

External review of the Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education and Career Development (AKKORK) by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)

Annex I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

August 2013

Revised May 2014

1. Background and Context

Established in 2005 as an autonomous non-profit organisation (according to the Civil Code of RF and the Law on Non-profit Organisations), AKKORK is the first public external QA agency in Russia. The agency was founded by two Russian limited liability companies named "Obrazovanie cherez vsu zhizn" (Lifelong learning) and "Garantii Kachestva" (Quality assurance), respectively.

The mission of the agency to form and develop in Russia an independent system of education quality assessment and assurance which corresponds to the principles of the Bologna declaration and the world best practices.

AKKORK offers its services both on the secondary and higher education level but mostly on the latter level. The major types of activities cover:

- quality review (evaluation / audit);
- accreditation and certification (voluntary, non-state);
- project work and business activity related to the scope of the agency (studies, research on a contract basis).

Evaluation and accreditation are offered both for institutions and programmes. AKKORK's main activities relate to study programme evaluation.

In December 2007, AKKORK (at that time using the acronym AQA) was granted associate status (now Affiliate status) with ENQA.

AKKORK applied three times for ENQA membership: twice for Candidate membership in April 2007 and in 2009 and once for Full membership in 2011. AKKORK is applying for Full membership for the second time.

2. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

This is a type A review, as defined in the *Guidelines for external reviews of quality assurance agencies in the European Higher Education Area*. It will evaluate the way in which and to what extent AKKORK fulfils the criteria for the ENQA membership and thus the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)*. Consequently, the review will also provide information to the ENQA Board to aid its consideration of whether AKKORK should be accepted as Full Member of ENQA.

The review panel is not expected, however, to make any judgements as regards granting Full Membership.

3. The Review Process

The process is designed in the light of the *Guidelines for external reviews of quality assurance agencies in the European Higher Education Area*.

The evaluation procedure consists of the following steps:

- Formulation of the Terms of Reference and protocol for the review;
- Nomination and appointment of the review panel;
- Self-evaluation by AKKORK including the preparation of a self-evaluation report;
- A site visit by the review panel to AKKORK;
- Preparation and completion of the final evaluation report by the review panel;
- Scrutiny of the final evaluation report by the Review Committee of the ENQA Board;
- Analysis of the scrutiny by the ENQA Board and their decision regarding ENQA membership;
- Follow-up of the panel's and/or ENQA Board's recommendations by the agency.

3.1 Nomination and appointment of the review team members

The review panel consists of five members: four external reviewers (one or two quality assurance experts, representative(s) of higher education institutions, student member) and a review secretary. Three of the reviewers (including the review secretary) are nominated by the ENQA Board on the basis of proposals submitted to ENQA by the national agencies, and are drawn from senior serving members of Board/Council or staff of ENQA member agencies. The fourth external reviewer is drawn from a nomination provided by the European University Association (EUA). The nomination of the student member is asked from the European Students' Union (ESU). One of the panel members serves as the chair of the review.

Current members of the ENQA Board are not eligible to serve as reviewers.

ENQA will provide AKKORK with the list of suggested experts with their respective curriculum vitae to establish that there are no known conflicts of interest. The experts will have to sign a non-conflict of interest statement as regards the AKKORK review.

3.2 Self-evaluation by AKKORK, including the preparation of a self-evaluation report

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

- Self-evaluation is organised as a project with a clearly defined schedule and includes all relevant internal and external stakeholders;
- The self-evaluation report is broken down by the topics of the evaluation: background description of the current situation of the Agency; analysis and appraisal of the current situation; proposals for improvement and measures already planned; a summary of perceived strengths and weaknesses;

- The report is well-structured, concise and comprehensively prepared. It clearly demonstrates the extent to which AKKORK fulfils its tasks of external quality assurance and meets the criteria for the ENQA membership and thus the ESG. The report is submitted to the review panel a minimum of eight weeks prior to the site visit.

3.3 A Site Visit by the Review Panel

AKKORK will draw up a draft proposal of schedule of the site visit to be submitted to the review panel two months before the planned dates of the visit. The schedule includes an indicative timetable of the meetings and other exercises to be undertaken by the review panel during the site visit, the duration of which is 2 days. The approved schedule shall be given to AKKORK at least one month before the dates of the visit, in order to properly organise the requested interviews.

The review panel will be assisted by AKKORK in arriving in Moscow, Russia.

The site visit will close with an oral presentation and discussion of the major issues of the evaluation between the review panel and AKKORK.

3.4 Preparation and completion of the final evaluation report

On the basis of the review panel's findings, the review secretary will draft the report in consultation with the review panel. The report will take into account the purpose and scope of the evaluation as defined under article 2. It will also provide a clear rationale for its findings with regards to each ENQA membership criteria. A draft will be submitted for comment to AKKORK within two months of the site visit for comment on factual accuracy. If AKKORK chooses to provide a 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 AKKORK, finalise the document and submit it to AKKORK and ENQA.

The report is to be finalised within three months of the site visit and will not exceed 40 pages in length.

4. Follow-up Process and Publication of the Report

AKKORK will consider the expert panel's report and may inform ENQA of its plans to implement any recommendations contained in the report. The review report will be published on the AKKORK website. The report will also be published on the ENQA website, regardless of the review outcome and decision by the Board.

5. Use of the report

ENQA shall retain ownership of the report. The intellectual property of all works created by the expert panel in connection with the review contract, including specifically any written reports, shall be vested in ENQA.

The review report is to be used by the Board of ENQA for the purpose of reaching a conclusion on whether AKKORK has or has not met the membership criteria/ESG.

The working paper authored by the Panel is to be considered as a report owned by ENQA only after being approved by the ENQA Board.

Once submitted to AKKORK and ENQA and until the decision by the Board is made, the working paper may not be used or relied upon by AKKORK the panel and any third party and may not be disclosed without the prior written consent of ENQA. AKKORK may use the report at its discretion only after the Board decision has been made.

AKKORK shall be aware that, should an application to the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) be submitted, the Chair of the panel might be approached by the Register Committee for any request for clarification. The Chair of the panel may give a response but he/she is requested to copy the Director of ENQA on all correspondences.

6. Budget

AKKORK shall pay the following review related fees:

Fee of the Chair	4,750 EUR
Fee of the Secretary	4,750 EUR
Fee of the 3 other panel members	8,250 EUR (2,750 EUR each)
Administrative overhead for ENQA Secretariat	5,000 EUR
Experts Training fund	1,250 EUR
Travel and subsistence expenses (approximate)	6,000 EUR

This gives a total indicative cost of 30,000.00 EUR for a review team of 5 members. In the case that the allowance for travel and subsistence expenses is exceeded, AKKORK will cover any additional costs after the completion of the review. However, the ENQA Secretariat will endeavour to keep the travel and subsistence expenses in the limits of the planned budget, and will refund the difference to AKKORK if the travel and subsistence expenses go under budget.

In the event of a second site visit required by the Board and aiming at completing the assessment of compliance, and should the agency accept a second visit, an additional fee of 500 EUR per expert, as well as travel and subsistence costs are recoverable from the agency.

7. Indicative Schedule of the Review

Agreement on terms of reference and contract	September 2013
Appointment of review panel members	October 2013
Self-evaluation completed	By February 2014
Preparation of site visit schedule and indicative timetable	Feb-March 2014
Briefing of review panel members	March May 2014
Review panel site visit	April 2014 29-30 May 2014
Draft of evaluation report to AKKORK	June end of July 2014
Statement of AKKORK to review panel if necessary	June August-September 2014
Submission of final report to ENQA	July September 2014
Consideration of the report by ENQA and response of AKKORK	September October 2014
Publication of report	September October 2014