



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



# Implementation of Education Quality Assurance System via Cooperation of University - Business-Government in HEIs (EDUQAS)

# TRAJECTOIRES

**Analysis of thirteen evaluations against the benchmarks  
and guidelines for quality assurance in the European  
Higher Education Area (ESG), Part 1**

January 2019



# The Project TRAJECTOIRES

It takes a cross-cutting look at the results of a large number of curriculum evaluations (thirteen evaluations) :

Civil Engineering and  
Bioengineering,  
History and Art History,  
Languages and Letters,  
Economic and Management  
Sciences,  
Dietetics,  
Occupational Therapy,  
Plastic, Visual and Space Arts,  
Graphic Techniques,  
Construction,  
Primary Teacher,  
Applied Arts and Textiles,  
Transport Management and  
Business Logistics,  
Public Relations.

29 bachelor's degrees  
43 different masters degrees  
10 fields of study  
39,746 students

170 external experts  
4 forms of higher education in  
FWB  
between 2012 and 2014.



# METHODOLOGICAL REMARKS

- ▶ The methodology consisted in identifying the main findings of the thirteen cross-sectional analyses and comparing them with the ten references in the first part of the ESG.
- ▶ ESGs are intrinsically very generic because their ambition is to have a high applicability through the various higher education systems in Europe (public, private or mixed)
- ▶ And so this work describes a set of good practices implemented by higher education institutions

# ESG 1.1



# ESG 1.1 Policy for QA

Institutions should have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.

- ▶ ESG 1.1 emphasizes the need for a strategic approach to quality assurance. Strategy is about the long-term direction or trajectory of an organization. In this way, institutions are encouraged to integrate their quality assurance policy into their development and make it public. The definition and implementation of this policy requires the involvement of all stakeholders.



# ESG 1.1 Policy for QA

In FWB, This first reference is already well established **since the legal framework of the French Community of Belgium imposes it:**

Educational institutions are required to monitor and manage quality for all missions they carry out (article 9 of the decree of 31 March 2004). In the Decree of 7 November 2013, the Government of the Community goes even further by obliging the institutions to implement effective internal self-evaluation and its monitoring for all its activities: *institutions are required to monitor and the quality management of all their activities and to take all measures for effective internal self-evaluation and monitoring.*

In its first criteria, the **AEQES referential** questions institutions about the existence and the effectiveness of a policy and associated procedures for the management of the quality.



# What have been noted by the expert committees

- ▶ The experts insist on the fact that quality must not be the concern of a single person, but must involve all the teams, both pedagogical, administrative and technical, **and the management**.
- ▶ The experts identified certain types of organizations.
  - the responsibility has been entrusted to a person (quite often it is a vice-president/rector) who operates in close contact with the rector and, possibly, the Chairman of the Board of Directors
  - a matrix model where quality criteria are used to in a transversal way, piloted at various levels of the organizational chart of the the establishment.
  - creating a department dedicated to quality support.
- ▶ No one in any form of education can deny today **that external evaluations conducted within institutions encourage them to question appropriate quality assurance structures and approaches**. Establishments are often on the move, expressing their interest in a quality approach and continuous improvement.



# ESG 1.1 points of focus

Meeting ESG 1.1 requires not only an awareness of the authorities of the institutions, but also the **mobilization and concentration of resources**, which are currently insufficient. It is desirable that the human resources already dedicated to quality be maintained and, if possible, strengthened. In the opinion of the expert committees, the teams that have worked on the various external evaluations should be sustained.

- ▶ the quality assurance policy is rarely made public, is still poorly structured and is not an integral part of the strategic management of the establishments - if they have developed one. >>>> Even if the legal framework does exist
- ▶ the AEQES evaluations have stimulated the beginning of the formalization of quality approaches within the entities and an awareness of their necessity to lead to the improvement of practices.
- ▶ While most central level institutions have now adopted and put in place quality management systems to support their management and development, which was observed in almost all the institutions visited, the reality of this institutional evolution was much less noticeable at the level of the faculties or departments and the programmes evaluated



- ▶ As a strength, the experts noted, in a large number of places, a participatory approach and internal stakeholder engagement.
- ▶ If, from a programmatic point of view, it has so far been teachers and students who have been the main actors involved, from an institutional evaluation point of view, academic authorities should now work to ensure that quality approaches in development are linked to the management of higher education and the strategic governance of institutions.



# ESG 1.1 good practices

- ▶ Development of a quality charter and a strategic note on teaching, research, international relations, services to society, organisation and governance. It includes management indicators, and is broken down into institutional and operational objectives
- ▶ Use of the CAF software [Framework for the self-assessment of public functions] as a reference for quality procedures or ISO certification procedures
- ▶ Several institutions organized plenary meetings to explain the challenges of the quality approach, review the progress of the report and involve all members of the community in a workshop to discuss one or other more specific theme
- ▶ Establishment of a structure that organizes internal quality evaluations



# ESG 1.1 How does AEQES ask Uni about it

Criterion 1: The institution/entity has formulated, implemented and maintains a policy to support the quality of its curricula

This criterion aims to analyse the existence and effectiveness of a policy and associated procedures for quality management. These should include an active role for students and other stakeholders.

- ▶ Dimension 1.1: Institutional governance policy

*The institution has defined and implements a governance policy in line with its missions and values.*

*In this context, it develops and implements an organisation and procedures to ensure effective governance. Governance facilitates the articulation of quality management between the institutional and programme levels; it contributes to the quality of the programme evaluated*



- ▶ What are the educational objectives (+ research and community services) and values of the institution/entity?
- ▶ How are these objectives and values articulated with each other? What are the priority objectives?
- ▶ How does the institution's governance affect the organization and management of study programs?
- ▶ What external partnerships does the institution/entity rely on to achieve its objectives?
- ▶ What are the roles and functioning of the consultation and decision-making bodies?
- ▶ What is the role of students in the governance of the institution/entity?
- ▶ To what extent and in what way do modes of governance contribute to the quality of the programme?
- ▶ To what extent has the institution articulated its objectives and values in a strategic plan?
- ▶ What improvements could be made to governance arrangements?



Criterion 1: The institution/entity has formulated, implemented and maintains a policy to support the quality of its curricula

- ▶ Dimension 1.2: Quality management at the institutional, entity and programme levels

*The institution/entity develops and implements a policy and associated procedures for quality management at the institutional, entity and programme levels. These provide for an active role for students and other stakeholders. Thus, the institution explicitly commits itself to the establishment of a culture that recognizes the importance of quality and its management through appropriate processes.*



- ▶ How does the institution define the notion of quality in its programs of study?
- ▶ What is the role of management and other bodies in terms of quality?
- ▶ Who are the stakeholders and how are they involved in this policy?
- ▶ What is the contribution of students to the quality assurance process? How does the institution ensure participatory student feedback and systematic follow-up?
- ▶ What are the institution's quality management policies? How are they organized in practice and how are they implemented?
- ▶ How are these policies communicated to stakeholders?
- ▶ How are quality management systems articulated with each other?
- ▶ Which central services are involved in the programme management process and its quality?
- ▶ How do they intervene or are they solicited?
- ▶ How to ensure the efficiency of key administrative processes and tasks (premises, secretariat, enrolment in teaching units and exams, schedules, etc.)?
- ▶ If so, to what extent does the institution take into account other internal evaluations and external?
- ▶ How is the sustainability of quality management ensured?
- ▶ How is it ensured that policies and measures are known to stakeholders?



- ▶ What is the entity's quality management policy?
- ▶ How does the internal program quality management process work? What are the most important
- ▶ bodies/bodies involved and what are their respective responsibilities and powers?
- ▶ What are the objectives of the internal quality management process of the programme? Are there any priority objectives? Which ones and for what reasons?
- ▶ How are the results of the internal quality management process disseminated?
- ▶ How is monitoring carried out and by whom?
  
- ▶ How do the processes put in place make it possible to achieve the formulated quality objectives?
- ▶ If identified, do the indicators allow the quality evolution to be monitored?
  
- ▶ What should be improved in terms of the entity's management of the quality of the program? If identified, do the indicators allow the quality evolution to be monitored?

## ESG 1.2



## ESG 1.2 design and approval of programmes

Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.

- ▶ The reference in ESG 1.2 includes in particular a reference to the qualifications framework and learning outcomes. In this way, it combines the tools of the Bologna reform with quality assurance, quality of learning and quality of pedagogical and evaluation approaches.
  - But the approval of a new programme is conditioned in FWB by an “habilitation” mechanism at government level and is separate from the external quality management system. In addition, the creation of a new programme is subject to regulation of the supply of training in all forms of higher education in FWB : like ex-ante accreditation
  - Consequently, the experts act at the time of an evaluation which, with regard to the Deming loop, is in the check stage



# What have been noted by the expert committees

- ▶ The concept of a qualifications framework (CFC) leads to the right approach to learning outcomes. Long before the LO approach was made mandatory, a series of initiatives had been taken at different levels.
- ▶ In the new AEQES framework, the program and learning outcomes approach is the cornerstone of program quality assessment.
- ▶ It is essential that a learning outcomes approach is based on in-depth team reflection on the competencies concerned, how best to acquire them and how to evaluate them. Coordination between teachers, the creation of learning situations and assessments common to several learning activities are being developed,



# ESG 1.2 points of focus

Strengthen stakeholder involvement, external expertise and benchmark

- ▶ Consultation with employers and professional associations when creating a new programme is currently not systematic but seems essential for a variety of reasons, including the employability of future graduates
- ▶ The construction and revision of a skills framework should include, among other things, the involvement of stakeholders, including employers, and provide serious documentation for the analysis of socio-economic needs. The FWB should also set up a system to monitor developments in higher education and the needs and expectations of society.
- ▶ The presence of teachers with professional experience and professionals with lecturing responsibilities, the support of students by professionals in professional practice modules, the consultation of internship supervisors and the monitoring of final year work in line with professional realities can testify to a real professional rooting in many programs



# ESG 1.2 points of focus

- ▶ At Uni level, this reference requires an integrated approach in order to link external tools (qualifications frameworks, quality assurance) with school management (school-specific quality system and stakeholder involvement) and specific pedagogical approaches (skills and learning outcomes approach, active pedagogies, integrated assessments, etc).



## ESG 1.2 good practices

- ▶ Construction of a table showing how each course in the programme contributes to the overall objectives of the training. This grid is a valuable tool for managing the program.



# ESG 1.2 How does AEQES ask Uni about it

Criterion 1: The institution/entity has formulated, implemented and maintains a policy to support the quality of its curricula

- ▶ dimension 1.3: Development, management and periodic review of the programme

*The institution/entity develops and implements procedures and mechanisms for developing, managing and revising its programme. These procedures and mechanisms are effective, participatory and contribute to developing the quality of the programme. The monitoring shall take into account the results of all evaluations of the quality of the programme.*



- ▶ Which bodies/bodies, persons involved and what are their responsibilities and respective powers?
- ▶ What are the factors and actors that can motivate/initiate an opening or review of the program?
- ▶ Has the program undergone any significant revisions since its implementation?
- ▶ What information/data is used in the internal quality management process?
- ▶ How are they collected? How are they analysed and how are follow-up decisions made? How do they intervene in the management of the program?
- ▶ How is the participatory dimension of the process ensured?
- ▶ How is the institution/entity involved in the work of the development bodies? the management and revision of the program?



- ▶ In the various forms of higher education where central bodies and agencies establish different requirements such as minimum contents, pedagogical files, educational files, etc. skills repositories\* etc., what use does the institution/entity make of its margin of autonomy?
- ▶ How does the institution/entity report its findings and expectations for the development, implementation and monitoring of the management and program revision to the authorities on which he/she depends?
- ▶ How does the school deal with the pedagogical freedom it has?
- ▶ What are the main problems encountered in the processes of developing, piloting and revising the programme? What remedies are being considered / have been implemented? Is the response capacity of the institution/entity/body/body adequate?



## ESG 1.2 How does AEQES ask Uni about it

- ▶ Dimension 2.1: Assessment of program relevance

*The institution/entity shall develop and implement procedures and mechanisms to ensure that the program is in compliance with legal provisions and takes into account the needs and expectations of the stakeholders. Thus, the programme is regularly updated (**professional practices, research results, articulation with research, articulation with professional circles, scientific and technical knowledge, etc.**) and promotes the socio-professional integration of graduates and/or their integration into a flexible training programme*



- ▶ Who, according to the institution/entity, are the **stakeholders** in the program?
- ▶ Among these, which have intervened and/or are intervening in the process of design/implementation/revision/revision/opening of the programme and how did they come about?
- ▶ How are elders and the world of work involved?
- ▶ How were the needs / expectations of the different stakeholders collected?
- ▶ How were their needs/expectations taken into account (or not)?
- ▶ How were their opinions on the program collected?
- ▶ How were their opinions taken into account (or not)?
- ▶ How are the specificities of audiences taken into account? Changes in needs/expectations?
- ▶ How have needs and expectations been translated into learning objectives?
  
- ▶ How do learning activities feed into **research results** (both within and outside the institution)? What measures are being taken to ensure that research advances are regularly integrated into teaching, both in terms of methods and results?

## Dimension 3.1 Learning outcomes of the programme



*The institution/entity selects, formulates and publishes the learning outcomes covered by the curriculum (teaching profile). These are realistic, adequate and appropriately communicated.*

- ▶ How and by whom are learning outcomes formulated? What processes are used to ensure their quality?
- ▶ How are they communicated?
- ▶ How are they broken down or broken down into sub-objectives to be acquired?
- ▶ How do learning outcomes describe what a student knows, understands and is able to do at the end of his training?
- ▶ How can we ensure that the announced learning outcomes are really known and understood, adequate, achievable and effectively exploited by all stakeholders (in particular by (e.g., teachers, students and, if applicable, potential employers)?
- ▶ How do we ensure that the learning outcomes announced are realistic, i. e. within reach? of students entering the program given the time available to reach them?
- ▶ How can we ensure that the learning outcomes announced are adequate, i.e. that they correspond to the needs and expectations of stakeholders?

## ESG 1.3

## ESG 1.3. Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach

- ▶ *A particular focus has been placed on the involvement of students in learning processes and no longer only on the rules governing the assessment of prior learning of students.*
- ▶ *This reference invites institutions to create a pedagogical environment that leads the student to play an active role in the learning process. He must become a co-creator of his learning*
- ▶ *Diversified pedagogical activities and evaluations that make sense in relation to the targeted competencies are important*



# What have been noted by the expert committees

- ▶ Although the notion of competencies represents a real break with curricula that were traditionally thought of in terms of courses and content, the practice of competence repositories is spreading widely.
- ▶ However, the outcome of the process varies according to the case and the information that the student can obtain from it to build his professional project is of very different levels
- ▶ The diversity of pedagogical approaches is a necessity both to meet the diversity of students' expectations, to enable them to acquire very different skills, but also to make them more active in their training through increased motivation.
- ▶ This need is stressed by the experts:
- ▶ The expert committee also recommends the development of learning activities to assess specific skills such as intellectual curiosity, risk-taking and autonomy



- ▶ In addition to specific pedagogical activities (such as problem-based learning) that are more relevant to the student's activity, experts also observe other practices such as:
- ▶ The use of the portfolio is a way to develop reflective practice and support the acquisition of skills.
- ▶ Student autonomy is described by expert committees as another important issue in higher education. The experts highlighted good practices in this area:
  - Some institutions have relied on the student's progressive autonomy in the organization of his work, by offering him regular supervision.
  - Elements of practice related to research from the bachelor's level are proving to be useful means to introduce future graduates to the reality of the labour market, by particularly that of freelance or contractual work, where intellectual autonomy, as well as the ability to build a project and bring it to completion, are major assets.



# ESG 1.3 points of focus

- ▶ ESG 1.3 covers many practices in higher education.
- ▶ Articulating (new) assessment methods with (new) pedagogical methods in relation to competency frameworks, but also effectively assessing targeted competencies and providing students with the required feedback is a recommendation that concerns the majority of curricula.
- ▶ It is important to find the right balance between the establishment of flexibility and consistency of pathways with the skills to be acquired, two requirements that may appear to be tense and difficult to manage



## ESG 1.3 Good practices

- ▶ School for student during master thesis with public presentation of the progress of the master's theses.
- ▶ A "pedagogical alert" system makes it possible to inform all teachers, via the intranet, of any difficulty encountered by a student in monitoring his or her training. Any initiative or action taken as a result of this "alert" is disseminated to teachers concerned by the student's learning path
- ▶ Some institutions organize every two weeks (or every month) a sequence of speech, analysis and regulation jointly led by the students and the referent teacher



# ESG 1.3 How does AEQES ask Uni about it

Criterion 3: The institution/entity has developed and is implementing a policy to ensure the internal coherence of its curriculum

*This criterion aims to assess the necessary consistency between the following elements:*

- ▶ *the learning outcomes covered by the curriculum (teaching profile);*
- ▶ *the contents implemented;*
- ▶ *learning devices and activities;*
- ▶ *the overall layout of the curriculum, the choice and logical sequencing of activities or learning devices; the time allowed for achieving these outcomes;*
- ▶ *the learning outcomes assessed;*
- ▶ *the criteria and methods for evaluating these achievements.*

## Dimension 3.1 Learning outcomes of the programme



*The institution/entity selects, formulates and publishes the learning outcomes covered by the curriculum (teaching profile). These are realistic, adequate and appropriately communicated.*

- ▶ How and by whom are learning outcomes formulated? What processes are used to ensure their quality?
- ▶ How are they communicated?
- ▶ How are they broken down or broken down into sub-objectives to be acquired?
- ▶ How do learning outcomes describe what a student knows, understands and is able to do at the end of his training?
- ▶ How can we ensure that the announced learning outcomes are really known and understood, adequate, achievable and effectively exploited by all stakeholders (in particular by (e.g., teachers, students and, if applicable, potential employers)?
- ▶ How do we ensure that the learning outcomes announced are realistic, i. e. within reach? of students entering the program given the time available to reach them?
- ▶ How can we ensure that the learning outcomes announced are adequate, i.e. that they correspond to the needs and expectations of stakeholders?



## Dimension 3.2: Contents, learning devices and activities (including internships, projects, master thesis)

*The institution/entity develops and implements learning systems and activities to achieve the targeted learning outcomes, encouraging students to play an active role.*

- ▶ How is it ensured that the learning outcomes targeted by each device and activity are explicitly formulated? How are these learning outcomes communicated to students?
- ▶ How do learning methods focus on knowledge mobilization and skills from different disciplines?
- ▶ What are the pedagogical practices that are representative of the announced pedagogy? How are they promoted? How is their effectiveness assessed?
- ▶ What innovative practices have been developed and for what purposes?
- ▶ To what extent is theory and practice articulated?
- ▶ What measures and initiatives are being taken to stimulate and maintain student motivation?
- ▶ What measures and initiatives are being taken to stimulate and maintain student autonomy?
- ▶ How do we ensure that the student is fully involved in his or her learning?



- ▶ What evidence is there of the effectiveness of measures and initiatives taken to stimulate and maintain student motivation? In particular: How do we ensure that there is enough variety in the activities offered to students? That these activities make sense to students? That the time available to carry them out is sufficient? That their level of difficulty is appropriate? etc.
- ▶ What is the place given to self-evaluation and the student's reflexive gaze?
- ▶ What evidence is there of the effectiveness of measures and initiatives taken to stimulate and maintain student autonomy? In particular: How do we ensure that the activities proposed to students leave room for individual or collective initiative?
- ▶ How are teaching/learning methods (pedagogical methods) appropriate to the learning outcomes concerned and how do they promote their achievement?
- ▶ How each learning activity contributes adequately to the achievement of learning outcomes learning objectives?
- ▶ What should be improved in terms of learning arrangements and activities as well as educational practices?



## Dimension 3.3: Overall arrangement of the programme and time allocated for the achievement of outcomes

*The programme is appropriately designed and implemented to achieve the intended learning outcomes. It allows students to reach them in a timely manner.*

- ▶ What are the elements that attest to the overall coherence of the programme? How can the logic of the construction of the program be made explicit for both teachers and students?
- ▶ How do we ensure that the prerequisites\* or corequisites\* of each part of the program are effectively mastered by all students, regardless of their individual backgrounds? What is to be done if certain prerequisites or corequisites are not met by certain categories of students?
- ▶ How is redundancy between different learning activities regulated?
- ▶ How is the progress in achieving the targeted learning outcomes of the programme organized?
- ▶ How do we ensure that the different parts of the program form a coherent whole, each part with its own targeted learning outcomes?
- ▶ If so, what are the recommended typical routes? How successful are they? How does the implementation of the program promote these pathways?



- ▶ In what ways are individualized career path opportunities presented and communicated?
- ▶ How is it ensured that they are well understood by students and implemented by the jury?
- ▶ How is the adequacy between the time required for each device and for each learning activity and the time actually available? How is it ensured that the total work is within reasonable limits (day, week, semester, year) and that there is sufficient of time for personal work? is the workload well distributed over the different quadrimeters?
- ▶ How are ECTS managed? How is the student's workload taken into account in assigning ECTS to the different elements of the programme and learning outcomes targeted? How do you keep ECTS count to calibrate the student's workload?
- ▶ How is student mobility taken into account in the design of the programme?



- ▶ How are the teaching units offered adjusted or do they adjust to each other both in terms of learning outcomes and content only at the organisational level?
- ▶ To what extent is there a match between the time required for each device and learning activity and the time actually available? To what extent is the total work required within reasonable limits (day, week, semester, year)? To what extent is there enough time for personal work? If problems have been reported with regard to the adequacy between the time needed for each device and learning activity and the time actually available, what measures have been taken to address them?
- ▶ Are the ECTS assigned to the different elements of the programme consistent with the learning outcomes targeted?
  
- ▶ What should be improved for all these points?
- ▶ What needs to be improved in terms of the overall design of the programme?

## Dimension 3.4: Assessment of the level of achievement of the learning outcomes concerned



*The criteria and assessment procedures shall be established in accordance with the learning outcomes concerned and applied systematically and consistently. In addition, requirements are clearly formulated and communicated to students in a timely manner.*

- ▶ What is the situation in particular with regard to the evaluation of end-of-study work/memoir/integrated test, internship(s), project(s)?
- ▶ What about the supervision of the internship(s) and the end-of-study work/memoir/integrated test? How do we ensure that students have the opportunity to receive enough feedback during the course of their work?
- ▶ What measures are in place to ensure the quality and relevance of evaluation mechanisms?



- ▶ What is in place to ensure that evaluations are consistent with learning outcomes announced ?
- ▶ How do we ensure that students know what is expected of them during evaluations? How to and when are the evaluation criteria communicated to students?
- ▶ How can the conditions for success and failure for the different elements of the program and for the Are the entire program explained? How were they determined? What are they like? communicated to students?
- ▶ How do assessments make students aware of their level, gaps and progress? What are the feedback mechanisms after each evaluation? What is the place of formative evaluations in the program?
  
- ▶ How do assessment systems effectively assess the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved?
- ▶ How is the consistency of the mechanisms implemented for the assessment of student learning outcomes with the learning activities of the programme ensured? In what way(s) do the learning activities include adequate preparation for assessments?
- ▶ How is it ensured that the time between an assessment and the feedback provided to students is as short as possible?
  
- ▶ What needs to be improved in terms of the assessment of learning outcomes?

# ESG 1.4

## ESG 1.4. Student admission, progression recognition and certification



Institutions should consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student “life cycle”, e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification.

- ▶ *This reference deals with the student's journey through the cycle of study and how institutions implement admission, progression, recognition and certification procedures. The main emphasis is on the completeness of the cycle and the necessarily fair and public nature of these procedures.*
- ▶ *In general, national legislation provides for a number of obligations to be respected by institutions in terms of admission, assessment of prior learning (VAE), registration, gateway and certification*



# What have been noted by the expert committees

- ▶ When these procedures are reviewed, it is to require improvement in their implementation or monitoring, in a lifelong learning context which requires good course management, in particular by flexibility terms (see ESG 1.3). In this perspective, the obligation to clearly inform students about the studies, but also about the procedures in place in the establishment, is welcome. Experts believe that it is important that each student receives quality information that allows them to build their individual career path and progression through the curriculum



# ESG 1.4 points of focus

- ▶ This reference and its guidelines are at the heart of the educational system because they target all the processes that mark the path of any student within an institution.
- ▶ If admission and certification are regulated by a number of legal guidelines, obviously, measuring the student's progress in the program studies must be based on the collection and use of data relating to more of the initiative of the institutions. And even if some data are sometimes available at a more institutional level, they are not used by smaller organizational divisions



# ESG 1.4 How does AEQES ask Uni about it

## Dimension 4.3: Equity in terms of welcoming, monitoring and supporting students

### 4.3.1 Student Admission and Orientation

- ▶ How does the admission process work? Are there different categories of entrants? How are they treated?
- ▶ How and by whom is the admission process assessed? What is the follow-up to this evaluation?
- ▶ What, if any, are the specific objectives for the admission of students to the programme?
- ▶ What measures have been put in place to help orient future students?
- ▶ If the number of entrants is not in line with the objectives, what are the reasons and what is being done to achieve them? remedy?



### 4.3.2 Transition to higher education, bridges, resumption of studies

- ▶ What are the difficulties encountered in the transition to higher education? How to have these difficulties been identified? If the input flow is heterogeneous, some input groups do they have any particular difficulties?
- ▶ What are the difficulties encountered when resuming studies and building bridges allowed by legal texts? How were these difficulties identified? If the input flow of the gateways is heterogeneous, do some input groups face particular difficulties?
- ▶ How are the prerequisites or corequisites of a given program identified? How are they? How are they communicated to students? how are they evaluated?
- ▶ If so, what specific measures have been put in place for foreign students?
- ▶ What measures have been taken to overcome the difficulties encountered during the transition to higher education ("helping people to succeed")?
- ▶ What measures have been taken to overcome the difficulties encountered in the context of gateways?



### 4.3.3 Fairness

- ▶ What arrangements are in place to enable the institution/entity to ensure that students can achieve, in an equitable way, the learning outcomes targeted and can achieve a similar level of competence regardless of their previous learning background, personal, social or economic situation?
- ▶ Does the institution provide assistance to students for housing, in what way, under what conditions?
- ▶ How does the institution/entity assess the fairness of treatment of the different categories of students, including access to scholarships?



## 4.3.4 Supporting Success

- ▶ How are students in difficulty identified?
- ▶ What measures are being taken to help students in difficulty?
- ▶ How are repeating students treated? Is their success rate satisfactory?
- ▶ In what ways are students redirected if necessary?
- ▶ What is the average length of studies? What are the objectives in this regard?
- ▶ What is the average success/dropout rate per teaching unit, per annual block (ba1) or per cycle? At what times during the course do departures occur?
- ▶ How can we ensure the effectiveness of the measures taken to help students in difficulty?
- ▶ If the average length of studies is not satisfactory, why not, what are the causes and what is being done to remedy them?
- ▶ What are the main causes of abandonment?
- ▶ What conclusions do you draw from the analysis of pass/fail rates per teaching unit?

## To go further:

Equip Project : Enhancing Quality : From policy to practice

<https://eua.eu/resources/publications/322:enhancing-quality-from-policy-to-practice.html>

Trajectoire document

<http://www.aeqes.be/documents/20160523Trajectoires.pdf>

Aeqes Framework

[http://www.aeqes.be/infos\\_documents\\_details.cfm?documents\\_id=246](http://www.aeqes.be/infos_documents_details.cfm?documents_id=246)



Thanks for your attention

