

ENQA TARGETED REVIEW

FLEMISH HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL – QUALITY ASSURANCE (VLUHR QA)

ACHIM HOPBACH, NÚRIA COMET SEÑAL,
PHILIPPE EMLIT, MATEJ DROBNÍČ

26 September 2024

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	5
BACKGROUND OF THE REVIEW AND OUTLINE OF THE REVIEW PROCESS	5
BACKGROUND OF THE REVIEW	5
SCOPE OF THE REVIEW	5
MAIN FINDINGS OF THE 2019 REVIEW	6
REVIEW PROCESS.....	7
CHANGES WITHIN THE AGENCY	9
HIGHER EDUCATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM	9
VLUHR QA'S ORGANISATION/STRUCTURE	9
VLUHR QA'S FUNDING.....	10
VLUHR QA'S FUNCTIONS, ACTIVITIES, PROCEDURES.....	10
FINDINGS: COMPLIANCE OF VLUHR QA WITH THE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (ESG) WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE REVIEW	11
ESG PART 3: QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCIES	11
ESG 3.4 THEMATIC ANALYSIS.....	11
ESG PART 2: EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE	13
ESG 2.1 CONSIDERATION OF INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE.....	13
ENHANCEMENT AREAS	21
ESG STANDARD '2.2 DESIGNING METHODOLOGIES FIT FOR PURPOSE'	21
ESG STANDARD '2.6 REPORT'	24
CONCLUSION	27
SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS	27
OVERVIEW OF JUDGEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	27
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT	27
ANNEXES	28
ANNEX 1: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	28
ANNEX 2: TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE REVIEW	35
ANNEX 3: GLOSSARY	43

ANNEX 4. DOCUMENTS TO SUPPORT THE REVIEW 44
DOCUMENTS PROVIDED BY VLUHR QA..... 44
OTHER SOURCES USED BY THE REVIEW PANEL 44

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This targeted review report analyses the compliance of the Quality Assurance Unit of the Flemish Higher Education Council (Vlaamse Universiteiten en Hogescholen Raad – Kwaliteitszorg), VLUHR QA with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), following the methodology described in the Guidelines for ENQA Targeted Reviews (last revised in October 2022).

VLUHR QA is applying for renewal of membership in the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) as well as for renewal of registration on the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) based on a targeted external review, as it has undergone two successful reviews against the ESG Parts 2 and 3, in 2014 and 2019.

The review was conducted from September 2023 to September 2024, with a site visit conducted between 21 and 22 March 2024 in VLUHR QA's office in Brussels.

VLUHR QA was established in 2013 as a result of an integration process of the quality assurance agencies of the Flemish Interuniversity Council (VLIR) and of the Council of Flemish Universities of Applied Sciences and Arts (VLHORA). It is a small quality assurance agency but nonetheless VLUHR QA contributes to monitoring and improving the quality of education in Flanders. The staff members have extensive experience and expertise in quality assurance, with a special focus on customisation and trust.

After a change of the legal framework in 2015, in which programme reviews systematically gave way to the institutional review in Flanders carried out by the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO), VLUHR QA repositioned itself. Since 2015, VLUHR QA has fulfilled its role as an expert for quality in education and training. Currently, VLUHR QA offers the following external quality assurance activities within the scope of the ESG:

- programme assessment in Flanders and
- evaluation based on the European Approach for quality assurance of joint programmes.

The international focus of the agency is evidenced through its participation in several quality networks and international projects.

According to the Terms of Reference, this targeted review has evaluated to what extent VLUHR QA continues to fulfil the requirements of the ESG. The focus areas are:

- Standards with a partial compliance conclusion in the Register Committee's last renewal decision:
 - ESG 2.1: review whether ESG Part 1 is sufficiently addressed in the main activity of the agency.
 - ESG 3.4: consider whether VLUHR QA published analysis based on the findings of its external quality assurance activities.
- Additionally, the panel considered ESG 2.2 and ESG 2.6 which were the agency's self-selected enhancement areas.

The panel finds VLUHR QA compliant with all addressed ESGs.

Summary of agency's compliance with the ESG (Parts 2 and 3)

ESG	Compliance according to the targeted review ¹	Compliance transferred from the last full review ²
2.1	Compliant	N/A
2.2	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
2.3	Not included in the targeted review	Substantially compliant → Compliant
2.4	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
2.5	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
2.6	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
2.7	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
3.1	Not included in the targeted review	Substantially compliant → Compliant
3.2	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
3.3	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
3.4	Compliant	N/A
3.5	Not included in the targeted review	Substantially compliant → Compliant
3.6	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant
3.7	Not included in the targeted review	Fully compliant → Compliant

¹ Compliance refers to the focus areas that were evaluated in depth and are part of the Terms of Reference, i.e., standards that were only partially compliant with the ESG during the last full review, ESG Part 2 for newly introduced or changed QA activities of the agency, ESG 2.1 for all QA activities and any standard affected by substantive changes since the last full review. If any of the standards of Part 2 of the ESG are covered due to the newly introduced or changed QA activities, a remark "for new or changed QA activities only" is added in brackets to the compliance assessment.

² Compliance refers to the last EQAR Register Committee decision for renewal of inclusion on the Register, or in case when an agency is not renewing its registration in EQAR, compliance refers to the last ENQA Agency Review report and should its judgement differ from that of the panel, the judgement of the ENQA Board, as stipulated in the membership decision letter by the ENQA Board. Compliance refers to the QA activities of the agency that were reviewed during the previous full review.

INTRODUCTION

This report analyses the compliance of Quality Assurance Unit of the Flemish Higher Education Council (Vlaamse Universiteiten en Hogescholenraad – Kwaliteitszorg), VLUHR QA with the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)*. It is based on an external review conducted in September 2023 to September 2024 and should be read together with the external review report of the agency's last full review against the ESG.

BACKGROUND OF THE REVIEW AND OUTLINE OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

BACKGROUND OF THE REVIEW

ENQA's regulations require all member agencies to undergo an external cyclical review, at least once every five years, in order to verify that they act in compliance with the ESG as adopted at the Yerevan ministerial conference of the Bologna Process in 2015.

Registration on EQAR is the official instrument established by the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) for demonstrating an agency's ESG compliance. An external review is a prerequisite for registration.

VLUHR QA has been a member of ENQA and registered on EQAR since 2013. With this review VLUHR QA is applying for renewal of ENQA membership and EQAR registration.

As VLUHR QA has undergone two successful reviews against the ESG Parts 2 and 3, in 2014 and 2019 it is eligible and has opted for a targeted review. The purpose of a targeted review is to ensure the agency's compliance with the ESG by covering standards that were found partially compliant during the agency's last renewal of registration in EQAR and on standards that could have been affected by substantive changes³ during the past five years while at the same time further strengthening the enhancement part of the review.

SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

VLUHR QA is carrying out the following activities within the scope of the ESG:

- Programme assessment in Flanders
- Evaluation based on the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes

The following activities of the applicant are outside the scope of the ESG:

- Support of programmes and institutions
- Accreditation training initiative for laboratory animal science
- Coordinating the discipline specific learning outcomes for bachelors and masters in Flemish higher education
- External evaluation of European projects
- Learning Network of Educational Support staff (LNO)

³ e.g. organisational changes, the launch of new external QA activities.

According to the Terms of Reference (ToR), this targeted review evaluates the extent to which VLUHR QA continues to fulfil the requirements of the ESG. The review covers the following areas:

- A) Standards with a partial compliance conclusion in the Register Committee’s last renewal decision:
 - ESG 2.1: review whether ESG Part I is sufficiently addressed in the main activity of the agency;
 - ESG 3.4: consider whether VLUHR QA published analysis based on the findings of its external quality assurance activities.
- B) Standards 2.1 to 2.7 for the following activities: Not applicable
- C) Standards affected by other types of substantive changes: Not applicable
- D) ESG 2.1 Consideration of internal quality assurance (in all activities);
- E) Selected enhancement area:
 - ESG 2.2 Designing methodologies fit for purpose
 - ESG 2.6 Reporting

The targeted review should also address other matters regarding ESG compliance that come up during the targeted review and that may affect the agency’s compliance with the ESG. In the case of VLUHR QA targeted review, the review panel did not identify any matters regarding ESG compliance that would need to be covered apart from the ones listed above and addressed in the ToR.

MAIN FINDINGS OF THE 2019 REVIEW

According to the decision of the EQAR Register Committee, based on the previous full review conducted in 2019, VLUHR QA was found to be in compliance with all the standards.

Standard	Review panel conclusion	Register Committee conclusion
2.1	Substantial compliance	Partial compliance
2.2	Full compliance	Compliance
2.3	Substantial compliance	Compliance
2.4	Full compliance	Compliance
2.5	Full compliance	Compliance
2.6	Full compliance	Compliance

Standard	Review panel conclusion	Register Committee conclusion
2.7	Full compliance	Compliance
3.1	Substantial compliance	Compliance
3.2	Full compliance	Compliance
3.3	Full compliance	Compliance
3.4	Partial compliance	Partial compliance
3.5	Substantial compliance	Compliance
3.6	Full compliance	Compliance
3.7	(not expected)	Compliance (by virtue of applying)

The panel acknowledges that no other changes occurred within the agency and thus acknowledges the status of the following ESG standards from the last full review for those activities that were addressed in the previous full review:

ESG Part 2: 2. 2, 2.3 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7

ESG Part 3: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7

REVIEW PROCESS

The 2024 external targeted review of VLUHR QA was conducted in line with the process described in the *Guidelines for ENQA Targeted Reviews (last revised in October 2022)*, the EQAR Procedures for Applications, and in accordance with the timeline set out in the Terms of Reference. The panel for the targeted review of VLUHR QA was appointed by ENQA and composed of the following members:

- Achim Hopbach (Chair), quality assurance professional (ENQA nominee), Higher Education Consultant, Austria
- Núria Comet Señal (Secretary), quality assurance professional (ENQA nominee), Responsible for the Internal Quality Assurance System and Project Coordinator, AQU Catalunya, Spain;
- Philippe Emplit (Member), academic (EUA nominee), Full-time tenured professor, Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Belgium
- Matej Drobnič, (Member) (ESU nominee, member of the European Students' Union Quality Assurance Student Experts Pool), PhD Student in Mechanical Engineering, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Alexis Fábregas Almirall (ENQA Project and Reviews Officer) acted as the review coordinator. The panel wishes to extend their thanks to Alexis Fábregas Almirall for his contribution in assuring the smoothness of the visit and the overall quality of the review process.

The ENQA review panel received the self-assessment report (SAR), including some appendices, in December 2023. After a preliminary analysis based on the information provided in the SAR, the panel requested additional information, which was promptly and extensively provided by the agency.

The ENQA review coordinator organised a preparatory online briefing for the panel on 19th February 2024 including input from EQAR regarding the scope of the review. In addition, the review panel held some additional preparatory online meetings in March 2024.

The review panel furthermore held a preparatory online meeting with the agency on 13th March 2024.

Mr. Patrick Van den Bosch from VLUHR QA acted as the agency's contact person to support the organisation of the review. The review panel appreciates his agility in resolving all the questions that appeared during the process.

The panel conducted the site visit from 21 to 22 March 2024 in VLUHR QA's office in Brussels, Belgium.

During the site visit, the review panel met with the agency's management and staff, its decision-making and advisory bodies, as well as the representatives of NVAO, higher education institutions, reviewers, and other stakeholders.

After the site visit, the review panel produced this final report based on the self-assessment report, additional information, the site visit and the panel's findings. As part of the report writing process, the panel provided an opportunity for VLUHR QA to comment on the factual accuracy of the draft report.

The review panel is very grateful to VLUHR QA and its management and staff for the supportive and open attitude throughout the review, which contributed significantly to the work of the panel.

Self-assessment report

As described in the VLUHR QA's self-assessment report (SAR), the process of preparing the SAR began in September 2023, after the Terms of Reference (ToR) were agreed. The final version of the SAR was approved by the VLUHR QA Board on 27 November 2023.

This SAR was a collaborative effort by the VLUHR QA team and the VLUHR QA Board, including the reflections of several stakeholders as members of the Advisory Council, the members of the Appeals Committee, as well as the policy advisors on education and secretaries-general of the Flemish Interuniversity Council (VLIR) and the Flemish Council of Universities of Applied Sciences and Arts (VLHORA).

As it was a targeted review, the SAR has a new structure, including the following chapters:

- History of VLUHR QA and description of the changes since the last full review
- Focus areas:
 - Analysis of ESG 2.1
 - Analysis of ESG 3.4
 - The enhancement standard selected by VLUHR QA: ESG 2.2 and 2.6
- SWOT analysis
- Conclusions
- Annexes: links to all relevant additional documentation and information.

The SAR was concise and focused on the selected ESG that provided the basis for conducting the targeted review.

Site visit

The site visit was spread across two days on 21-22 March 2022 in the VLUHR QA office in Brussels; some interviewees participated using MS Teams, which functioned smoothly.

During the two days, the panel had the opportunity to talk to all but one interviewee as foreseen in the visit schedule.

The panel appreciates the contributions from all members of the VLUHR QA staff, the members of the Board, and the Advisory Council. Their dedication and professionalism were visible throughout the visit.

The panel is also grateful to all the external participants (experts, representatives from higher education institutions and from NVAO, and other external stakeholders) contributing to the review with their input, as this was very important in building an informed and rounded view on the agency's work.

The panel also wants to highlight the development of the two Focus Group sessions, where the active and open participation of all attendees allowed for very useful and productive sessions.

For the detailed schedule of meetings, please see Annex I.

CHANGES WITHIN THE AGENCY

HIGHER EDUCATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

From 2019, the Flemish Quality Assurance Framework changed. The changes for programme assessments are twofold:

- The system with four review standards has been replaced by eight quality features that have been refined based on the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG).
- Evaluation is done holistically through a pass/fail system whereas criteria are not assessed separately.

In 2022, VLUHR QA conducted the last decree-mandated programme reviews of programmes according to the 'old' system at the universities and the universities of applied sciences (and arts). These were reassessments of programmes that scored unsatisfactory on one or more standards of the assessment framework during a previous review. The last of these decree-mandated programme reviews took place for the professional bachelor's programmes in Nursing.

VLUHR QA'S ORGANISATION/STRUCTURE

Changes in VLUHR QA Board:

VLUHR QA is governed by the VLUHR QA Board, which meets four times a year. VLUHR QA is proud of the broad international composition of its Board, yet the board members sensed a need to include board members who have a stronger connection to Flemish Higher Education. The QA Board was therefore expanded from four to five members as of February 2021.

Changes in internal management:

Although the VLUHR QA team used to operate as a self-steering team, the QA Board decided that the VLUHR QA team needed a manager. In January 2022, Patrick Van den Bosch was appointed Head of VLUHR QA.

Changes in Advisory Council:

In the last review, the ENQA peer review recommended to VLUHR QA an even stronger embedding of different stakeholders in its governance structure. VLUHR QA Advisory Council was originally composed of:

- A representative of the Flemish Interuniversity Council (VLIR).
- A representative of the Flemish Universities of Applied Sciences and Arts Council (VLHORA).
- A representative of the Flemish Student Union (VVS).

Therefore, VLUHR QA chose to extensively involve a broader spectrum of stakeholders. Since autumn 2023, the Advisory Council comprises

- A quality assurance representative from the universities
- A quality assurance representative from the universities of applied sciences and arts
- An educational representative from the universities
- An educational representative from the universities of applied sciences and arts
- A representative from the registered institutions
- Two representatives from the Flemish Students Union (VVS)
- A representative from the Flemish Government, Department of Education and Training
- Two representatives from the professional field
- A member of the VLUHR QA Board (chairperson)
- A policy advisor from VLUHR QA

VLUHR QA'S FUNDING

No changes

VLUHR QA'S FUNCTIONS, ACTIVITIES, PROCEDURES

Due to legal changes, currently VLUHR QA focuses on:

- Programme reviews at registered institutions.
- Voluntary programme reviews at universities and universities of applied sciences (and arts).
- Mandatory and voluntary programme reviews according to the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes in Flanders and beyond.

VLUHR QA wanted to make the manuals more user-centred rather than procedure-centred; following this perspective VLUHR QA revised the following manuals. The update of the manuals took place soon after the previous site visit, these changes were already reported to EQAR at the time of the previous renewal of registration in 2020:

- Manual for Programme Review (January 2020).
- Manual for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (January 2020).
- A modified manual was prepared specifically for the assessment of the Bachelor of Nursing programmes.

FINDINGS: COMPLIANCE OF VLUHR QA WITH THE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (ESG) WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

ESG PART 3: QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCIES

ESG 3.4 THEMATIC ANALYSIS

Standard:

Agencies should regularly publish reports that describe and analyse the general findings of their external quality assurance activities.

2019 review recommendation

VLUHR QA should actively engage in discussions with the higher education stakeholders other than higher education institutions to ensure that VLUHR QA has an active role in conducting the upcoming comparative and thematic analyses.

VLUHR QA should identify the areas for thematic analysis that would be of interest for the higher education stakeholders.

VLUHR QA should use the results of the thematic analysis in order to improve the quality assurance processes on institutional and national level.

EQAR- Renewal of Inclusion on the Register (2020)

It should be addressed whether VLUHR QA has sufficient and sustainable resources to implement its activities.

Evidence

During the interviews, the VLUHR QA Board places a high priority on conducting thematic analyses. Despite the limited human and financial resources, the QA Board recognises that conducting thematic analyses could enhance VLUHR QA expertise, visibility, recognition and impact on Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Flanders.

VLUHR QA has identified two categories of analyses, those directly linked to programme assessment reports and those requiring additional information.

In 2020, the QA Board meeting aimed to perform thematic analysis as outlined below:

- In 2021-2022, a thematic analysis on external stakeholder involvement in the internal quality assurance system of Flemish HEIs. This thematic analysis could help to improve the quality assurance processes on institutional level.
- In 2022, a thematic analysis of Bachelor's programmes in Nursing.
- In 2023, a comparative study of evaluations results according to the European Approach. This study was postponed until early 2024, when three programmes would be evaluated through this framework.

The following actions have been put in practice to support thematic analysis in the agency:

- In the current Policy Plan (2023-2027) thematic analysis is integrated into VLUHR QA's daily work. The current Policy Plan (2023-2027) indicates “*VLUHR further consolidates and develops its tasks as an expertise center and has the ambition to grow into a leading player in the field of quality assurance methods and processes. To this end, we focus on knowledge development through the expansion of our network of experts at home and abroad, the implementation of thematic analysis and qualitative research based on findings from our activities*”. The QA board expects that the agency produces one thematic analysis per year.
- From 2023, the Flemish universities and universities of applied sciences and arts pay an annual contribution to cover staff costs for the annual thematic analysis.
- The proposals for thematic analysis are one of the topics in the Advisory Council meetings.

VLUHR QA has produced and published three thematic analysis reports since the last review include:

- 2020 - Document: Programme Review Analysis 2015 - 2020 (English), a short analysis (2 pages) of the scores of all programme assessments, it also contained a brief reflection on why some programmes scored insufficiently on certain standards.
- 2023 - Thematische analyse Verpleegkunde (Dutch), with a short summary in English (Thematic analysis nursing: short summary): following the twelve nursing programme reviews, VLUHR QA conducted a thematic analysis of the review reports involved.
- 2023 - Thematische analyse Opleidingsbeoordelingen (Dutch) / Thematic analysis programme review (English): includes the analysis of the seven assessments done with the current Flemish Framework between May 2021 and May 2023.

In 2024, the agency is going to finish this thematic analysis:

- 2024 – Thematic analysis European Approach (English): following the first three evaluations undertaken by VLUHR QA in the framework of the 'European Approach' area, the results are being analysed. The agency also wants to include the results from other reports published by other agencies and the reflection from an external expert (publication in progress)

In the SAR the agency lists two more publications that don't fall into the category of thematic analysis:

- Article: A First Exploration of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes, (2019). A presentation at the 2019 EQAF conference.
- Article: Codiplômation et assurance qualité dans l'enseignement supérieur en Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles et en Flandre, (2014) Yoneko Nurtantio (AEQES), Cosmina Ghebaour (ARES) & Patrick Van den Bosch (VLUHR QA), Brussels, 2021

VLUHR QA disseminates the results of its thematic analyses through seminars, newsletters, social media and the publication of news items on its website. For example, to strengthen the impact of the thematic analysis on the Bachelor of Nursing, VLUHR QA organised a seminar with representatives of the relevant programmes and panels involved with the programme reviews and the thematic analysis European Approach will be used for information sharing at various European forums on the one hand and with the Flemish HEI offering joint programmes on the other.

Analysis

During the interviews, the panel learned that, due to limited resources, VLUHR QA prioritizes producing thematic analyses that are of interest to higher education stakeholders and ministry representatives; otherwise, it would lack justification. Although the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), only requires thematic analysis from the results of the quality assurance activities, the panel supports VLUHR QA's approach not to limit

thematic analyses to the outcomes of its own reviews but to also produce reports with additional information as source that would be appealing to higher education institutions at both national and international levels. This follows the nowadays broader concept of thematic analysis.

Regarding the number of reports produced, the panel is of the opinion that the number is aligned with the activity of the agency. Nonetheless, the panel wishes to mention that the Programme Review Analysis 2015 – 2020, (2020), provided only very limited information on its 2 pages. Almost all external quality assurance activities undertaken by VLUHR QA have been described and analysed in some thematic analysis.

The resources of the agency are deemed sufficient to meet the expectations of the QA Board and stakeholders with the additional financial support of the Flemish higher education institutions. The estimated workload of one month full-time for one member of the staff producing one thematic analysis per year is considered realistic.

Additionally, the role of the Advisory Council, that includes a huge representation of stakeholders, regarding the selection of topics and needs for the system, allows them to produce thematic analysis reports that will be of interest and useful for them.

During the interviews, all stakeholders expressed their appreciation for the agency's role and expertise highlighting the value and relevance of the thematic analysis reports conducted by VLUHR QA. For instance, the thematic analysis focusing on nursing programme reviews has had a positive impact among higher education representatives involved in these programmes. This report has been a good opportunity to disseminate the knowledge and expertise of the agency. Moreover, the thematic analysis conducted alongside programme reviews in registered institutions has facilitated comparison among these institutions.

In the panel's opinion, the recommendations from the previous review have been taken into account by raising additional income especially for conducting thematic analyses, by using the extended Advisory Council (among others) to include stakeholders in deliberations about future topics for thematic analyses.

Panel commendations - 01

The panel commends the agency for its valued role as a center of expertise, appreciated by stakeholders. Not only are its reports valued, but also the transfer of knowledge regarding quality assurance.

Panel suggestions for further improvement – 01

The panel suggests seeking additional partnerships to develop additional thematic analyses, such as collaboration with student associations to produce reports about the quality of the learning process or the student involvement in quality assurance.

Panel conclusion: compliant

ESG PART 2: EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

ESG 2.1 CONSIDERATION OF INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

Standard:

External quality assurance should address the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance processes described in Part I of the ESG.

2019 review recommendation

For the assessment procedures in Flemish higher education VLUHR QA should make sure that all the elements covered by the ESG Part 1 are analysed in the review reports. This could be done either by further detailisation of the standards or by ensuring guidance to the review panels.

Evidence

Currently, VLUHR QA conducts two types of programme reviews utilizing two distinct frameworks,

- The Flemish framework described in the Manual Programme Review (January 2020);
- The European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes detailed in the Manual for the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (January 2020).

Regarding the Flemish framework

In the latest external review, conducted in 2019, the panel evaluated the “previous” Flemish Framework for Programme reviews. This framework encompassed 4 standards:

- Standard 1 – Targeted outcome level
- Standard 2 – Educational learning environment
- Standard 3 – Outcome level achieved
- Standard 4 – Structure and organisation of internal quality assurance

The recommendations and comments provided by the previous panel and EQAR in 2019 refer to the out-dated framework, which is no longer in use. Consequently, the panel did not evaluate the implementation of these recommendations but checked whether they would be applicable in the current framework.

Since 2019, VLUHR has transitioned to employing the “current” Flemish framework to assessing programmes.

This framework evaluates the quality of a programme through eight quality features (QF) which are stipulated by Flemish decree and form the basis for accreditation by the NVAO:

- QF 1. The programme’s learning outcomes constitute a transparent and programme-specific interpretation of the international requirements regarding level, content, and orientation.
- QF 2. The programme’s curriculum ties in with the most recent developments in the discipline, takes account of the developments in the professional field, and is relevant to society.
- QF 3. The staff allocated to the programme provide the students with optimum opportunities for achieving the learning outcomes.
- QF 4. The programme offers the students adequate and easily accessible services, facilities, and counselling.
- QF 5. The teaching and learning environment encourages the students to play an active role in the learning process and fosters smooth study progress.
- QF 6. The assessment of students reflects the learning process and concretises the intended learning outcomes.
- QF 7. The programme provides comprehensive and readable information on all stages of study.
- QF 8. Information regarding the quality of the programme is publicly accessible.

Also there is an additional point that could be considered as another quality feature (QF9) “In addition, a programme ensures the involvement of internal and external stakeholders on the one hand and external and independent peers and experts on the other hand, in a continuous pursuit of quality development. “

The relation between the ESG part I and the Flemish framework is described here:

ESG 1.1 Policy for quality assurance

HE institutions are legally obliged to ensure the quality assurance of their educational activities. This includes permanent monitoring and the involvement of internal and external stakeholders and external, independent experts in their quality assurance processes.

ESG 1.2 Design and approval of programmes

The QF aligned with this standard are:

- QF 1. The programme's learning outcomes constitute a transparent and programme-specific interpretation of the international requirements regarding level, content, and orientation.
- QF 2. The programme's curriculum ties in with the most recent developments in the discipline, takes account of the developments in the professional field, and is relevant to society.

The HEI should explain the purpose of the programme, the intended learning outcomes and how the programme or institution aims to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

ESG 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

The QF aligned with this standard are:

- QF 3. The staff allocated to the programme provide the students with optimum opportunities for achieving the learning outcomes.
- QF 5. The teaching and learning environment encourages the students to play an active role in the learning process and fosters smooth study progress.
- QF 6. The assessment of students reflects the learning process and concretises the intended learning outcomes.

HEI should explain how teaching and the learning environment allow students to take an active role in the learning process.

ESG 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

The QF aligned with this standard are:

- QF 4. The programme offers the students adequate and easily accessible services, facilities, and counselling.
- QF 7. The programme provides comprehensive and readable information on all stages of study.

Programmes need to have procedures for orientation, guidance, study guidance, admission, progression and certification. The admission process is not a main topic due to the regulations of the admission system in Flanders.

ESG 1.5 Teaching staff

The QF aligned with this standard is:

- QF 3. The staff allocated to the programme provide the students with optimum opportunities for achieving the learning outcomes.

Teachers have to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The programme should show the personnel policy and recruitment, selection, promotion and professionalization of teachers.

ESG 1.6 Learning resources and student support

The QF aligned with this standard is:

- QF 4. The programme offers the students adequate and easily accessible services, facilities, and counselling.

HEIs should have student services, study funding opportunities and student guidance.

ESG 1.7 Information management and ESG 1.8 Public Information

The QF aligned with these standards are:

- QF 7. The programme provides comprehensive and readable information on all stages of study.
- QF 8. Information regarding the quality of the programme is publicly accessible.

Institutions are expected to publish information about the quality of their programmes.

ESG 1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes

The QF aligned with this standard are:

- QF 8. Information regarding the quality of the programme is publicly accessible.

Institutions have to demonstrate this either at regular intervals or continuously. The result of this monitoring is shared with the stakeholders through public information.

ESG 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance

Each programme follows a fixed path to ensure that it undergoes external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis.

This list demonstrates that the following elements of some of the ESG part I are less directly addressed by the QFs: policy for quality assurance (ESG 1.1), approval of programmes (ESG 1.2), student admission (ESG 1.4).

For example, in the Quality Framework (QF), there is no explicit mention that universities must have a public quality policy (ESG 1.1) and that they must have processes for the approval of programmes (ESG 1.2). Regarding ESG 1.4, QF 4 and QF 7 are very focused on providing information to students, but the internal processes of the university to ensure the monitoring of support processes for students at all stages of the lifecycle are not explicitly addressed. To address this shortcoming, VLUHR QA developed the “Guide for drawing up a self-evaluation report” (Guide). In this Guide, VLUHR QA specifies the quality features in four inter-related questions to which HEIs should be able to provide an answer:

- What does the programme intend?
- How does the programme realise its intentions?
- How is the achievement of these intentions demonstrated?
- How is the programme investing in continuous quality enhancement?

Each of these questions is accompanied by a detailed list of the different elements that can be understood related to the question.

The following mapping table was done by the panel:

ESG Part I	Guide for drawing up a self-evaluation report (Flemish Framework). (elements to be included in the SAR by HEI)
<i>1.1 Policy for Quality Assurance</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• the quality assurance policy and the related starting points: the instruments and systems used, highlighting the periodicity and the systematics; and the verifiable targets and how these targets are realised.• the recently implemented actions for improvement, including the allocation of resources, the allocation of responsibilities, planning and follow-up.

ESG Part I	Guide for drawing up a self-evaluation report (Flemish Framework). (elements to be included in the SAR by HEI)
<i>1.2 Design and approval of programmes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the conception of the content and design of the programme, including the involvement of internal and external stakeholders, as well as external and independent peers. • the general structure of the programme, paying attention to its internal coherence (both vertical and horizontal). • the alignment of the content of the programme with the most recent developments in the disciplinary and professional fields.
<i>1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the active role students take during their learning process. • the effectiveness of student counselling and learning path guidance. • the accessibility of student counselling. • the types of assessment used in relation to the intended learning outcomes, the learning process and the learning content (validity) • the methods of quality assurance regarding testing (validity and reliability). • the way in which the types of assessment are communicated (transparency).
<i>1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the admission requirements and the characteristics of the intake • the alignment of the programme with prior education. • the way in which all phases of the learning pathway are communicated to (potential) students in an accessible manner. • the involvement of external parties in assessment, testing and examination
<i>1.5 Teaching staff</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • staff management policy and factors that may hinder the implementation of an effective staff management policy; • the size of the workforce, in relation to student numbers as well as in relation to the programme and the intended learning outcomes; • policy regarding staff professionalisation; • the professional and educational expertise of the staff (taking the various staff categories into account) in relation to the programme and the intended learning outcomes.
<i>1.6 Learning resources and student support</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the physical infrastructure (library, laboratories, study areas, ...) relevant for the programme and the intended learning outcomes. • the accessibility of these facilities. • the effectiveness of student counselling and learning path guidance. • the accessibility of student counselling.
<i>1.7 Information management</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the instruments and systems used, highlighting the periodicity and the systematics. • the verifiable targets and how these targets are realised. • key figures related to intake, progression rate, outflow and drop-out. • measures taken as a response to these key figures.
<i>1.8 Public information</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the way in which information about the quality of the programme is made publicly accessible

ESG Part I	Guide for drawing up a self-evaluation report (Flemish Framework). (elements to be included in the SAR by HEI)
1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the way in which the previous assessment results were followed up.
1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all external programme assessments have been cyclical and accreditation is awarded for a period of 8 years.

During the site visit the panel learned that the internal process of VLUHR QA to draft a report includes a checklist (Conformity Check Report Programme Review Flanders) that VLUHR QA Board completes to assure confidence that for each quality feature the report contains the panel's findings, its considerations, judgements and recommendations.

The panel read several programme review reports and can confirm that all QFs are addressed in the assessment. However, because the agency has opted for reports with a more holistic approach, aimed at programme improvement and focused on the most relevant aspects of the programme, it becomes more difficult to demonstrate the response to all aspects encompassed by the QFs.

To address this difficulty, the agency, through a thematic analysis report (Thematic analysis programme review, 2023), analysed in detail whether the latest reports from 2020 to 2023 address all QFs, if they are treated uniformly across panels and to what extent they are complied with. The analysis shows that all QFs are analysed, but with varying intensity depending on the programme. VLUHR QA considered this variation acceptable.

European Approach

The assessment framework for joint programmes according to the European Approach has been used by VLUHR QA since 2018. VLUHR QA has deliberately opted to implement the European Approach without any additional assessment criteria or policies added to the framework "European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes, October 2014, approved by EHEA ministers in May 2015".

The European Approach has 9 Standards. The mapping, published by EQAR, is the following:

ESG Part I	European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes
1.1 Policy for Quality Assurance	Standard 1. Eligibility Standard 9. Quality Assurance
1.2 Design and approval of programmes	2.1 Level 2.2 Disciplinary field Standard 3. Study Programme 3.1 Curriculum 3.2 Credits. 3.3 Workload
1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment	Standard 5. Learning, Teaching and Assessment 5.1 Learning and teaching 5.2 Assessment of students
1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification	Standard 4. Admission and Recognition 4.1. Admission 4.2. Recognition

ESG Part I	European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes
<i>1.5 Teaching staff</i>	Standard 7. Resources 7.1 Staff 7.2 Facilities
<i>1.6 Learning resources and student support</i>	Standard 6. Student Support Standard 7. Resources 7.1 Staff 7.2 Facilities
<i>1.7 Information management</i>	S1-9 In all the standards
<i>1.8 Public information</i>	Standard 8. Transparency and Documentation [ESG 1.8]
<i>1.9 On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes</i>	S1-9 In all the standards
<i>1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance</i>	S1-9 In all the standards

The panel read the European Approach programme review reports and can confirm that all standards are addressed in the assessment. The reports are structured following the nine standards, so their alignment with the ESG is very high.

During the meeting with experts, it was evident that the training and support to them assures the knowledge of both procedures and the frameworks (Flemish framework and European Approach framework).

Analysis

About the Flemish Framework

The panel learned that the QFs have not been designed by the agency; instead, they are mandated by decree, which must be implemented by the agencies that evaluate programmes in Flanders.

The panel considers the current Framework on the one side more comprehensive and closer to the ESG than the previous one. The mere transition from 4 standards to 8 quality features provides more detail, allowing for a clearer approach to the ESG-part I. However, the QFs do not provide an additional explanatory or guiding information.

Based on the evidence presented, the panel believes that some QFs have a less direct relationship with the ESG. Approval of programmes, the student admission, and the policy for quality assurance are implicitly but not explicitly addressed in the QFs.

This shortcoming has been adequately addressed by the “Guide for drawing up a self-evaluation report” with the aim of assisting or ensuring that higher education institutions (HEI) address all quality features and the ESG. The panel came to the conclusion that also the elements of some of the ESG that are missing in the QFs are included in the Guide.

In the opinion of the panel this Guide for drawing up a self-evaluation report plays an important role to assure full coverage of the ESG and also the panels and other interested parties would benefit from this additional guidance which is why VLUHR QA may consider including the guide in the Manual Programme Review.

About the European Approach Framework

The European Approach standards explicitly refer to the ESG as their basis. The correspondence between the ESG and the EA standards is beyond doubt.

Panel recommendations-01

The panel recommends including the content of the Guide for drawing up a self-evaluation report in the Manual Programme Review.

Panel conclusion: compliant

ENHANCEMENT AREAS

ESG STANDARD '2.2 DESIGNING METHODOLOGIES FIT FOR PURPOSE'

In autumn 2019 VLUHR QA adapted its follow-up procedures. The adaptations were based partly on deliberations in the context of major reforms in the external quality assurance system of Flanders that had taken place since 2015; partly the adaptations followed up on the recommendation by the ENQA panel 2019 regarding ESG 2.3, to “make the follow-up procedure a mandatory element of the review process, while also collaborating with the HEIs and other stakeholders to ensure the procedure provide a clear added value for them.” As a result, VLUHR QA developed and implemented compulsory follow-up activities for both evaluations according to the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes, and for the evaluations in the Flemish system.

According to the Manual Programme Review the follow-up is scheduled three years after the evaluation and includes a preparatory meeting between VLUHR QA and the institution, the nomination of one member of the original panel to conduct the follow-up, a site visit, a report which may include recommendations to be sent to the institution and to the VLUHR QA Board which may ask for further information or make additional comments. Although the policy mentions “developments the programme has gone through since the site visit” as a regular topic for the site visit, VLUHR QA emphasizes that it is generally up to the institution to trigger the discussions through the preparatory or introductory information.

At the time of the site visit VLUHR QA was about to accomplish the first three follow-up procedures. (The small number is to be taken into account when discussing experience made with the follow-up.)

For its 2023 targeted review VLUHR QA decided to choose ESG 2.2 and namely the newly designed follow-up as one of the two Enhancement Areas, to discuss the first three cases with stakeholders and the ENQA panel and to deliberate whether:

- the follow-up contributes to the quality culture of the programme,
- the methodology is fit for purpose, and
- how VLUHR QA can best shape future follow-up procedures.

(SAR, p. 19)

The review panel did a desk-based analysis of the material submitted by the agency and discussed VLUHR QA's approach to follow-up during its preparatory meeting. During the site visit the panel discussed the topic in the various interview sessions of the first day; at the second day the panel discussed the topic during a dedicated focus group session which included members of VLUHR QA's governance and staff and representatives of two institutions that had undergone a follow-up and a representative of an institution that is due for follow-up. The discussion was moderated by the panel and addressed purpose, design, and impact of the follow-up procedure.

Based on the desk-based analysis and the various meetings during the site visit the review panel wants to emphasize certain framework conditions of VLUHR QA to be taken into consideration in the development of future plans:

- VLUHR QA is not the only quality assurance agency that is operating in the Flemish higher education system.
- VLUHR QA's remit goes beyond conducting reviews of programmes and includes the broader role as centre of expertise for questions and services related to quality in higher education. Stakeholders explicitly support the agency's intention to strengthen this role.
- VLUHR QA's conclusions of a programme review may include recommendations, but the agency does not impose conditions on the institutions.

- Institutions are supportive of the follow-up procedure.

The panel offers the opinion that these framework conditions create a leeway to design its follow-up procedures without 'traditional' limitations that are often linked to follow-up procedures of decisions with legal consequences. Furthermore, the review panel wishes to emphasize that there is no blueprint for the design of a follow-up, and that purpose, topics and methodologies can vary, as also ENQA concluded in a recent report about follow-up procedures: "Agencies have different approaches to conducting follow-up as part of their external QA activities depending on the nature of the activity and on the decision (if any) made following the procedure, including whether the decision includes conditions or not." (ENQA Report p. 6) The report presents mainly three types of follow-up activity, namely:

- Follow-up reports in some cases also regular monitoring reports,
- Site visits (sometimes in addition to the follow-up report),
- Seminars, conferences and annual meetings with all evaluated HEIs,

with varying purposes and foci mainly depending on whether or not the agency takes an accreditation decision and/or might give conditions to a formal decision. (ENQA Report pp. 7/8)

Based on the analysis of the material and the discussion during the site visit the panel wants to highlight the following deliberations:

The purpose of the follow-up might be identified more clearly. VLUHR QA's definition of the purpose, "The follow-up contributes to the promotion of the quality culture. It stimulates the reflection of the programme on the findings and recommendations of the panel. The procedure is also aimed at the improvement perspective in which the programme and the panel carry out a co-creative dialogue." (Follow-up Policy, attachment I I to the SAR), is not unusual; it demonstrates a common combination of a widespread narrow understanding of follow-up which refers to activities resulting directly from the findings of the previews review, and of a wider understanding of follow-up that takes (more) into focus current developments and/or future plans that are not necessarily directly linked to the previous review.

The separate discussions with individuals involved in the follow-up and the focus group discussions, both revealed that both purposes co-exist in variations and that there is no consistent weighting of these, neither on the side of the agency nor on the side of the institutions. Most of the deliberations offered can be linked to a backwards perspective and a forward perspective.

- The backwards perspective supports mainly the potential function to evaluate or assess if the institution has implemented the recommendations properly. At least theoretically, such a follow-up might ignore any other relevant developments that have taken place in the meantime.
- The forward perspective supports a stronger developmental approach which might address potential recent or future development as additional or as main focus of the follow-up and might even address the recommendations only if their implementation is still underway.

Although these two perspectives normally coexist, it is advisable to prioritize explicitly which route an agency wants to follow because this would have to trigger the design of the procedure. VLUHR QA gives some hints in this regard. First of all, its perception of being the more summative part of the whole process whereas the follow-up supports the formative aspect, and its perception of being a crucial feature of a continuous engagement of institutions with VLUHR QA.

Furthermore, two features of the current procedure seem to support the forward perspective and a more developmental approach:

Timing: At programme level, many recommendations will most likely be implemented within one or one and a half years. Putting these into focus for a follow-up visit, again 18 months later might be of limited relevance for the institution. If following up on the implementation of recommendations is the primary purpose of the site-visit, an earlier timing might make more sense. Instead, more recent or generally other developments might be of greater interest to discuss. An interesting contribution referred to the next regular review whose preparation is not far away from the follow-up site visit which might be used as a preparation for the next cycle.

Design: It is fair to say that, currently it is mainly the institution that determines the focus of the follow-up by deciding about the content of its preparation for the site-visit. Whether it focuses on recommendations by the panel separately or in a summarizing way and focuses instead on other relevant developments since the review is left with their decision.

The panel suggested taking into consideration one important feedback from institutions that would also apply if the follow-up procedure doesn't change in the future. This is the request for more guidance on how to prepare for the follow-up site visit.

The follow-up would benefit from clarification of the (main) purpose which would help avoid false expectations.

If reconsideration of the purpose would result in changes of the methodology, the panel wishes to suggest including the role of VLUHR QA namely of the project coordinator in this discussion. If the programmes, especially its aims, learning outcomes, structure, teaching staff etc. are in the focus, it is natural that the current division of responsibilities is appropriate: The panel member serves as expert and the project coordinator supports mainly administratively because his or her experience does not cover aspects related to the field. If, however, a broader perspective will be chosen, with topics that might go beyond the individual programme and include developments at regional level or positioning of the programme vis-à-vis developments in the relevant field/comparison to other programmes of the field, etc., the expertise of VLUHR QA and/or the individual project coordinator regarding the entire system will become relevant which would complement its role. Especially the discussion in the focus group pointed at a high interest of institutions to make VLUHR QA's expertise usable in follow-up procedures. The panel appreciates that VLUHR QA draws a clear line between its review activities and its consultancy activities which would also be relevant in follow-up procedures. In any case, an important feedback from institutions was that they wished to have more guidance on how to prepare for the follow-up site visit.

Whatever considerations about the follow-up might result from the review, the panel suggests that VLUHR QA takes into account its strategic aim to strengthen its role in the Flemish higher education system as centre of expertise and provider of services beyond evaluations. It is worth discussing what role follow-ups can play in this strategy and/or how they might be linked to the agency's other activities.

The panel wants to support one suggestion which was unanimously aired by participants of the focus group, namely enlarging the follow-up panel from one member to two members. Without doubt, discussion among peers bears huge potential of broadening perspectives and avoids the risk of dependence on singular interpretations.

ESG STANDARD '2.6 REPORT'

In 2019 VLUHR QA took the opportunity of the revision of the Flemish quality assurance system, reconsidered its policy on reporting and implemented some changes for the programme reviews in Flanders whereas the reporting policy regarding in the European Approach didn't change.

Apart from rather editorial changes in the report template, the new approach took into consideration the more holistic assessment in the reviews by leaving the structure more open instead of orienting it only towards the eight quality features. Implicit requirements for structure and content of the reports can be derived from the template for the Conformity-Check which is conducted by the VLUHR QA Board to assure the quality of the reports by establishing various requirements, among others:

- Structure: Introduction (panel composition, panel's working methods.); main body, annexes (CVs, site visit schedule, consulted documents)
- Comprehensiveness: Each QF must be addressed; each track and location must be addressed.
- Content: For each QF findings, considerations, judgements and recommendations. "The report shows that the programme(s) is/are in accordance with decree requirements and regulations.").

An analysis by VLUHR QA of the reports (Thematic analysis on programme reviews, VLUHR QA, Brussels 2023, p 10) published since the implementation of the new framework reveals a quite substantial diversity regarding structure and content:

- Reports that go through the eight quality features one by one (Innocom, Vesalius College '21, Vesalius College '23)
- Reports that start incrementally from the panel's experiences through the scrutiny of the SAR and the site visit; travelogue (Innocom, Drama)
- Reports based on the panel's oral report at the end of the site visit (Vesalius College '23, VKI)
- Reports structured around recurring, overarching topics raised by the programme and/or the panel (ETF, FPTR)
- Reports based on themes raised by the programme itself (Drama)

This finding was confirmed by the panel through a quick reading of various review reports. In the Thematic Analysis VLUHR QA quotes the aims to build customisation and flexibility into its reports, and to always maintain a balance between enhancement and accountability. The survey revealed a high level of satisfaction with the reports.

For its 2024 targeted review VLUHR QA decided to choose ESG 2.6 as one of the two Enhancement Areas, to discuss "various topics related to our reports, such as structure, target audience, level of detail, the balance between findings and considerations, and the role of the QA Board in approving reports." (SAR, p. 21) The panel was advised that VLUHR QA took the opportunity of the review to discuss the experience of the first couple of reports in a general way without assuming any problematic issue.

The review panel did a desk-based analysis of the material submitted by the agency, notably the thematic analysis, and also analysed some of the review reports and discussed VLUHR QA's new approach to reporting during its preparatory meeting. During the site visit the panel discussed the topic in the various interview sessions of the first day; at the second day the panel discussed the topic during a dedicated focus group session which included members of VLUHR QA's staff representatives from institutions that underwent programme reviews and members of expert panels. The discussion was moderated by the panel and addressed purpose, content, and use of the reports.

The review panel wishes to emphasize that although there is no blueprint for the design of a review report, the principles listed in ESG 2.6 are indispensable and are, to the knowledge of the panel, not disputed:

Standard: Full reports by the experts should be published, clear and accessible to the academic community, external partners and other interested individuals. If the agency takes any formal decision based on the reports, the decision should be published together with the report.

Guidelines: The report by the experts is the basis for the institution's follow-up action of the external evaluation and it provides information to society regarding the activities of an institution. In order for the report to be used as the basis for action to be taken, it needs to be clear and concise in its structure and language and to cover context description (to help locate the higher education institution in its specific context); description of the individual procedure, including experts involved;

- *evidence, analysis and findings;*
- *conclusions;*
- *features of good practice, demonstrated by the institution;*
- *recommendations for follow-up action.*

The preparation of a summary report may be useful. The factual accuracy of a report is improved if the institution is given the opportunity to point out errors of fact before the report is finalised

Based on the analysis of the material and the discussion during the site visit the panel wants to highlight the following deliberations:

The diversity of the reports as far as coverage of the quality features and namely the level of detail and explicitness of assessment regarding the individual quality features are concerned surprises at first sight. Taking into consideration the two main processes VLUHR QA uses to support high quality of the reports namely, the project coordinators drafting the report and the VLUHR QA Board conducting the conformity check one might have expected a higher degree of similarity or even standardization, even more so because the review reports form the basis for accreditation decisions taken by NVAO.

The panel learned during the site visit, that VLUHR QA's new and more holistic approach to making assessments finds an equivalence in the reports by way of building customisation and flexibility into the reports to be able to take into account better the specifics of a given programme and also to mirror the relevance of certain topics in the given review.

On the one hand, the panel would be inclined to support this flexible approach because it might give more support to the institution, by focusing in a user-oriented perspective on the aspects that were the most important during the review. On the other hand, the panel suggests considering this approach carefully because it creates a potential tension with the use of the reports as basis for accreditation decisions which normally calls for a standardized approach.

Such a tension is by no means a specificity of VLUHR QA but is inherent to many review reports. The reason is the well-known dual purpose of external quality assurance. The accountability function, in this case mainly represented by accreditation decision by NVAO requires reports that demonstrate transparently comprehensive assessment against all quality features (just like in the previous practice) and the need to demonstrate the compliance with all the ESG part I; whereas the enhancement

function might give more leeway by focusing on topics where the institution might wish to or might need to introduce changes in the programme.

Both alternatives have advantages and disadvantages of which only few are to be mentioned here:

- If the reports are to be used for thematic analyses or system-wide comparison, a more standardized approach might be beneficial.
- Consistency in decision-making is easier to reach with a standardized approach.
- The individual follow-up might benefit from a more flexible approach because the report might emphasize the most relevant issues.
- A more flexible approach might make it easier to make use of the potential of peer review.

During the site visit the panel was able to confirm that stakeholders namely institutions, VLUHR QA and NVAO weigh the different purposes of the reports differently. Giving good account of the most important topics during the review and especially during the site visit, giving direct recommendation or suggestions for enhancing the quality of the programmes, providing a basis for comparing programmes of various institutions, taking accreditation decisions, are only some, and the list demonstrates the tension named previously.

Especially the focus group discussion revealed that VLUHR QA might reconsider the main purpose of the review reports and how to best support the main purpose and the other purposes. In the SAR VLUHR QA states that it tries to keep a balance between accountability and enhancement. To put it pointedly, this could be seen as a description of the problem rather than the solution without clarifying what the main purpose is. In practical terms this means that structure, content and style should take into account the different readers and their needs. Either VLUHR QA decides who the main reader is and tailors the report to their demand by trying to accommodate other readers' interests as much as possible without compromising. Or VLUHR QA might consider another approach which is not totally new for the agency, namely tailoring the report to the decided main reader and including different summaries dedicated to different readers.

Because of the relevance of the review report for the follow-up process, this question should be discussed in connection with any discussion about future developments regarding the follow-up procedure as mentioned in the previous chapter.

Especially based on the focus group discussion the panel wishes to add one suggestion VLUHR QA might wish to take into account independently from any revision of the purpose.

Whereas stakeholders highlighted as positive features the fact that the reports give accurate account of the discussions during the site visits and the consideration of the panels, it was obvious that VLUHR QA can enhance the quality and especially the usability of the reports by communicating more explicitly the relevance or weighting of recommendations. The longer the list of recommendations is, the more guidance institutions might want to have whether a recommendation addresses a necessary issue to be addressed or whether it refers more to a 'nice to have'.

CONCLUSION

SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS

Panel commendations - 01(ESG 3.4)

The panel commends the agency for its valued role as a center of expertise, appreciated by stakeholders. Not only are its reports valued, but also the transfer of knowledge regarding quality assurance.

OVERVIEW OF JUDGEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Panel recommendations – 01(ESG 2.1)

The panel recommends including the content of the Guide for drawing up a self-evaluation report in the Manual Programme Review.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT

Panel suggestions for further improvement – 01(ESG 3.4)

The panel suggests seeking additional partnerships to develop additional thematic analyses, such as collaboration with student associations to produce reports about the quality of the learning process or the student involvement in quality assurance.

In light of the documentary and oral evidence considered by it, the review panel is satisfied that, in the performance of its functions, VLUHR QA is in compliance with the ESG.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

SESSION NO.	TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	TOPICS
[13-03-2024] - Online meeting with the agency's resource person				
1	120 min	Review panel's kick-off meeting and preparations for site visit	<i>Panel</i>	
2	90 min	An online clarifications meeting with the agency's resource person to clarify the agency's changes since the last full review against the ESG and to understand the background and motive of the agency's choice of the self-selected ESG standard for enhancement (next to the overall HE and QA context of the agency)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of VLUHR QA • Policy Advisor Quality Assurance 	
[20.03.2024]				
3	17.00 -18.30	60 min	Review panel's pre-visit meeting and preparations for day I	
4		As necessary	A pre-visit meeting with the agency's resource person to clarify any remaining questions after the online clarifications meeting	<i>Not necessary</i>

SESSION NO.	TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	TOPICS	
[21.03.2024] – Day I					
		30 min	Review panel's private meeting		
5	09.15- 10.00	45 min	Meeting with VLUHR QA Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of VLUHR QA 	General overview of VLUHR
		15 min	Review panel's private discussion		
6	10.15-11.00	45 min	Meeting with VLUHR QA Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President of the Board, • Board member, • Board member and Chair of the VLUHR QA Advisory Council, 	General overview of VLUHR
		15 min	Review panel's private discussion		
7	11.15-12.00	45 min	Meeting with team of VLUHR QA (staff in charge of external QA activities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Advisor Quality Assurance • Policy Advisor Quality Assurance • Policy Advisor Quality Assurance 	General overview of VLUHR + ESG 2.1 + ESG 3.4
	12-13.00	60 min	Lunch (panel only)		
8	13.00-13.45	45 min	Meeting with the and Advisory Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Department of Educational Development & Quality Assurance, Odisee University College, (educational representative from the universities of applied sciences and arts) • KU Leuven Teaching & Learning Services – T&L Strategy (quality assurance representative from the universities) • Head of Education Office, Institute of Tropical Medicine Antwerp (representative from the registered institutions) 	General overview of VLUHR

SESSION NO.		TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	TOPICS
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • master student clinical psychology, Free University of Brussels (VUB) (representative from the Flemish Students Union) • Coordinator Higher Education Policy unit (representative from the Flemish Government, Department of Education and Training) • Senior Advisor Education, VOKA (representative from the professional field) 	
	13.45-14.00	15 min	Review panel's private discussion		
9	14.00-14.45	45 min	<p>Meeting with heads of some reviewed HEIs/ HEI representatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Including nursing programmes - Including EA programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme Director 'Bachelor of International Affairs', Vesalius College (involved in the programme review in 2023) • Head of Education Office, Institute of Tropical Medicine Antwerp (involved in the programme review in spring 2024) • Policy Advisor Quality Assurance, Ghent University (involved in the SINREM European Approach programme review in 2023) • programme manager 'Bachelor of Nursing', Thomas More Kempen (involved in the programme review of the 'Bachelor of Nursing' in 2022) • Quality Assurance Staff Member, Howest (involved in the programme review of the 'Bachelor of Nursing' in 2022) • Programme Manager 'Bachelor of Nursing', HOGENT (involved in the programme review of the 'Bachelor of Nursing' in 2022) 	ESG.3.4 Thematic analysis
		15 min	Review panel's private discussion		
10	15.00-15.45	45 min- ONLINE	Meeting with representatives from the reviewers' pool, including students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Dr. of New Testament Exegesis and Theology, Theologische Hochschule Ewersbach, panel member 	ESG 2.1

SESSION NO.		TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	TOPICS
				<p>(involved in the programme review at the Evangelische Theologische Faculteit (ETF) in 2023)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior Staff Member international office, Hogent, University of Applied Sciences and Arts (involved in the SINREM European Approach programme review in 2023) • Student panel member (involved in the programme reviews of the 'Bachelor of Nursing' at Odisee and Erasmushogeschool Brussel in 2022) • Programme manager IBS, Institute for Movement Studies, Utrecht University of Applied Sciences, chair and panel member (involved in the programme reviews of the 'Bachelor of Nursing' at Hogeschool PXL, Odisee and Erasmushogeschool Brussel in 2022) • Professor Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Ghent University (involved in the programme reviews of the 'Bachelor of Nursing' at University College Leuven Limburg in 2022) • Educational expert CEGO (involved in the programme review of the 'Bachelor of Nursing' at Arteveldehogeschool in 2022) 	<p>Flemish assessment framework</p> <p>EA Framework</p>
		15 min	Review panel's private discussion		
II	16.00.16.30 ONLINE	30 min	Meeting with NVAO representative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director NVAO Department Flanders 	General overview
	16.30-17.30	60 min	Wrap-up meeting among panel members and preparations for day 2		
			Dinner (panel only)		

SESSION NO.	TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	TOPICS	
[22.03.2024] – Day 2					
		15 min	Review panel's private meeting		
12	09.00-10.00	60 min	<p>Focus group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - programme managers (3 persons) - VLUHR QA (staff in charge of external QA activities (2 persons) - experts (3 persons) 	<p><u>Programme managers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director Academic Administration Office, College of Europe (involved in the programmes' follow-up visit in 2024) • Programme Director of the 'Master in Diplomacy and Global Governance' & 'Master in Global Security and Strategy', Vesalius College (involved in the programmes' follow-up visit in 2024) • Advisor Education & Quality Development, Royal Conservatoire Antwerp (involved in the Drama programme, eligible for follow-up in 2025) <p><u>VLUHR QA:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Advisor Quality Assurance, VLUHR QA (involved in the follow-up at Vesalius College in 2024) • Head of VLUHR QA (involved in the follow-up at von Karman institute and at College of Europe in 2024) <p><u>VLUHR QA Board member</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board Member - Rector at the Jac. P. Thijsse College in Castricum, The Netherlands <p><u>Experts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair Mathematics of Multiscale Modelling and Simulation (3MS) in the Department of Applied Mathematics at the University of Twente, The 	Enhancement ESG: 2.2.- follow-up

SESSION NO.		TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	TOPICS
				<p>Netherlands (involved as expert in the follow-up at von Karman institute in 2024)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professor master Nursing KU Leuven (eligible to be involved as expert in the follow-up of the nursing programmes in 2025) • Director of the Drama Department, RITCS, Brussels (eligible to be involved as expert in the in the follow-up of the drama programmes in 2025) 	
		15 min	Review panel's private discussion		
13	10.15-11.15	60 min	<p>Focus group:</p> <p>-quality assurance officers or programme managers of HEIs (2 persons)</p> <p>- VLUHR QA (who write reports- 2 persons)</p> <p>- experts (2 persons)</p> <p>- VLUHR QA Board member – 1 person</p>	<p><u>Quality assurance officers or programme managers of HEIs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Vice Dean for Education, Evangelische Theologische Faculteit (ETF) (involved in the review of their programmes in 2023) • Programme Director of the 'Master of Enterprise Architecture', INNOCOM (involved in the programme's review in 2022) <p><u>VLUHR QA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Advisor Quality Assurance, VLUHR QA (involved in the programme reviews at Vesalius College in 2021 and 2023) • Policy Advisor Quality Assurance, VLUHR QA (involved in the programme reviews at INNOCOM in 2022, ETF and FPTR in 2023) <p><u>VLUHR QA Board member</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vice-President VLUHR QA Board - Former Pedagogical Counsellor for the Federation of Catholic Higher Education Bruxelles, Belgium <p><u>Experts</u></p>	Enhancement ESG: 2.6.- Reporting

SESSION NO.		TIMING	TOPIC	PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW	TOPICS
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair Mathematics of Multiscale Modelling and Simulation (3MS) in the Department of Applied Mathematics at the University of Twente, The Netherlands (involved as expert in the programme review at von Karman institute in 2021) 	
		15 min	Review panel's private discussion		
14	11.45-12.15	30 min	A session to further investigate additional topics that may arise during the site visit regarding agency's compliance with the ESG or to clarify any pending issues(as necessary)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Head of VLUHR QA 	
	12.15-13.15	60 min	Lunch (panel only)		
	13.15-14.45	90 min	Review panel's private discussion		
		15 min	Break		
15	15.00-15.30	30 min	Final de-briefing meeting with staff and Board members of the agency to inform about preliminary findings		

ANNEX 2: TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE REVIEW

Targeted review of Flemish Higher Education Council - Quality Assurance (VLUHR QA) against the ESG

Annex I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

The present Terms of Reference were agreed between VLUHR QA (applicant), ENQA (coordinator) and EQAR.

September 2023

1. Background

Flemish Higher Education Council - Quality Assurance-VLUHR QA has been registered on the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) since 07/05/2013 and is applying for renewal of EQAR registration based on a targeted external review against *the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)* coordinated by The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA).

Flemish Higher Education Council - Quality Assurance-VLUHR QA has been a member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) since 2013 and is applying for renewal of ENQA membership.

VLUHR QA is carrying out the following activities within the scope of the ESG:

- *Programme assessment in Flanders*
- *European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes*

All these activities will be included on the agency's profile on the EQAR website and linked to DEQAR database. NB: The agency may not upload reports from other activities to DEQAR.

The following activities of the applicant are outside the scope of the ESG:

- *Support of programmes and institutions*
- *Accreditation training initiative laboratory animal science*
- *Coordinating the discipline specific learning outcomes for bachelors and masters in Flemish higher education*
- *External evaluator of European projects*
- *Learning Network of Educational Support staff (LNO)*

While these activities are not relevant to the application for renewal on EQAR, it is VLUHR QA's choice – in agreement with the review coordinator – whether those activities should be commented upon by the review panel.

2. Purpose and scope of the targeted review

This review will evaluate the extent to which VLUHR QA continues to fulfil the requirements of the ESG. The targeted review aims to place more focus on those parts that require attention and provide sufficient information to support VLUHR QA's application to EQAR.

The review will be further used as part of the agency's renewal of membership in ENQA.

2.1 Focus areas

- A) Standards with a partial compliance conclusion in the Register Committee's last renewal decision:
- ESG 2.1: review whether ESG Part 1 is sufficiently addressed in the main activity of the agency;
 - ESG 3.4: consider whether VLUHR QA published analysis based on the findings of its external quality assurance activities.
- B) Standards 2.1 to 2.7 for the following activities:
- Not applicable
- C) Standards affected by other types of substantive changes:
- Not applicable
- D) ESG 2.1 Consideration of internal quality assurance **(in all activities)**;
- E) Selected enhancement area:
- ESG 2.2 Designing methodologies fit for purpose
 - ESG 2.6 Reporting
- F) Other matters regarding ESG compliance that come up during the targeted review and that may affect the agency's compliance with the ESG (if any).

These issues should be investigated by the review panel as far as possible, providing an analysis and conclusion on the ESG standard(s) concerned.

3. The review process

The review will be conducted in line with the requirements of *the EQAR Procedures for Applications* and *the Policy on Targeted Reviews*, and following the methodology described in the *Guidelines for ENQA Targeted Reviews*.

The evaluation procedure consists of the following steps:

- Agreement on the Terms of Reference between EQAR, VLUHR QA and The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA);
- Nomination and appointment of the review panel by The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA);
- Self-assessment by VLUHR QA including the preparation and publication of a self-assessment report;
- A site visit by the review panel to VLUHR QA;
- Preparation and completion of the final review report by the review panel;
- Scrutiny of the final review report by ENQA's Agency Review Committee;
- Analysis of the final review report and decision-making by the EQAR Register Committee;
- Decision on ENQA membership by the ENQA Board;
- Attendance to the online follow-up seminar.

3.1 Independence of the review coordinator

The coordinator has not provided remunerated (e.g. consultancy) or unremunerated services to VLUHR QA during the past 5 years, and conversely VLUHR QA has not provided any remunerated or unremunerated services to the coordinator.

3.2 Nomination and appointment of the review team members

The review panel consists of four members including an academic employed by a higher education institution, a student member and one other expert. At least two members are from another country.

At least one panel member should be a quality assurance professional that is currently employed by a QA agency and has been engaged in quality assurance within the past five years. When requested by the agency under review or when considered particularly pertinent, other stakeholders (for example, a representative of the labour market) may be included. In this case, an additional fee is charged to cover the reviewer's fee and travel expenses.

One of the members serves as the chair of the review panel, and one as the review secretary. At least one of the reviewers is an ENQA nominee (most often the QA professional[s]). At least one of the reviewers is appointed from the nominees of either the European University Association (EUA) or the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE), and the student member is always selected from among the ESU-nominated reviewers. If requested, the labour market representative may come from the Business Europe nominees or from ENQA. At least two panel members come from outside the national system of the agency under review (if relevant).

The panel will be supported by the ENQA Review Coordinator (an ENQA staff member) who will monitor the integrity of the process and ensure that ENQA's requirements are met throughout the process. The Review Coordinator will not be the secretary of the review and will not participate in the discussions during the site visit interviews.

ENQA will provide the agency with the proposed panel composition and the curricula vitarum of the panel members to establish that there are no known conflicts of interest. The reviewers will have to agree to a non-conflict of interest statement that is incorporated in their contract for the review of this agency.

Once appointed, the coordinator will inform EQAR about the appointed panel members.

3.3 Self-assessment by VLUHR QA, including the preparation of a self-assessment report

VLUHR QA is responsible for the execution and organisation of its own self-assessment process and shall take into account the following guidance:

- Self-assessment includes all relevant internal and external stakeholders;

The self-assessment report is expected to contain:

- a description of the self-assessment process and the production of the SAR;
- a description of changes occurred within the agency since the last full review, including any eventual changes in the higher education system and quality assurance system in which the agency predominantly operates, the agency's structure, funding, its list of external quality assurance activities within the scope of the ESG, as well as the changes in the agency's quality assurance activities abroad (where relevant);
- a section that addresses the focus areas of the review, including standards that were considered to be partially compliant with the ESG in the last full review as well as ESG 2.1 and one self-selected ESG standard for enhancement (see **2.1 Focus areas**);
- a SWOT analysis of the agency as a whole;
- for each of the individual standards enlisted above (see section 2) a consideration of how the agency has addressed the recommendations as noted in the previous EQAR Register Committee decision of inclusion/renewal (if applicable).

The report is well-structured, concise and comprehensively prepared. It clearly demonstrates the extent to which VLUHR QA fulfils its tasks of external quality assurance and continues to meet the ESG and thus the requirements for EQAR registration.

The self-assessment report is submitted to the review coordinator, which has two weeks to carry out a screening. The purpose of a screening is to ensure that the self-assessment report is satisfactory for the consideration of the panel. The coordinator will not judge the content of information itself but rather whether or not the necessary information, as outlined in the *Guidelines for ENQA Targeted Reviews*, is present. If the self-assessment report does not contain the necessary information and fails to respect the requested form and content, the ENQA Secretariat reserves the right to ask for a revised version within two weeks.

The final version of the agency's self-assessment report is then submitted to the review panel a minimum of eight weeks prior to the site visit. The agency publishes the completed SAR on its website and sends the link to ENQA. ENQA will publish this link on its website as well.

3.4 A site visit by the review panel

The review panel will draft a proposal of the site visit schedule considering the aspects included under the focus area (as defined under point 2.1 of the Terms of Reference).

The schedule will include an indicative timetable of the meetings and other exercises to be undertaken by the review panel during the site visit. The approved schedule shall be given to VLUHR QA at least one month before the site visit, in order to properly organise the requested interviews.

The site visit should enable the review panel to explore how the agency has addressed the standards where it has been found to be partially compliant (if the case), aspects of substantive change, consideration of internal quality assurance (ESG 2.1) and the self-selected ESG standard(s) for enhancement. The panel will include extra time during the site-visit to address any other arising issues (if the case) that might have an impact on the agency's compliance with the ESG.

The site visit will close with a final de-briefing meeting outlining the panel's overall impressions but not its judgement on the ESG compliance of the agency.

Prior to the physical site visit, the panel attends a joint briefing call between the panel, ENQA and EQAR to clarify the review expectations and address any possible arising matters.

In advance of the site visit (at least two weeks before the site visit), the panel will organise an obligatory online meeting with the agency. This meeting is held to ensure that the panel reaches a sufficient understanding of:

- The specific national/legal context in which the agency operates;
- The specific quality assurance system to which the agency belongs;
- The key characteristics of the agency's external QA activities.

3.5 Preparation and completion of the final review report

The review report will be drafted in consultation with all review panel members and correspond to the purpose and scope of the review as defined under articles 2 and 2.1. In particular, it will provide a clear rationale for its findings concerning each ESG. When preparing the report, the review panel should bear in mind the *EQAR Policy on the Use and Interpretation of the ESG* to ensure that the report will contain sufficient information for the Register Committee for application to EQAR⁴.

The external report will present the facts and analysis reflecting the reality at the time of review. This will form the main basis for the Register Committee's decision making.

A draft will first be submitted to the ENQA Review Coordinator who will check the report for consistency, clarity, and language. After panel has considered coordinator's feedback, the report will go to the agency for comment on factual accuracy. If VLUHR QA chooses to provide a position statement in reference to the draft report, it will be submitted to the chair of the review panel within two weeks after the receipt of the draft report.

Thereafter, the review panel will take into account the statement by VLUHR QA and submit the document for scrutiny to ENQA's Agency Review Committee and then to EQAR along with the remaining application documents (self-evaluation report, Declaration of Honour, statement to review report-if applicable). The report is to be finalised normally within 2-4 months of the site visit and will normally not exceed 30 pages in length. All panel members will sign off on the final version of the external review report. The coordinator will provide to VLUHR QA the [Declaration of Honour](#) together with the final report.

4. Publication and use of the report

VLUHR QA will receive the expert panel's report and publish it on its website once the ENQA Agency Review Committee has validated the report. Prior to the final validation of the report, the ENQA Agency Review Committee may request additional (documentary) evidence or clarification from the review panel, review coordinator or the agency if needed. The review report will be published on ENQA website regardless of the review outcome. The report will also be published on the EQAR website together with the decision on registration, regardless of the outcome.

ENQA will retain ownership of the report. The intellectual property of all works created by the review panel in connection with the review contract, including specifically any written reports, will be vested in ENQA. In the case of an unsuccessful application to EQAR, the report may also be used by the ENQA Board to reach a conclusion on whether the agency can be admitted/reconfirmed as a member of ENQA.

⁴ See here: <https://www.eqar.eu/assets/uploads/2018/04/UseAndInterpretationOfTheESGv2.0-2015.pdf>

5. Decision-making on EQAR registration and ENQA membership

The agency will submit the review report via email to EQAR before expiry of the agency's registration on EQAR. The agency will also include its self-assessment report (in a PDF format), the Declaration of Honour and any other relevant documents to the application to EQAR (i.e. annexes, statement to the review report).

EQAR is expected to consider the review report and the agency's application at its Register Committee meeting in (Autumn 2024). The Register Committee's final judgement on the agency's compliance with the ESG as a whole can either be substantially compliant (approval of the application) or not substantially compliant (rejection of the application). In case of a positive decision (substantially compliant with the ESG), the registration is renewed for a further five years (from the date of the review report).

The decision on ENQA membership by the ENQA Board will take place after EQAR Register Committee decision.

To apply for ENQA membership, the agency is requested to provide a letter addressed to the ENQA Board outlining its motivation for applying for membership and the ways in which the agency expects to contribute to the work and objectives of ENQA during its membership. This letter will be considered by the Board together with the confirmation of EQAR listing when deciding on the agency's membership. Should the agency not be granted the registration in EQAR or the registration is not renewed, the decision on ENQA membership will be taken based on the final review report, the application letter, and the statement from the Agency Review Committee. The decision on membership will be published on ENQA's website.

6. Indicative schedule of the review

Agreement on Terms of Reference	September 2023
Appointment of review panel members	November 2023
Self-assessment report (SAR) completed by VLUHR QA	1 December 2023
Screening of SAR by ENQA Review Coordinator	December 2023
Preparation of site visit schedule and indicative timetable	January 2024
Briefing of review panel members	February 2024
Review panel site visit	March 2024
Submission of the draft review report to ENQA Review Coordinator	April 2024
Factual check of the review report by the VLUHR QA	May 2024
Statement of VLUHR QA to review panel (if applicable)	May 2024

Submission of review report to ENQA	June 2024
Validation of the review report by the Agency Review Committee	September 2024
EQAR Register Committee meeting and decision on the application by VLUHR QA	Autumn 2024
Decision on ENQA membership by the ENQA Board	Winter 2025

ANNEX 3: GLOSSARY

EA	European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
ENQA	European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
EQAF	European Quality Assurance Forum
EQAR	European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education
ESG	Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, 2015
HE	higher education
HEI	higher education institution
NVAO	Accreditation Organisation for the Netherlands and Flanders
QA	quality assurance
QF	quality feature
SAR	self-assessment report
SWOT	trengths-weaknesses-opportunities-threats
VLHORA	Council of Flemish Universities of Applied Sciences and Arts
VLIR	Flemish Interuniversity Council
VLUHR QA	Flemish Council for Higher Education - Quality Assurance
VVS	Flemish Students Union

ANNEX 4. DOCUMENTS TO SUPPORT THE REVIEW

DOCUMENTS PROVIDED BY VLUHR QA

Annexes to the SAR:

1. Manual Programme Review
2. Manual European Approach
3. Policy plan (Dutch)
4. Overview panel members per country
5. International activities since 2019
6. Guide for drawing up a SER
7. Assessment form panel member
8. Assessment form panel member (EA)
9. Survey institutions 2023 (Dutch)
10. Survey panels members (Dutch)
11. Follow-up procedure
12. Conformity check reports
13. Programme reviews in Flanders

Additional information requested:

- Extract on thematic analysis from the Advisory Council's minutes
- Survey on the follow-up procedure
- Potential thematic analysis topics
- Follow-up reports (confidential draft)

OTHER SOURCES USED BY THE REVIEW PANEL

<https://www.qualityassurance.vluhr.be/>

ENQA TARGETED REVIEW 2024

THIS REPORT presents findings of the ENQA Targeted Review of the Flemish Higher Education Council – Quality Assurance (VLUHR QA), undertaken in 2024.