



European Association for  
Quality Assurance in Higher Education

Ms Anette Dørge  
Executive Director  
The Danish Accreditation Institution (AI)  
Bredgade 38, 1260 Copenhagen  
Denmark

Gloucester, 29 June 2021

**Subject: Reconfirmation of membership of AI in ENQA**

Dear Ms Anette Dørge,

I am pleased to inform you that, at its meeting of 24 June 2021, the Board of ENQA agreed to reconfirm the AI membership of ENQA for five years from that date. The Board concluded that AI is in compliance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015) and thus fulfils the membership criteria according to article 6, paragraph 1 of ENQA's rules of procedure.

The Board would like to use this opportunity to provide an articulation regarding standard 3.3 Independence, where the Board reiterates the need to properly communicate the roles and congruence between the agency and the Accreditation Council to all involved stakeholders in the Danish higher education system.

Furthermore, the Board asks the agency to pay further attention to the ESG 3.4 Thematic analysis. While the panel commends the agency for its significant efforts in the production of thematic analyses and involvement of stakeholders, the panel notes that the recommendations from 2016 are nonetheless still relevant and could help the agency further improve in its work on external quality assurance.

The Board would like to receive a follow-up report within two years of its decision, i.e. by June 2023.

The Board also encourages AI to take advantage of the voluntary progress visit – an enhancement-led feature in the review process. The visit would take place in about two to three years' time from this decision. The ENQA Secretariat will be in touch with you in about a year's time to discuss this possibility. The costs of this visit have already been included as part of the review fee and are non-refundable except for the travel costs of the experts. More information about the progress visit can be found in the Guidelines for ENQA Agency Reviews.



European Association for  
Quality Assurance in Higher Education

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact the ENQA Secretariat.

Please accept my congratulations for the re-confirmation of membership of AI.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Douglas Blackstock', is written over a light grey circular watermark that contains the ENQA logo.

Douglas Blackstock

President

Annex: Areas for development

## **Annex: Areas for development**

As outlined by the review panel, AI is recommended to take appropriate action, so far as it is empowered to do so, on the following issues:

### **ESG 3.1 Activities, policy and processes for quality assurance**

The agency is recommended to address the peculiarities of the dual accreditation system, namely by reflecting on how to consolidate the interdependence of the relationship between AI and the AC.

The agency is recommended to consider the establishment of an advisory body or similar that could institutionalize and strengthen the dialogue with the relevant stakeholders, namely with the MHES, the AC and with HEIs.

### **ESG 3.3 Independence**

The agency is recommended to reflect about the understanding of independence between AI and the AC and how to balance between their statutory independence and the necessary coordination and congruence between these two bodies.

### **ESG 3.6 Internal quality assurance and professional conduct**

The agency is recommended to consolidate its processes of internal reflection and devote more attention to self-reflection, namely by using in a more systematic way the contributions of internal and external stakeholders.

### **ESG 2.1 Consideration of internal quality assurance**

The agency is recommended to reconsider its approach condensing to 3 standards and to evaluate on whether these 3 standards are effective and comprehensive in addressing the whole of Part 1 of ESG.

### **ESG 2.2 Designing methodologies fit for purpose**

The agency is recommended to develop a continuous monitoring to its comprehensive approach, especially regarding the idea of differentiation and fitness for purpose. In particular, the agency should reflect on how to make the current system of IA effective for large and comprehensive institutions.

### **ESG 2.3 Implementing processes**

The agency is recommended to improve the degree of coordination with the AC regarding guidelines and decision-making processes in order to ensure greater clarity of the whole review process in IA 2.0.



European Association for  
Quality Assurance in Higher Education

### **ESG 2.5 Criteria for outcomes**

The agency is recommended to devote greater efforts to design clearer and consistent criteria regarding decision-making and review processes in a coordinated way with AC to avoid any uncertainty.

### **ESG 2.6 Reporting**

The agency is recommended to devote more attention to the consistency of reports to avoid the perception among some stakeholders that these reflect the quality and commitment of the reviewers.

### **ESG 2.7 Complaints and appeals**

The agency is recommended to consider the establishment of a separate body that could analyse the institutions' complaints within the remit of the agency.