

## Příloha 4 Přehled hodnocení v letech 2017-2019

Agentura/compliant <sup>1</sup>	F	S	P	N	Standards/recommendations
Rok 2019					
QQI (Ireland)	12	2			
ANVUR (Italy)	3	8	3		<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.1 The panel recommends to extend consideration of the internal quality assurance processes described in Part 1 of the ESG to all of ANVUR's external QA activities falling within the scope of the ESG.</p> <p>2.4 The panel recommends to involve student experts in all external quality assurance activities</p> <p>2.6 The panel recommends to publish full reports by the experts not only clear and accessible to the academic community but also to external partners and other interested individuals.</p>
A3ES (Portugal)	11	3			
QA Austria	9	5			
CTI (France)	11	1	2		<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.5 For improved consistency of decisions, CTI is recommended to develop the deliberation rules and criteria for decision-making explicitly. They do not need to be mathematical but should still give a clear indication for the different types of decisions.</p> <p>2.6 The panel recommends CTI to intensify efforts regarding the new template for panel reports in order to increase redactional uniformity and coherence. Full reports should be publishable in a short period, given the fact that this recommendation already exists since the previous ENQA review.</p>
Evalag (BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG)	10	4			

<sup>1</sup> F-fully compliant, S-Substantially compliant, P-Partially compliant, N-Non-compliant

NCPA (Russia)	4	8	2		<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.2 Review its practice of accreditation of clusters of programmes to ensure its fitness for purpose. Either the practice has to be adjusted to the methodology of programme reviews or the activity has to become a separate activity with its own methodology. This review should include regulations for clusters (qualitative and quantitative) that have to correspond with experts (qualitative and quantitative) and also cover the impacts for site visit schedules and reports as well as final decisions. Separate accreditation procedures of basic programmes of vocational education.</p> <p>2.6 Adjust its publication practice and publish accreditation decisions together with the full reports. Assure transparency regarding the publication of reports on the English website. Assure that reports contain an adequate evidence basis and analysis in order to explain recommendations in a comprehensible way.</p>
AHPGS (Germany)	7	5	1	1	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2. 1 The expert panel recommends that the agency develops more widely all the criteria of Part 1 in the international assessments. To demonstrate compliance with ESG part 1, the agency should undertake a mapping exercise that clearly indicates that all standards are addressed.</p> <p><b>NON COMPLIANT</b></p> <p><b>3.4 Recommendation: The review panel recommends allocating financial and human resources to regularly develop thematic analysis.</b></p>
NCEQE (Georgia)	6	7	1		<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>3.3 It should be ensured that there is absolute independence from the government in that the Minister cannot dismiss director or council member without serious reasons, the circumstances of which should be more transparently defined beyond a mere “inappropriate manner”.</p>
<b>EUA-IEP</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>			
UNIBASQ (Spain)	7	7			
CYQAA (Cyprus)	4	8	2		<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.6 Put in place a mechanism to ensure that all external evaluation reports are of comparably high quality in terms of evidence to substantiate scores, comments being specific and consistency between scores and comments, and give due consideration to the effectiveness of internal quality assurance; provide space in the evaluation report template to address the specificity of joint programmes; introduce an annex to an external evaluation report for experts to comment on the implementation of recommendations by institutions, and to be published together with a report; and publish all reports, including those leading to</p>

				<p>refusal of accreditation, in addition to those currently available on its website.</p> <p>3.4 Introduce the practice of analysing systematically the material collected in its external quality assurance activities and publishing regularly its findings to provide inputs to national policies, support institutions in the development of internal quality assurance and aid its own reflection on its external quality assurance processes.</p> <p><b>Poznámka: Původní hodnocení standardu 3.4 non compliant bylo po doporučení Boardu změněno na partially compliant s požadavkem zpracovat follow-report do jednoho roku.</b></p>
SQAA (Slovenia)	3	8	3	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.6 The panel recommends SQAA publishing all reports including those with a negative outcome in the case of initial accreditation procedures for reasons of transparency and further development.</p> <p>3.4 The panel recommends SQAA developing a method for the production and dissemination of thematic analyses on issues which are relevant to its stakeholders.</p> <p>3.6 The panel recommends SQAA including external stakeholders more directly in the internal evaluation and quality improvement activities of the agency. Also proper feedback should be provided to better inform stakeholders about the results of surveys/actions taken by the agency; The panel recommends SQAA involving all its bodies in the conception and the implementation of its internal quality assurance policy. The panel feels that the agency's council as the highest decision-making body could lead the way and play a more active role.</p>
Rok 2018				
PKA (Poland)	4	7	3	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.1 The opinion giving procedure should be fully aligned with the requirements of Part 1 of the ESG.</p> <p>2.4 PKA should develop a practice reassuring the equal involvement of stakeholders across the different procedures making sure all experts are involved in the relevant key steps of each procedure. - External experts, particularly students should be used in the opinion giving process.</p> <p>2.6 Expert reports and resolutions of the opinion giving process should be published. 48/60 - When drafting the assessment reports for the programme evaluation procedures by the chair of the panel, PKA should setup a mechanism reassuring appropriate involvement of all experts.</p>
RCVS (UK)	8	4	2	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.5 Accreditation decisions should be confinable and justifiable. Therefore, the review panel recommends to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider whether the complex system of decision-making could be simplified;</li> <li>• make the option "Full accreditation for a shorter period" more precise.</li> </ul>

				3.4 Panel recommendations: • Develop a clear concept and plan for thematic analysis. • Set clear roles and responsibilities among staff members for analysing and publishing general findings of RCVS's external quality assurance activities.
HAC (Hungary)	9	4	1	<b>Partially compliant</b>  2.4 The HAC should (1) give up anonymity and invisibility of its experts for ex-ante procedures; (2) involve foreign experts in all visiting panels and disciplinary committees; (3) ensure the involvement of students in ex-ante evaluations and in all processes and decisions; (4) increase the training of experts; and (5) standardise the method of training according to the purpose and type of evaluation activity.
ARACIS (Romania)	8	4	2	<b>Partially compliant</b>  2.6 For its new evaluation methodology ARACIS should broaden its view of the intended readership of its reports at programme and institutional levels to embrace potential students, those who advise them, and employers of Romanian graduates, and provide reports that are more accessible to a wider readership. As it develops its new information systems under the QAFIN Project, ARACIS should ensure that they deliver improved performance, storage, organisation and presentation of data, including via the new ARACIS website, and that all its reports can be indexed by internet search engines.  3.1 The panel recommends that the respective responsibilities of the Council, the President, the Executive Board, the Chief 48/72 Executive Officer and the Secretary General should be more clearly drawn in the interests of transparency, accountability and good governance. The panel recommends the creation of a strategic plan setting aims for the Agency's own development with targets against which ARACIS can measure its progress and as a means of informing the Ministry of National education, higher education institutions and all those who work with ARACIS of its priorities and expectations. The panel suggest to ENQA that after one year it asks to see a draft strategic plan from ARACIS for the next 5 years. To work on the shift from quality assurance as compliance to quality assurance for enhancement, ARACIS should seek the support of the Ministry for a partnership project led by ARACIS with the Ministry and the HEIs to give substance to what is at present an aspiration. The panel recommend that ARACIS should either implement the 2013 recommendation, for a stakeholders' committee and embrace a more generous definition of stakeholder, or that it substantially increase the number of stakeholder representatives on its Council.
NOKUT (Norway)	12	1	1	<b>Partially compliant</b>  2.3 NOKUT should implement the plans for follow-up in the 3rd cycle of audits while making sure that there is some form of checking if and how the recommendations from the previous cycle had been implemented. NOKUT should also consider introducing a follow-up procedure for programme accreditations.
AIC (Latvia)	6	7	1	<b>Partially compliant</b>  2.7 The panel recommends that the agency AIC/AIKA considers revising those aspects of the appeals process and procedures which may potentially undermine the perception of an independent objective decision-making and describes in the respective document the impact of the appeal decision made by the

					Chairperson of AIC on the accreditation decision of CAS/CLSP.
<b>QAA (UK)</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>			
NQA (Netherlands)	4	7	3		<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.7 The review panel recommends to the agency developing a complaints procedure and communicate it to the institutions. That should include the establishment of an independent and competent commission that may handle any relevant issues.</p> <p>3.1 The review panel recommends establishing an advisory committee with the participation of different relevant stakeholders. The review panel recommends the formalization of a strategic plan to reflect on its objectives.</p> <p>3.4 The review panel recommends that NQA includes thematic analysis as one regular activity in its planning. The review panel recommends using a part of the budget and the experience and knowledge of internal and external secretaries gained from various assessment procedures in order to conduct those thematic analyses.</p>
EAEVE (Europe)	9	3	2		<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.1, The technique suggested and provided by the ESEVT SOP for assessing the ESG 2015 Part 1 should be reviewed to make it more fit for purpose and in order to avoid misconceptions and either overlaps or omissions. Instead of seeing the ESG 2015 Part 1 as an add-on feature of quality assurance, it is recommended to integrate the ESG 2015 Part 1 standards and guidelines holistically and directly into the other standards provided in the ESEVT SOP concepts and hands-on templates for writing SERs and evaluation reports. This may render better services to developing and assessing quality and quality assurance policies and practices of higher education institutions.</p> <p>2.5 The panel reiterates the recommendation given under ESG 2.1 above. EAEVE is strongly advised to review its template for experts' reporting, in addition to reviewing its template for drafting the SERs, in order to align the template content to the quality criteria (rubrics) laid out in the SOP chapters, and to do so by integrating ESG 2015 Part 1 (standard 11 of the SOP 2016) holistically into the quality assessment criteria presented in standards 1 – 10 of the SOP 2016 in order to both avoid undue overlap and promulgate better understanding of the quality concepts fostered by ESG 2015 Part 1. While the panel is convinced that having done so will suffice to make sure that all reports explicitly cover all quality parameters in a more holistic and systematic way, the panel advises to check more intensely that this is in fact the case.</p>
<b>ECCE (Europe)</b>	4	3	2	1	<p>Agentura byla hodnocena v roce 2015, jehož výsledkem bylo doporučení stát se „hodnoceným členem“ s plánem částečného hodnocení v průběhu dvou let. Agentura o částečné hodnocení požádala v roce 2017. Výsledek hodnocení v roce 2018 ukázal, že u některých standardů došlo ke zlepšení, v některých případech hodnocení zůstalo stejné nebo horší, u standardu 3.4 byl shledán nesoulad s ESG, k řadě dalších byly významné výhrady a proto nebylo žádosti o prodloužení členství vyhověno. Board ECCE navrhl požádat o statut</p>

				<p>přidruženého člena a požádat o členství v průběhu dvou dalších let.</p> <p><b>NON COMPLIANT</b></p> <p><b>3.4 To engage in structured analysis to describe and analyse the general findings of their quality assurance activities. ECCE should learn from other ENQA full members what kind of different activities could fall under this category and how analysis could be implemented utilising both internal capacities and in cooperation with HEIs and individuals.</b></p>
<b>CAQA (Serbia)</b>	2	5	7	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.2 CAQA should (1) devise, in cooperation with the national authorities, arrangements where its members do not combine the role of a body taking decisions with the role of key external experts, and where they focus on the former role in line with the spirit of the ESG; (2) place a stronger emphasis on quality improvement in its processes; and (3) amend its internal regulations to ensure full clarity and consistency. For a related recommendation about expert involvement, see ESG 2.4.</p> <p>2.3 CAQA should (1) revise its procedures to include a site visit as part of each periodic programme review; and (2) devise a way for HEIs to report on progress in the implementation of its recommendations as part of existing or new arrangements; (3) consider developing guidelines on scoring for academic experts to ensure greater consistency in their approach to assessment. See also the related recommendations about the involvement of CAQA members and experts under ESG 2.2. and 2.4.</p> <p>2.4 CAQA should (1) ensure the involvement of external experts as playing a central role in EQA processes, in line with the ESG; (2) ensure the involvement of students and labour market representatives in all periodic programme accreditation reviews; (3) provide space for students to contribute to its EQA processes beyond a range of aspects considered to be strictly student matters; (4) ensure much wider involvement of international experts, not only in periodic programme accreditation reviews but also in audits; (5) provide regular training, and feedback on reports, to academic experts. See also the related recommendation about CAQA's role in EQA processes under ESG 2.2. and guidelines for experts under ESG 2.3.</p> <p>2.6 CAQA should (1) devise a way for ensuring, even within the current legal constraints, a more substantial contribution from external experts, including academic experts, students and labour market representatives, to its final reports; (2) devise, in collaboration with the Ministry of Education, an arrangement for CAQA to publish its initial accreditation opinions / reports on newly accredited institutions and their programmes; (3) define more clearly the rules for the publication of reports in its internal regulations; and (4) consider providing drafts of its reports to HEIs for a factual accuracy check. See also the related recommendation about involvement of external experts under ESG 2.2.</p> <p>2.7 (1) CAQA should put in place a procedure for HEIs to file a complaint as it is defined under ESG 2.7; and (2) a separate appeals body should be established within CAQA (or within a new quality assurance body to be set up by the newly enacted Law on Higher Education).</p> <p>3.1 CAQA should (1) revise its mission so that it clearly defines the range of its responsibilities, principles underlying its work and the nature of its interaction with stakeholders; (2) put in place mechanisms for</p>

					<p>effective forward planning and reviewing progress towards its objectives; and (3) take action, insofar as it is possible within its remit, to ensure that students and employers have their representatives in CAQA governance.</p> <p>3.6 CAQA should (1) devise an action plan for the development of its internal quality system; and (2) put in place formal mechanisms for gathering external feedback after each accreditation review and audit and internal feedback on a regular basis, and for following up on internal and external feedback collected.</p>
NEAA (Bulgaria)	9	5			
EKKA (Estonia)	12	2			
Rok 2017					
ANECA (Spain)	12	2			
<b>RS HEAA (Republika Srpska)</b>	3	6	3	2	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>3.3 The agency should discuss with the government enhanced arrangements for securing the operational independence of the RS agency and for promoting improved cooperation with the HEA. RS HEAA Steering Board should review the role of the Accreditation Council to clarify its remit and responsibilities.</p> <p>3.5 The Agency should seek assurances from the Ministry about the provision of sufficient resources to fulfil its planned program of accreditation.</p> <p>3.6 In consultation with the Steering Board and the Academic Council, RS HEAA should consider developing a code of conduct or internal quality assurance, that assures integrity of procedures and fosters the continuous improvement of the Agency's activities. It should also address the conduct of accreditation reviews and the protocols of staff engagement with higher education institutions and other stakeholders.</p> <p><b>NON-COMPLIANT</b></p> <p><b>2.7 The agency should develop and publish details about its complaints and appeals process and communicate them to the institutions.</b></p> <p><b>3.4 As part of its strategic planning the agency should consider how it could review the outcomes from its quality assurance activities and make the analysis available to all relevant stakeholders.</b></p>
<b>HEA (Bosnia and Herzegovina)</b>	4	6	4		<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.2 The panel recommends a thorough review of the different documents related to the methodology of external QA in BiH, with special regard to multiplication and overlapping number, content and</p>

				<p>interpretation of criteria; level of generalisation; and sensitivity to substandard operations.</p> <p>2.3 The panel recommends that with the stronger consultative and supporting role of the coordinating staff member the consistency of accreditation procedures be further improved. Although this is not a direct responsibility of HEA, the panel finds it necessary that BiH authorities consider updating the FLHE and corresponding rules to at least give the responsibility to HEA of monitoring the follow-up procedures and reacting if needed with consequences for HEI.</p> <p>2.7 The panel recommends to HEA to consider how it can establish a complaints and an appeals process for the QA procedures that it is responsible for. The appeals and complaints would include more than a possibility to comment a draft external review report and the general possibility for appeals in the administrative court.</p> <p>3.3 The composition of the SB should be more balanced, not have only members coming from HEIs (public universities), and especially them not having any leadership positions at their HEI. The panel suggests that HEA takes over the whole responsibility for creating the national list of experts and then appointing expert committees in the accreditation procedures. The panel recommends the accreditation decisions to be made by the SB of HEA.</p>
NVAO (Netherland)	7	6	1	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.7 The panel is satisfied with the procedures on appeals against decisions, but considers the lack of a solid and formal comprehensive complaint procedure an omission, even if some elements of complaint-handling are there and informal handling of complaints by NVAO normally suffices. NVAO develops a complaint procedure and opens a section 'Complaints and appeals' at its website with appropriate formats for complaints and appeals.</p>
SKVC (Lituania)	9	5		
AQU Catalunya (Spain)	6	8		
FIBAA (Germany)	5	8	1	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.6 The agency should review the process for database entries in such a way that all decisions made in programme and system accreditation procedures, including the publication of the review reports are entered immediately and completely in the database of accredited study programmes.</p>
NAA (Russia)				<p>NAA byla hodnocena v roce 2014 podle ESG 2005 s výsledkem přidělení statutu „člen v procesu hodnocení“. NAA sdělila v roce 2014, že již provedla doporučená opatření ke zlepšení a podstoupila v roce 2017 částečné hodnocení. Board shledal, že aktivity NAA jsou v souladu s ESG 2005 a přiznal agentuře status člena ENQA do roku 2020 (na pět let od původního hodnocení) s tím, že zapracuje ESG 2015 do všech svých procedur.</p>



AQAS (Germany)	8	4	2	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.5 The criteria for international institutional accreditation should be published</p> <p>3.4 AQAS should develop a concept for future thematic analyses and publish a first contribution on their homepage within a short period of time.</p>
ACQUIN (Germany)	5	7	2	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>3.4 ACQUIN's activities regarding qualitative analysis of the results of its own work should be intensified and lead to publication.</p> <p>3.5 ACQUIN should submit a compilation of the amount of work for the activities related to and across procedures in the head office, comprehensively and sustainably adapt the strategic human resources planning to the actual capacities and demonstrate in the medium term that the subsequent filling of positions at the beginning of 2016 makes the human resources sufficient.</p> <p><i><b>Poznámka. Board navrhol změnit původní hodnocení panelu souladu s ESG 3.4 jako partially compliant na non compliant, což znamenalo nepotvrzení žádosti o prodloužení členství v ENQA. Agnetura se proti rozhodnutí odvolala, ACC doporučil vrátit se k původnímu hodnocení panelu a Board to akceptovat. Jedním z důvodů doporučení ACC vrátit se k původnímu doporučení bylo to, že panel má vždy lepší přístup k informacím prostřednictvím rozhovorů v rámci návštěv, což platí rovněž pro přístup k dokumentům.</b></i></p>
ANQA (Armenia)	8	6		
AEQES (Belgium)	13		1	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>3.5 The Panel recommends that the Agency continues its discussions with policy-makers on its financial situation, in order to ensure the continuation of its activities while maintaining the same level of responsibility and quality standards.</p>
IQAA (Kazakhstan)	7	4	3	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.1 in order to make its external quality assurance methodology better fit for purpose, (1) phase out its preliminary review process; and (2) redesign its post-accreditation monitoring process before the second cycle of accreditation reviews, so that it focuses on follow-up on action taken by institutions in response to findings from accreditation reviews (rather than on progress they make towards meeting its accreditation standards, with a view to facilitating reaccreditation); and to balance this, (3) expand its QA capacity building activities for institutions, in particular on IQA, so that they are better prepared to undergo an accreditation review and take primary responsibility for quality and its assurance; - put in place a mechanism for regular review of its methodology, including arrangements for regular collection of feedback on its fitness for purpose from its external stakeholders.</p> <p>2.6 (1) amend its regulations so that they state explicitly that accreditation review reports are published on</p>

				<p>its website regardless of the final outcome of a review; and (2) accordingly, publish all reports and related decisions of the Accreditation Council at least on its main website. IQAA may also consider the value of publishing summaries in English of all accreditation review reports, including those leading to conditional accreditation and nonaccreditation, on its English-language website.</p> <p>3.4 analyse the material available in its accreditation review reports and produce on this basis (a) thematic analysis(es) to support further development of quality assurance in higher education institutions and policy development at national level.</p>
HCERES (France)	7	3	4	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.3 HCERES should encourage institutions to follow-up its panels' recommendations by including options for follow-up of recommendations in evaluation reports. HCERES should consider revising its flexible approach to the selection of standards for self-evaluation to ensure comparability and consistency of its published reports.</p> <p>2.4 To publish on the website the agency's policy and criteria for nomination and appointment of experts. To consider active involvement of international experts in review panels by developing and implementing consistent approach to their selection and recruitment, including for the evaluations abroad. HCERES should involve students and employer representatives in the panels for all types of evaluations and strengthen their role as equal members, and ensuring proper and regular training.</p> <p>2.5 To refine outcomes' criteria for different evaluations, in order to ensure consistency in their application by different panels and institutions.</p> <p>2.7 The panel recommends HCERES to coordinate its complaints procedure with accrediting and contracting ministries, in order to promote coherent approach to complaints and appeals; The panel recommends HCERES to get ready for work its complaints committee as soon as possible in order to be able to take account of the adequacy and effectiveness of its new methodology.</p>
ASHE (Croatia)	7	5	2	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>2.5 The panel recommends ASHE to be more transparent as regards information on the overall policy of the criteria used by the Accreditation Council, as the decision-making body of the Agency, with a view to clarifying in which cases unconditional accreditation or accreditation accompanied by a letter of expectation is to be expected. ASHE is recommended to iterate its endeavours to clarify the interpretation and implementation of the quality criteria, both by means of interpretative documents and through schooling.</p> <p>2.7 The panel recommends in the case of the re-accreditation procedure for Higher Education Institutions and study programmes, to provide a separate and standing Appeal Committee in order to dissociate the decision on the appeal from the Accreditation Council that has made the initial decision which is being appealed against. ASHE may also consider to establish the Appeal Committee as a standing committee, or to consider other modes of precaution to safeguard against any undue influence which may occur when installing it ad hoc in view of the concrete case. Regarding initial accreditation of study programmes and Higher Education Institutions, the panel recommends ASHE to provide an appeal procedure within the</p>

				Agency. In light of the documentary and oral evidence considered by it, the review panel is satisfied that, in the performance of its functions, the Agency for Science and Higher Education, ASHE, is in compliance with the ESG.
FINEEC (Finland)	11	2	1	<p><b>Partially compliant</b></p> <p>3.4 The panel recommends FINEEC to quickly initiate the planned thematic analyses and allocate the necessary resources to this activity so that the development of the audit model for the third round can be based on solid knowledge and reflections on the results and experiences from the second round.</p>