discussed in the main part of the report are summarised again in the conclusion.

- Plans to remedy weaknesses are offered in the conclusion in the form of a specific action plan.

Appendices

Appendices will typically include the following:

- The current Institutional Strategic Plan (if one exists) or preferably, an Executive Summary (in English, if that exists)

- The data provided by the institution during the process of national data collection as per the guidelines included in OMECTS 4072/21.04.2011

- Any other available reports of evaluations during recent years (e.g. ARACIS)

- An organisational chart of the institution's faculties (or any other relevant units of teaching/research)

- An organisational chart of the central administration and support services (rector's office staff, libraries etc.)

- An organisational chart of the management structure (rector, council/senate, faculty deans and councils, major committees, etc.)

- Student numbers for the whole institution, with a breakdown by faculty, over the last three to five years; student/staff ratio (lowest, highest and mean ratios); time-to-graduation; drop-out rates; gender distribution by faculty; demographic trends in the wider target population

- Academic staff numbers (by academic rank and faculty) for the whole institution, over the last three to five years, with a breakdown by level, discipline, gender and age

- Funding: government funding (amount and percentage of total budget), other funding sources (type and percentage of total budget) and research funding (percentage within total budget); amount of institutional funding for teaching and research per faculty over the last three to five years

- Infrastructure in relation to the number of students and staff: number and size of buildings, facilities, laboratories, and libraries; their location (e.g., dispersed over a large geographical area or concentrated on a single campus); condition of the facilities

- Handbook for prospective international students (if one exists).

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

Beyond these appendices, the institution is free to add other information, but the number and length of appendices should be limited to what is strictly necessary in order to understand the statements and argumentation in the self-evaluation report.