
**Report of the External
Review of European
Chemistry Thematic
Network Association
(ECTNA)**

September 2013

ENQA

Table of contents

1. Executive summary

2. Glossary of acronyms

3. Introduction

Background and outline of the review process

The Review Panel

The Self assessment report

The Site visit

The preparation of the Panel's report

4. The Context of the Review

5. Compliance of ECTNA with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area

ESG Part 2: EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES

ESG 2.1 Use of internal quality assurance procedures

ESG 2.2 Development of external quality assurance procedures

ESG 2.3 Criteria for decisions

ESG 2.4 Processes fit for purpose

ESG 2.5 Reporting

ESG 2.6 Follow-up procedures

ESG 2.7 Periodic reviews

ESG 2.8 System-wide analyses

ESG Part 3: EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCIES

ENQA criterion 1- ESG 3.1 Use of external quality assurance procedures

ENQA criterion 2- ESG 3.2 Official status

ENQA criterion 1- ESG 3.3 Activities

ENQA criterion 3- ESG 3.4 Resources

ENQA criterion 4- ESG 3.5 Mission statement

ENQA criterion 5- ESG 3.6 Independence

ENQA criterion 6- ESG 3.7 External quality assurance criteria and processes used by the agencies

ENQA criterion 7- ESG 3.8 Accountability procedures

ENQA criterion 8 -Miscellaneous

6. Conclusion and recommendations

7. Annexes

Appendix One – List of evidences received

Appendix Two – Schedule of the Site Visit

1. Executive Summary

This report analyses the compliance of the European Chemistry Thematic Network Association (ECTNA) with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) and to what extent ECTNA fulfils the criteria for ENQA Associate Membership.

The member status Associate Membership was created at the ENQA General Assembly in October 2011 to respond to the diversification of actors in the field of quality assurance in higher education, and the emergence of European agencies that do not fit into the prevailing model of nationally recognised agencies, but still conduct quality assurance procedures in accordance with the ESG in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA).

ECTNA is a non-profit-making association under Belgian law. This review focuses especially on one of the Standing Committees of the ECTNA, the Label Committee, which deals with the Eurolabels (such as the Eurobachelor®, Euromaster®, and Chemistry Doctorate Eurolabel®).

This first review of a subject professional organization was organized and conducted according to the ENQA Guidelines for National Type A Reviews. The ENQA Board has decided that criterion 3.2 Official Status does not apply for reviews such as this.

ECTNA's brief self-evaluation report and the interviews held during the site visit 10-11 June in Brussels still gave the review panel sufficient evidence to come to the conclusion that ECTNA:

- does not comply with ESG 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 3.8
- partially complies with ESG 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.5, 3.7, criterion 8
- substantially complies with ESG 3.6

The Panel notes the seriousness of purpose of ECTNA as an organisation and the subject-professional qualifications of the ECTNA leadership. However, the Panel realises that the ECTNA leadership has not been fully aware of the implications of demonstrating compliance with ESG and ENQA membership criteria. Accordingly, several key procedures to assure compliance were not in place before this review took place.

Therefore the Panel has included a number of recommendations. Main areas for necessary improvements relate to public information including system-wide analyses and publication of reports, participation of students in visit panels and better training of panel members, increased focus on a label applicant's internal quality framework and the consistency of label reviews, including follow-up, feedback and appeal processes.

2. Glossary of acronyms

ASIIN: Accreditation Agency for Study Programmes of Engineering, Information Science, Natural Sciences and Mathematics

EASPA: European Association for Subject-Specific and Professional Accreditation and Quality Assurance

ECA: European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education

ECTN: European Chemistry Thematic Network

ECTNA: European Chemistry Thematic Network Association

EHEA: European Higher Education Area

ENQA: European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education

EQAR: European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education

ESG: Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area

ESU: European Students Union

EuCheMS: The European Association for Chemical and Molecular Sciences

HEI: Higher Education Institution

SEFI: European Society for Engineering Education

SER: Self-evaluation report

SWOT: Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities -Threats

ToR: Terms of Reference

3. Introduction

This is the report of the review of the European Chemistry Thematic Network Association (ECTNA) undertaken in June, 2013 in Brussels for the purpose of determining to what extent ECTNA fulfils the criteria for the ENQA associated membership and thus the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).

The member status Associate Membership was created at the ENQA General Assembly in October 2011 to respond to the diversification of actors in the field of quality assurance in higher education, and the emergence of European agencies that do not fit into the prevailing model of nationally recognised agencies, but still conduct quality assurance procedures in accordance with the ESG in the EHEA. Associate Members meet the ENQA membership criteria, apart from criterion 2 - Official status (ESG 3.2).

It must be added that ECTNA is the first subject professional association that applies to ENQA to be reviewed for Associate Membership.

Consequently, the review should provide the basis for the decision of the ENQA Board, whether to grant ECTNA the associate membership of ENQA for which ECTNA has applied.

This review is identified in its ToR from April 2013 as a type A review.

Background and outline of the review process

The Statutes of ENQA require all member agencies to undergo an external cyclical review, at least once every five years, in order to verify that they fulfil the membership provisions.

In November 2004, the General Assembly of ENQA agreed that the third part of the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area should be incorporated into the membership provisions of its statutes. Substantial compliance with the ESG thus became the principal criterion for membership of ENQA. The ESG were subsequently adopted at the Bergen ministerial meeting of the Bologna Process in 2005.

The third part of the ESG covers the cyclical external review of quality assurance and accreditation agencies.

The external review of ECTNA was conducted in line with the process described in Guidelines for External Reviews of Quality Assurance Agencies in the European Higher Education Area and in accordance with the timeline set out in the Terms of Reference.

The Review Panel

The Review Panel for the external review of ECTNA was composed of the following members:

- *Christian Thune*, Former Executive Director of the Danish Evaluation Institute (EVA) and former President of ENQA, Denmark. Presently vice chair of the Danish Accreditation Council (Panel Chairman)
- *Núria Comet*, Responsible for Internal Quality Assurance and Project Coordinator, AQU Catalunya, Spain (Panel Secretary)
- *Patrick van den Bosch*, Staff member Quality Assurance, Flemish Council of Universities and University Colleges (VLUHR), Belgium (Panel Member)
- *Andrejs Rauhvargers*, Secretary General of the Latvian Rectors' Council, Latvia – *EUA nomination* (Panel Member)
- *Petra Lindblad*, student at Åbo Akademi University, Secretary of Educational Affairs at the Student Union of Åbo Akademi University, Finland – *ESU nomination* (Panel Member)

ENQA provided the Panel with ENQA's Terms of Reference (ToR), including a suggested timeline and a short presentation of the Panel members. It should be mentioned that the Panel never received a final version of the ToR as accepted by ECTNA, including the final schedule for the revised process. The site visit was originally planned by ENQA and ECTNA to take place in Mid-May 2013. However, the Panel was appointed in early April at a time, when the ECTNA SER was not available. ENQA and eventually ECTNA accepted therefore the Panel's argument that a site visit had to be postponed to June 2013 and the dates 10-11 June were agreed upon. Still concerning the timeline for the review the Panel considered it to be very tight:

Agreement on the composition of the Panel members / ENQA sends the Terms of Reference: 16 April 2013.

Agreement on the site visit: 23 April 2013

ECTNA sends the SER: 10 Mai 2013

Panel request more evidences: 30 Mai 2013

ECTNA sends the schedule for the site visit with the participants: 6 June 2013

ECTNA sends more documentation: 6 – 7 June 2013

Panel meeting: 9 June 2013

Site visit: 10-11 June 2013

The self assessment report

ECTNA produced a short self-evaluation report (13 pages), which was sent to the Review Panel four weeks prior to the site visit. The self-evaluation report was signed by the chair and the executive secretary of ECTNA's Label Committee and by the president and secretary of ECTNA.

18 documents followed the SER placed in the following groups:

- The statutes and list of members of ECTNA
- Files about Eurobachelor: Guidelines, Framework, Self-assessment, Report, Award letter, Certificate.
- Files about Euromaster: Guidelines, Framework, Self-assessment, Award letter.
- Files about Eurodoctorate: Guidelines, Framework, Self-assessment, Report
- Expert criteria
- List of awards

The Review Panel found the self-evaluation report to be on the very brief side. Even more importantly the Panel found that implications of several ESG were not well understood by ECTNA. Still, the last part of the SER includes a SWOT analysis, where ECTNA reflects the strong points and the weak points, which need further improvement. This analysis actually reflects a considerable awareness on the part of ECTNA of critical points in its organisation and processes.

Due to the lack of key information, the Panel asked ECTNA for more documentation, some of which was received by the Panel only a few days before the site-visit. All documents are listed in Annex 1.

It should be added that ECTNA did not submit references to its website, which, however, was easy to find, but difficult to navigate.

The site visit

The Panel sent 14 May to ECTNA its proposal for the schedule and sessions of the site visit. The confirmation and ECTNA's detailed programme for the site visit were received by the Panel one week before the site visit. See annex 2.

The Panel met for a preparatory meeting the day before the site visit to discuss the self-evaluation report and share first impressions regarding compliance with the ESG. The members also discussed the programme of the visit and initial lines of questioning were distributed among Panel members.

The main problem of the site visit was ECTNA's selection of representatives and stakeholders. The same persons attended various sessions, but in different roles. The Panel had a serious discussion on this issue, but accepted under the circumstances the set up. However, as a consequence it was not possible to pursue a substantial focus of a site visit, which should be to compare different and independent points of view.

By way of example of this problem the Panel interviewed:

- Prof. E, A. Varella in the roles of Administrative Council member, Label Committee member, Panel Expert and Quality Label Holder
- Prof. R. Chalzer and Prof. Rosenberg as Label Committee members and Panel Experts
- Prof Smith and Prof. Mó as Administrative Council members and Quality Label Holders

The Review Panel visited the office of ECTNA in Brussels on 10 and 11 June of 2013. To the surprise of the Panel it was not possible for the present president of ECTNA to attend the site visit.

The sessions went according to the scheduled program, except the session with representatives of Quality Assurance Agencies in partnership with ECTNA, where the representative of the Polish Accreditation Commission did not attend the meeting and the representative of ASIIN also did not attend the meeting, but a senior representative of ASIIN was available for a telephone call by the Panel chair. In other words the only partner representative present was professor Lagana from the Italian Chemical Society. The Panel found it far from satisfactory that it was not possible to probe more in depth and detail ECTNA's working relationship with the partners, especially in the light of the very substantial number of label reviews undertaken by partners, cf. the table on page 13 below.

By the end of the site visit, the Panel had a session with the leadership of ECTNA to share the preliminary conclusions related to level of compliance of ECTNA in relation to each of the ESG.

The preparation of the Panel's report

The secretary of the Panel drafted the report in cooperation with the chair and subsequently the rest of the Panel.

The Review Panel submitted on 5 August 2013 the draft report to ECTNA for verification and comments on any factual inaccuracies.

ECTNA was given two weeks to comment on the report.

ECTNA responded 20 August 2013 with a five page "Statement in Reference to the Draft Report". The Panel considered this Statement, but did not feel that it necessitated any substantial changes in its report. Thus a major point in the Statement is that ECTNA has prepared its processes in a manner to support a focus in ECTNA assessments on the internal quality management of programmes cf. ESG part 2. However, as stated several places in this report the implementation of such a focus is neither apparent in the self-assessment documents submitted by assessed programmes, nor in the very brief reports of ECTNA visiting panels. Other points raised in the Statement are considered by the Panel to be sufficiently covered by the analysis in relation to individual compliance conclusions.

Still, on the basis of the Statement in a few places the Panel has reworded its analysis. Further the Panel comments in its conclusion (part 6) on the number of assessment procedural points, where ECTNA declares changes to become effective by September this year.

The final report was submitted to ENQA and ECTNA on 4 September 2013.

4. The Context of the Review

The European Chemistry Thematic Network (ECTN) has been operating continuously since 1996, when Thematic Networks were set up by the European Commission as part of the ERASMUS programme.

In 2001 ECTN set up a non profit making Association (ECTNA) under Belgian law, in order to have a legal entity available to carry on parts of its work, in particular to become the owner of intellectual property rights and to act as a project partner in funded projects.

There are currently over 100 members from 30 European countries and associate members world wide.

The objectives of the Association, cited in the Statues, shall be

- to implement, consult or supervise programmes for the assessment of skills and knowledge in science and engineering, with an emphasis on chemistry,
- to undertake programmes concerning education and training, especially those concerning innovative approaches,
- to operate as a consultant or assessor in programmes concerning education and training,
- to provide certification of achievement when assessments have been carried out under appropriate conditions,
- to cooperate with established professional or other associations in the furtherance of its objectives
- to extend the reach of all aspects of education in science and engineering beyond national borders.

The structure of ECTNA is composed by:

The General Assembly

According to the statutes, the ECTNA is governed by the General Assembly, meeting once a year. The General Assembly has the right to establish Committees.

The Administrative Council

The general policy and the management of the Association is the responsibility of the Administrative Council, which is composed of the ECTNA President, one Vice-President and three elected members, if the Association is composed of less than twenty members, or five elected members, if the Association is composed of twenty or more members. Committees refer to the Administrative Council, in order to have their proposals approved and adopted.

The Working Groups and Standing Committees

The objectives of the Working Groups and Standing Committees should correspond to the general goals of the Association. The mandates of the Working Groups and Standing Committees are determined by the General Assembly.

For the time being, the two standing committees in operation are the Label Committee and the Virtual Education Community Committee.

The Label Committee is that Standing Committee of the ECTNA, which deals with the Eurolabels (such as the Eurobachelor®, Euromaster®, and Chemistry Doctorate Eurolabel®) and similar activities.

It consists of a Chair, a vice-Chair, an Executive Secretary and a maximum of seven ordinary members. The Chair, vice-Chair and Executive Secretary are nominated by the Administrative Council.

The ordinary members are elected by the General Assembly according to guidelines established by the Administrative Council.

The Virtual Education Community Committee is that Standing Committee of the ECTNA, which deals with its virtual community activities concerning EChem Test and Testing Centres, dissemination and publications, distributed Learning Object development and repository, and similar activities.

The focus of the SER and the site visit was the work conducted by the Label Committee.

The Eurobachelor project

ECTNA was asked by the high-level project "Tuning educational Structures in Europe" to set up a Chemistry Subject Area Group. The Group developed the concept of "Eurobachelor", and devised a framework for such a degree in chemical sciences. This was named the Eurobachelor Framework, and was adopted by ECTNA and later by the European Association for Chemical and Molecular Sciences (EuCheMS), the umbrella body for national Chemical Societies across Europe.

When the EU Commission decided to take first steps towards the development of what later became "Quality Labels", ECTNA was able to convince the Commission that chemistry would also be an ideal candidate.

The Eurobachelor® project was run from 2004 to 2006 by the elected Label Committee.

The primary aim of the Eurobachelor qualification is to provide a first cycle degree which will be recognised by other European institutions as being of a standard which will provide automatic right of access (though not right of

admission, which is the prerogative of the receiving institution) to chemistry Master programmes.

Similarly the primary aims of the Euromaster qualification are to provide a second cycle degree of the highest standard which will be:

- recognised by other European institutions as being of a standard which will provide automatic right of access (though not right of admission, which is the prerogative of the receiving institution) to chemistry doctoral programmes.
- recognised by employers as being of a standard which fit the graduates for employment as professional chemists in chemical and related industries or in public service.
- recognised by the European Chemist Registration Board of EuCheMS as meeting the educational standard necessary to allow the graduates to obtain the status of European Chemist.

In 2010 ECTNA took the next step of developing a framework for the doctoral cycle.

In the words of ECTNA, main concerns are

- degrees in chemistry across the European Higher Education Area should be easily readable and comparable.
- the degree awarded after the first cycle must be relevant to the European labour market for chemistry graduates.
- ECTS must be used correctly.
- mobility and recognition are vital.
- quality assurance of chemistry degrees across Europe should be carried out in a European dimension using comparable criteria and methodologies.
- inter-institutional co-operation must be the norm rather than the exception.

The ECTNA procedure

The Chemistry Labels are awarded for a period of five academic years and can be renewed for further periods of five years. Applications for renewal require a much less detailed self-evaluation report.

The first step in the application process is the preparation of a self-evaluation report according to the guidelines. The report is submitted to the executive secretary of the ECTNA Label Committee, responsible for making decisions on the award of the label.

If a site visit is decided, this is carried out by a team of three experts, two from ECTNA and one by a national representative, selected whenever possible by the relevant national Chemical Society. Written reports are submitted to the Institution for comment prior to final deliberations in the Label Committee. Recommendations for awarding the label could be subject to conditions or to recommendations. Final decisions are taken by the ECTNA Administrative Council.

Agreements with partners

The perceived success of the project suggested to ECTNA that it would be advisable to look for partners who would be prepared to use their procedures and criteria in order to carry out label awards on a wider and more sustainable basis.

Agreements were made with four partners:

- The German Accreditation Agency "Akkreditierungsagentur für Studiengänge der Ingenieurwissenschaften, der Informatik, der Naturwissenschaften und der Mathematik" (ASIIN)
- The Società Chimica Italiana
- The British Royal Society of Chemistry (this partnership agreement has now lapsed)
- The Polish Accreditation Council (Uniwersytecka Komisja Akredytacyjna)

Cooperation with the partners has now developed to an extent, where these are responsible for a very large part of the reviews towards the Eurolabels, cf. the table below, which presents distribution of Eurolabel awards as of May 2013:

	ECTNA	Partners	Renewal - ECTNA	Renewal - Partners
Eurobachelor	32	34	20	13
Euromaster	23	20	17	3
Eurodoctorate	2	0	0	0

5. Compliance of ECTNA with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance on the European Higher Education Area

ESG Part 2: EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES

Agencies should undertake external quality assurance activities (at institutional or programme level) on a regular basis. The external quality assurance of agencies should take into account the presence and effectiveness of the external quality assurance processes described in Part 2 of the European Standards and Guidelines. The external quality assurance activities may involve evaluation, review, audit, assessment, accreditation or other similar activities and should be part of the core functions of the agency.

ESG 2.1 Use of internal quality assurance procedures

Standard

External quality assurance procedures should take into account the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance processes described in Part 1 of the European Standards and Guidelines.

Guidelines: The standards for internal quality assurance contained in Part 1 provide a valuable basis for the external quality assessment process. It is important that the institutions' own internal policies and procedures are carefully evaluated in the course of external procedures, to determine the extent to which the standards are being met. If higher education institutions are to be able to demonstrate the effectiveness of their own internal quality assurance processes, and if those processes properly assure quality and standards, then external processes might be less intensive than otherwise.

Evidence

The Eurolabels focus primarily on the subject content of the degree in chemistry, specifically in the content of the programme and in principle also on the outcomes: abilities and competences that students are expected to have developed by the end of their chemical programme.

Assessment of the HEI's internal quality assurance is definitely not a major focus in the labels frameworks, though an applicant is expected to describe briefly in the SER the internal quality assurance procedures of the faculty, department or institution.

Accordingly several of the quality aspects included in the standards contained in the Part 1 of the ESG are not included in the label frameworks:

- ECTNA states in its SER concerning ESG 1.1 that *"Since we are only involved in the quality assurance of degree programme in the chemical sciences, 1.1 is only of limited relevance for us"*.
- Regarding the ESG 1.2, the ECTNA guidelines clearly include issues such as development and publication of explicit intended learning outcomes and

specific needs of different modes of delivery (e.g. full time, part-time, distance learning).

- However, these issues were only covered in the SER by the statement that ECTNA “would always expect” that its practice follows those ESG points. Similarly, it was not possible to identify whether ECTNA pays any attention to the extent to which student assessment procedures are expected to be designed to measure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes (ESG 1.3).
- Quality assurance of teaching staff (ESG 1.4) is in principle introduced in the procedures for the master label, but it is not evident from the documentation that reviews actually take this element into account.
- On Information systems (ESG 1.6) and Public information (ESG 1.7) the ECTNA SER states that *“This is an area with which we have not concerned ourselves until now”*.

According to ECTNA procedures the approval, monitoring and periodic review of programs are in focus during the site visit that ECTNA conducts. In most cases, though, ECTNA assesses programs that have already been evaluated by national accreditation agencies and asks for documentation of the official regulations defining the study programme.

According to procedures the site visit should also include the assessment of students and the learning resources available. It is, however, not evident from the documentation, SERs of applicants and review reports, that these elements are in all cases reviewed.

Analysis

Internal quality assurance is not the focus of ECTNA assessments. ECTNA does not present evidence that procedures are comprehensively and operationally in place that assess the effectiveness of the internal quality management systems of universities or faculties that apply for the European Label.

Conclusion

ECTNA partially complies with ESG 2.1

ESG 2.2 Development of external quality assurance processes

Standard

The aims and objectives of quality assurance processes should be determined before the processes themselves are developed, by all those responsible (including higher education institutions) and should be published with a description of the procedures to be used.

Guidelines: In order to ensure clarity of purpose and transparency of procedures, external quality assurance methods should be designed and developed through a process involving key stakeholders, including higher education institutions. The procedures that are finally agreed should be published and should contain explicit statements of the aims and objectives of the processes as well as a description of the procedures to be used. As external quality assurance makes demands on the institutions involved, a preliminary impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that the procedures to be adopted are appropriate and do not interfere more than necessary with the normal work of higher education institutions

Evidence

The Administrative Council approves the general policy and the management of ECTNA. The aims and objectives of ECTNA activities are explained and published on the ECTNA website as well as the guidelines and frameworks for Eurolabels.

ECTNA has developed and approved three frameworks to obtain the labels (bachelor degree, master, doctorates) by representatives of HEIs.

There is no evidence in the SER about the involvement of stakeholders while procedures are being developed. But the modifications of the frameworks are being discussed and approved in general meetings and assemblies. The frameworks contain the statements of the aims and objectives of the assessment processes.

The guidelines for applicants describe the structure of the self-evaluation report submitted by applicants for labels. The SER must be structured in 11 points, which basically describe the skills, competence and structure of the chemical degree. It does not include anything about the quality of the staff or measures to improve the degree.

Analysis

ECTNA does not maintain a systematic communication with universities and other stakeholders about external quality assurance. Staff from ECTNA member institutions, who attend the ECTNA General Assembly meeting or annual meetings are according to ECTNA statutes formally representing their institutions. However, neither the documentation nor the site visit made it completely evident for the Panel the extent to which member participants can be said to really represent their institutions and to have responsibility for ensuring communication with their institution. Members are seemingly primarily representing the chemical studies in their university. In the sense of the ESG, the Panel must therefore conclude that there may be no formal communication with the universities potentially involved. For example, many members belong to universities, which do not have the label.

ECTNA publishes descriptions of its frameworks on its website, but the Panel found the website not very friendly to navigate.

Conclusion

ECTNA partially complies with ESG 2.2

4.1.3 ESG 2.3 Criteria for decisions

Standard

Any formal decisions made as a result of an external quality assurance activity should be based on explicit published criteria that are applied consistently.

Guidelines: Formal decisions made by quality assurance agencies have a significant impact on the institutions and programmes that are judged. In the interests of equity and reliability, decisions should be based on published criteria and interpreted in a consistent manner. Conclusions should be based on recorded evidence and agencies should have in place ways of moderating conclusions, if necessary.

Evidence

The criteria are described in the ECTNA guidelines. The Administrative Council is responsible for making sure that the criteria have been applied consistently by review panels and subsequently the Label Committee.

It is not obvious from the documentation how consistency is assured in an operational sense. However, the international panel experts are often at the same time members of the Label Committee or even the Administrative Council and accordingly it can be expected that these experts in their double and overlapping capacities are responsible for ensuring consistency.

To this must be added that all the experts follow an on-line training programme, and that to be rapporteur of a site visit team the expert must have participated in at least two Eurolabels site visit teams.

In the substantial number of reviews, where the assessment is done by one of the partners (agencies), the evidence to assure that the criteria have been applied consistently is insufficient. The panel is aware that the document "International agreement on Eurolabels" states that "ECTNA shall make available to the AGENCY (if requested), at the AGENCY's expense, training and instruction with respect to the Eurolabels and technical data and literature covering them", but it is not clear to what extent this has taken place. In other words ECTNA does not seem to present any procedure to assure consistency, for example by periodical meetings, expert training and cross-reviews.

Analysis

The Panel considers that consistency may well be adequately assured in the cases, where experts are centrally placed in the ECTNA organization. But on the other hand a substantial number of reviews are done by experts drawn from the ECTNA pool of experts. These experts may not necessarily be able to weigh consistency implications, because they are not familiar with ECTNA views on consistency as defined by the Label Committee especially. The Panel does not consider the web-based training of experts to be sufficient in this regard.

Another problem is the many cases, where a partner organisation is responsible for the review. The Panel could not find any evidence that criteria are applied and interpreted in a consistent manner by the partners.

The Panel finds that training about Eurolabels must be obligatory for all external experts. Also ECTNA must promote other procedures such as periodical meetings to share the knowledge and experiences between ECTNA and the different partners.

Conclusion

ECTNA partially complies with ESG 2.3

ESG 2.4 Processes fit for purpose

Standard

All external quality assurance processes should be designed specifically to ensure their fitness to achieve the aims and objectives set for them.

Guidelines: Quality assurance agencies within the EHEA undertake different external processes for different purposes and in different ways. It is of the first importance that agencies should operate procedures which are fit for their own defined and published purposes. Experience has shown, however, that there are some widely-used elements of external review processes which not only help to ensure their validity, reliability and usefulness, but also provide a basis for the European dimension to quality assurance.

Amongst these elements the following are particularly noteworthy:

- insistence that the experts undertaking the external quality assurance activity have appropriate skills and are competent to perform their task
- the exercise of care in the selection of experts
- the provision of appropriate briefing or training for experts
- the use of international experts
- participation of students
- ensuring that the review procedures used are sufficient to provide adequate evidence to support the findings and conclusions reached
- the use of the self-evaluation/site visit/draft report/published report/follow-up model of review
- recognition of the importance of institutional improvement and enhancement policies as a fundamental element in the assurance of quality

Evidence

Characteristics of the panels

The panels are composed by two international members (who are members of ECTNA) and one national expert. The panels are appointed by the Label Committee.

ECTNA has developed "Criteria for Joining the Pool of Experts", which include: an online training course and previous experience as researchers.

The online training focuses on chemical subject aspects, not on the practicalities of assessing SERs and documentation, managing a site visit, writing a report or on the importance of institutional improvement and enhancement policies.

The rapporteur of the panel must have participated in at least two Eurolabels site visit or has at least twice been a member of international or national accreditation teams.

The substantial involvement of international experts is highly relevant in the context of ECTNA reviews. However, no students are involved as experts. The ECTNA SER gives as an explanation the difficulties in finding students specialized in chemistry, because there are no associations of students of chemical sciences, but the ECTNA does not seem to have explored the possibility of contacting the European Students Union and relevant national students unions.

Framework for reviews

The framework for the reviews includes self-evaluation report, site visit and written report. But it does not include the publication of the report and a periodic follow-up.

The aim of the process is based in the quality of the chemical level of the degree, not the institutional improvement and enhancement policies.

According to the documentation the site visits are very brief, and interviews take place only with programme staff and a group of students. The format of the reports is also very brief and reports are not published.

Analysis

The Panel considers the ECTNA framework for reviews as appropriate in itself. This includes the self-evaluation report, site visit and final report, carried out by international experts.

However, the Panel considers the review process to be designed to ensure the chemical subject quality of the program, but not to provide a sufficient basis for establishing the European dimension in quality assurance. In this sense such aspects of ECTNA processes as the following are non-compliant: the selection and the training of experts (that prioritizes the qualification in chemistry and not knowledge in quality assurance) the non-participation of students, and the non-publication of the review.

Conclusion

ECTNA partially complies with ESG 2.4

ESG 2.5 Reporting

Standard

Reports should be published and should be written in a style which is clear and readily accessible to its intended readership. Any decisions, commendations or recommendations contained in reports should be easy for a reader to find.

Guidelines: In order to ensure maximum benefit from external quality assurance processes, it is important that reports should meet the identified needs of the intended readership. Reports are sometimes intended for different readership groups and this will require careful attention to structure, content, style and tone.

In general, reports should be structured to cover description, analysis (including relevant evidence), conclusions, commendations, and recommendations. There should be sufficient preliminary explanation to enable a lay reader to understand the purposes of the review, its form, and the criteria used in making decisions. Key findings, conclusions and recommendations should be easily locatable by readers. Reports should be published in a readily accessible form and there should be opportunities for readers and users of the reports (both within the relevant institution and outside it) to comment on their usefulness.

Evidence

Each ECTNA review results in a report. All the reports meet the same requirements. There is an external part only for the applying institution, and an internal part for ECTNA. The reports received by the Panel as documentation run to two or three pages and are exceedingly brief in analysis, conclusions, commendations, and recommendations. Reports do not include sufficient preliminary explanation to enable a lay reader to understand the purposes of the review, its form, and the criteria used in making decisions. Recommendations are not easy for a reader to find.

The reports are written in English.

ECTNA does not publish the reports. Only the list of chemical degrees and university that have the Eurolabel are available on the website. As explained in the ECTNA SER: "*Our reports are intended to be read within the higher education institutions which have applied for our Quality Labels, and by them only*".

Analysis

The Review Panel found that the reports are brief documents, which describe the subject content of chemical programmes, and where there is practically no analysis in the sense of ESG 2.5.

Reports are not published.

Conclusion

ECTNA does not comply with ESG 2.5

ESG 2.6 Follow-up procedures

Standard

Quality assurance processes which contain recommendations for action or which require a subsequent action plan, should have a predetermined follow-up procedure which is implemented consistently.

Guidelines: Quality assurance is not principally about individual external scrutiny events: it should be about continuously trying to do a better job. External quality assurance does not end with the publication of the report and should include a structured follow-up procedure to ensure that recommendations are dealt with appropriately and any required action plans drawn up and implemented. This may involve further meetings with institutional or programme representatives. The objective is to ensure that areas identified for improvement are dealt with speedily and that further enhancement is encouraged.

Evidence

The Label Committee is responsible for the follow-up of the recommendations, but ECTNA does not present clear evidence of systematic follow-up. In this sense, there is not a structured follow-up procedure to ensure that recommendations are dealt with appropriately and that any required action plans are drawn up and implemented.

Further no meetings with institutional or programme representatives were shown as evidence.

Analysis

Firstly, the fact that the recommendations are so brief indicates that follow-up is not one of the objectives of the process.

Secondly, the objective of the label applicants seems primarily to be obtainment of the label, not necessarily to ensure improvement of the degree. Once the programme has demonstrated its necessary chemistry subject qualifications to obtain the label, the process is basically complete.

Another evidence is that the brief ECTNA document on renewal of labels states that a much less detailed self-evaluation report is required (cf. standard 2.7) and that the site visit may not be considered necessary.

Conclusion

ECTNA does not comply with ESG 2.6

ESG 2.7 Periodic reviews

Standard

External quality assurance of institutions and/or programmes should be undertaken on a cyclical basis. The length of the cycle and the review procedures to be used should be clearly defined and published in advance.

Guidelines: Quality assurance is not a static but a dynamic process. It should be continuous and not 'once in a lifetime'. It does not end with the first review or with the completion of the formal follow-up procedure. It has to be periodically renewed. Subsequent external reviews should take into account progress that has been made since the previous event. The process to be used in all external reviews should be clearly defined by the external quality assurance agency and its demands on institutions should not be greater than are necessary for the achievement of its objectives.

Evidence

In the Guidelines for applications for the Chemistry Eurolabels the length of a cycle is defined as follows: "The Eurolabels are awarded for a period of five academic years and can be renewed for further periods of five years. Applications for renewal will require a much less detailed self-evaluation report".

However, renewal of a label is not obligatory. It follows from the documentation that some of the labels have been renewed, others have not.

Analysis

The design of the Eurolabels includes defined periods. Although the aim of ECTNA obviously is the renewal of all the labels and even if renewal seems mostly to be the case, still the fact that the label process is basically voluntary diminishes the cyclical nature of the process.

In the Panel's view the label framework can lead to a static and not the dynamic process, which is pre-supposed by the ESG. Once the program has obtained the label and during the five years in which the label is valid, no review or monitoring report of degree quality is expected.

Conclusion

ECTNA partially complies with ESG 2.7

ESG 2.8 System-wide analyses

Standard

Quality assurance agencies should produce from time to time summary reports describing and analysing the general findings of their reviews, evaluations, assessments etc.

Guidelines: All external quality assurance agencies collect a wealth of information about individual programmes and/or institutions and this provides material for structured analyses across whole higher education systems. Such analyses can provide very useful information about developments, trends, emerging good practice and areas of persistent difficulty or weakness and can become useful tools for policy development and quality enhancement. Agencies should consider including a research and development function within their activities, to help them extract maximum benefit from their work

Evidence

There is no evidence in the ECTNA SER or on the ECTNA web-site of summary reports describing and analysing the general findings of the reviews undertaken by ECTNA.

ECTNA itself only considers as system-wide analysis the web-published list of issued Eurolabels, cf. the statement in the SER: "*Our websites describe our work by carrying an up-to-date list of Quality Labels awarded*".

Analysis

The Panel understands the ESG requirement for system-wide analysis as the analysis of the information collected during assessments. In this sense, the Panel does not recognize as a system-wide analysis a mere list of degrees that have received the Eurolabel. The Panel must therefore conclude that ECTNA does not produce system-wide analyses.

The Panel feels confident, however, that ECTNA has substantial information about developments, trends, and best practices of programs of chemistry in Europe that could be analyzed and subsequently published in the form of reports, summaries, or statistics.

Conclusion

ECTNA does not comply with ESG 2.8

ESG Part 3: EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCIES

ENQA criterion 1 / ESG 3.1 Use of external quality assurance procedures

Standard

The external quality assurance agencies should take into account the presence and effectiveness of the external quality assurance processes described in Part 2 of the European Standards and Guidelines.

Guidelines: The standards for external quality assurance contained in Part 2 provide a valuable basis for the external quality assessment process. The standards reflect best practices and experiences gained through the development of external quality assurance in Europe since the early 1990s. It is therefore important that these standards are integrated into the processes applied by external quality assurance agencies towards the higher education institutions. The standards for external quality assurance should together with the standards for external quality assurance agencies constitute the basis for professional and credible external quality assurance of higher education institutions.

Evidence

Standard 3.1 includes the whole part 2 of ESG

Analysis

ECTNA does not comply with ESG 2.5, 2.6, 2.8

ECTNA partially complies with ESG 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7

Conclusion

Overall, the Review Panel concludes that ECTNA partially complies with ESG 3.1.

ENQA criterion 2 / ESG 3.2: Official status

Standard

Agencies should be formally recognised by competent public authorities in the European Higher Education Area as agencies with responsibilities for external quality assurance and should have an established legal basis. They should comply with any requirements of the legislative jurisdictions within which they operate.

The ENQA Board has decided that this criterion does not apply for applicants for review in the category in which ECTNA belongs.

ENQA criterion 1 /ESG 3.3 Activities

Standard

Agencies should undertake external quality assurance activities (at institutional or programme level) on a regular basis.

Guidelines: These may involve evaluation, review, audit, assessment, accreditation or other similar activities and should be part of the core functions of the agency

Evidence

The aim of ECTNA is described in its statutes as the supervision of programmes and certification of achievements. There is a regular activity of reviews of programmes that apply for the Eurolabels. 164 reviews have taken place until now. However, a large part of the reviews (70) has been the operational responsibility of partner organisations; cf. the table on page (13) of this report.

Analysis

In continuation of the analysis of ESG 2.7 the Panel finds that although the aim of ECTNA is to review applications for Eurolabels and to review applications for renewal of issued labels, the voluntary character of ECTNA procedures implies that ECTNA cannot fully demonstrate the regularity of its activities. Even more importantly the substantial review load carried by partners does detract from the extent to which it is possible to confirm a regularity of ECTNA activities by themselves.

Conclusion

ECTNA partially complies with ESG 3.3

ENQA criterion 3 / ESG 3.4: Resources

Standard

Agencies should have adequate and proportional resources, both human and financial, to enable them to organise and run their external quality assurance process(es) in an effective and efficient manner, with appropriate provision for the development of their processes, procedures and staff.

Evidence

Financial resources

ECTNA has an annual budget of approximately 37.000 € per year, which comes from the member subscriptions (350 € per year).

Applicants for Quality Labels pay fees, which in turn cover the costs of site visits and a small fee to the site visit experts. The European Commission funding is no longer available. So in 2012, the income from members' fees, application fees and bank interest was 63.000€. It follows that this income is not guaranteed.

Facilities

ECTNA has no permanent office facilities of their own, but the European Society for Engineering Education (SEFI) makes a meeting room available in Brussels for smaller ECTNA meetings. ECTNA does not have its own database and evidently makes use of information systems from member institutions. E.g. the web link for on-line training of experts is a link to a Greek university and not to the ECTNA web site.

Human resources

For budget reasons ECTNA has decided not to employ permanent or part-time basis staff. Therefore ECTNA has only one part-time employee available to help with administrative issues.

Members of ECTNA Council and committees do not receive any fees for their work. Thus all members work on a voluntary basis.

ECTNA has a pool of 60 experts for the reviews.

Analysis

As the funds are not guaranteed, ECTNA finances are completely dependent on fees from members and therefore dependent on stability and even growth of membership. It is the view of the Panel that the limitations and fragility of the financial basis constitute a problem.

ECTNA has no staff and its activities are based on the voluntary work of members and committees. Though the Panel received a strong impression of the motivation and professional qualifications of the ECTNA members it met during the site visit, at the same time the Panel does consider it a problem that there is not in the organisation any permanent professionalism available from an even limited professional staff. Such professionalism would strengthen ECTNA's capacity for the continuity and development of its processes – and it would diminish the work load of the voluntary council and committee members.

Conclusion

ECTNA partially complies with ESG 3.4

ENQA criterion 4 / ESG 3.5: Mission statement

Standard

Agencies should have clear and explicit goals and objectives for their work, contained in a publicly available statement.

Guidelines:

These statements should describe the goals and objectives of agencies' quality assurance processes, the division of labour with relevant stakeholders in higher education, especially the higher education institutions, and the cultural and historical context of their work. The statements should make clear that the external quality assurance process is a major activity of the agency and that there exists a systematic approach to achieving its goals and objectives. There should also be documentation to demonstrate how the statements are translated into a clear policy and management plan.

Evidence

In the SER ECTNA has defined its mission as:

"Our mission is to ensure that the Eurobachelor®, Euromaster® and Chemistry DoctorateEurolabel® awarded by ECTNA and its partners set the standards for chemistry higher education in Europe and ensure that Bachelor, Master and Doctoral degrees offered by European higher education institutions are comparable and easily readable as far as skills, competences and learning outcomes are concerned."

ECTNA presented as evidence a Management Plan that describes the composition and the responsibilities of each Committee and the generic plans for the next two years. The mission and the document presented as Management Plan are not published on the web site of ECTNA.

Chapter 2 of the ECTNA statutes includes the objectives and aims of the Association.

Analysis

The not publicly available strategic document is not in itself sufficient evidence that ECTNA has in place a Strategic Plan in the ESG 3.5 sense.

Accordingly ECTNA does not have clear and explicit goals and objectives for their work that make evident that an external quality assurance process is the major activity of ECTNA. Also the mission statement does not incorporate the division of labour with relevant stakeholders in higher education, especially the higher education institutions.

Nevertheless the aims of the labels promoted by ECTNA are to provide degrees, which will be recognised by other European institutions.

Conclusion

ECTNA partially complies with ESG 3.5

ENQA criterion 5 / ESG 3.6: Independence

Standard

Agencies should be independent to the extent both that they have autonomous responsibility for their operations and that the conclusions and recommendations made in their reports cannot be influenced by third parties such as higher education institutions, ministries or other stakeholders.

Guidelines: An agency will need to demonstrate its independence through measures, such as:

- its operational independence from higher education institutions and governments is guaranteed in official documentation (e.g. instrument of governance or legislative acts)
- the definition and operation of its procedures and methods, the nomination and appointment of external experts and the determination of the outcomes of its quality assurance processes are undertaken autonomously and independently from governments, higher education institutions, and organs of political influence
- while relevant stakeholders in higher education, particularly students/learners, are consulted in the course of quality assurance processes, the final outcomes of the quality assurance processes remain the responsibility of the agency.

Evidence

ECTNA's operational independence from governments is evident, as ECTNA has no formal ties with ministers or governments.

The evidence is less clear that ECTNA as an organisation has full operational autonomy from the higher education institutions that constitute its membership.

All members of the association: higher education institutions, companies or associations may participate in various groups and standing committees through their nominated personal representative.

In the same way the General Assembly, which includes all members, appoints or dismisses the individual members of the Administrative Council, which is the body responsible for the general policy and the management of the Association.

The members of the Label Committee which deals with the Eurolabels are appointed by the General Assembly and the chair, vice chair and executive secretary are selected by the Administrative Council.

Membership of ECTNA is open for all European institutions whether or not awarded with the Eurolabels.

Members of the Label Committees are eligible for appointment as experts.

ECTNA does not have a Code of Conduct or official documentation that shows that the independence of ECTNA processes and decisions is guaranteed in relation to member organisations.

Analysis

ECTNA declares itself to be 'completely autonomous'.

The fact that ECTNA is a member organization that reviews its members does imply the need for some kind of Code of Conduct or official documentation that in the context of label assessment the independence of individual members is guaranteed. During the site visit the members from the Label Committee interviewed assured that they act independently, but at the same time they stressed that their goal is that applicants receive a certification for an optimal level of excellence in chemistry.

To this end, prior to a review ECTNA, advises the applicant institution about the real possibilities of obtaining the label. If the chemistry degree in question is not perceived to meet ECTNA criteria the recommendation to the applicant is to withdraw the application. Accordingly it is perhaps not surprising that there has not till now been any reviews with a negative outcome.

Because of the lack of documentation the Panel considers it difficult to assess exactly the limits of operational independence of ECTNA in relation to its member organisations. The Panel must therefore under the circumstances accept ECTNA leadership's serious assurance that independence is not under threat.

Conclusion

ECTNA substantially complies with ESG 3.6

4.6 ENQA criterion 6 / ESG 3.7 External quality assurance criteria and processes used by the members

Standard

The processes, criteria and procedures used by agencies should be pre-defined and publicly available.

These processes will normally be expected to include:

- a self-assessment or equivalent procedure by the subject of the quality assurance process;

- an external assessment by a group of experts, including, as appropriate, (a) student member(s), and site visits as decided by the agency;
- publication of a report, including any decisions, recommendations or other formal outcomes;
- a follow-up procedure to review actions taken by the subject of the quality assurance process in the light of any recommendations contained in the report.

Guidelines: Agencies may develop and use other processes and procedures for particular purposes.

Agencies should pay careful attention to their declared principles at all times, and ensure both that their requirements and processes are managed professionally and that their conclusions and decisions are reached in a consistent manner, even though the decisions are formed by groups of different people.

Agencies that make formal quality assurance decisions, or conclusions which have formal consequences, should have an appeals procedure. The nature and form of the appeals procedure should be determined in the light of the constitution of each agency.

Evidence

The Frameworks and Guidelines for Applicants for the Chemistry Eurolabels (bachelor, master and doctorate) used by ECTNA are defined and published on the website. (See ESG part 2)

All types of assessments include a self-assessment report, an external assessment, site visits done by a group of experts and the publication of the result of the assessment, but not publication of the report itself.

The self-evaluation report is defined in the guidelines.

The panel is composed of three experts, two nominated from the pools of experts of ECTNA and one national expert. The panel does not include a student.

The reports are composed by two parts: one for the HEi and the other for the Label Committee. Neither of the two parts is publicly available.

ECTNA only publishes on its web site the list of degrees with Eurolabel.

The report could include recommendations and conditions, but the way in which the follow-up procedure is applied is not well defined.

Appeals may be made to the President of ECTNA, but there is not any written procedure.

ECTNA explains that no institution has yet found it necessary to appeal on any points.

Analysis

The frameworks and guidelines for applicants are well structured and comprehensive. The Panel considers them to be some of the best documents that ECTNA put forward.

However, the SERs of applicants presented to the Panel are quite extensive running up to 150 pages, but for the distinctly major part presenting details of study plans and curricula. Even more important the review reports shown as evidence are exceedingly brief and in their two or three pages it is not possible to identify at all whether all the requirements of frameworks and guidelines are in reality met. Prominent examples of this are the lack of report evidence that qualifications of staff, learning outcomes and others have been observed by the panels. At the site visit the Label Committee argued that it was its objective that reports are short and concrete.

In the future, ECTNA will establish a student group named "Youth for Science Education" and ECTNA leadership demonstrated willingness to consider including students in their review panels. The Panel must, however, base its assessment on the fact that students are not at the time of the review in place as panel members.

The Panel of course considers the non-publication of reports to be a major issue as well as the lack of proper appeals procedures. In the latter case it is not a sufficient argument that no appeals have yet been launched.

Conclusion

ECTNA partially complies with ESG 3.7

4.7 ENQA criterion 7 / ESG 3.8: Accountability procedures

Standard

Agencies should have in place procedures for their own accountability.

Guidelines: These procedures are expected to include the following:

1. A published policy for the assurance of the quality of the agency itself, made available on its website.
2. Documentation which demonstrates that:
 - the agency's processes and results reflect its mission and goals of quality assurance
 - the agency has in place, and enforces, a no-conflict-of-interest mechanism in the work of its external experts
 - the agency has reliable mechanisms that ensure the quality of any activities and material produced by subcontractors, if some or all of the elements in its quality assurance procedure are subcontracted to other parties

- the agency has in place internal quality assurance procedures which include an internal feedback mechanism (ie means to collect feedback from its own staff and council/Board); an internal reflection mechanism (ie means to react to internal and external recommendations for improvement); and an external feedback mechanism (ie means to collect feedback from experts and reviewed institutions for future development) in order to inform and underpin its own development and improvement.
3. A mandatory cyclical external review of the agency's activities at least once every five years.

Evidence

In the SER, ECTNA declares that it is only accountable to itself for its decisions. Accordingly there is no documentation that demonstrates evidence of:

- A policy for the assurance of the quality of ECTNA and its processes.
- A mechanism that ensures the quality of the evaluations produced by subcontractors. The Panel considers ASIIN, the Italian Chemical Society or the Polish University Accreditation Commission to act as subcontractors. But the Panel did not find evidence of any system to monitor the reviews done by these subcontractors. This constitutes a major problem in the light of the fact that partners have operational responsibility for app. 40 percent of the reviews.
- A mechanism that assures a no-conflict-of-interest in the work of its external experts.
- Internal quality assurance procedures, which include an internal feedback mechanism, an internal reflection mechanism or an external feedback mechanism.

ECTNA took the initiative of asking ENQA for a review of its compliance with the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in a cyclical external review, which shall be carried out every five years.

Analysis

The Panel finds no evidence that ECTNA meets the requirements of ESG 3.8.

Conclusion

ECTNA does not comply with ENQA ESG 3.8

4.8 ENQA criterion 8: Miscellaneous

- The Agency pays careful attention to its declared principles at all times, and ensures both that its requirements and processes are managed professionally and that its judgements are reached in a consistent manner, even if the judgements are formed by different groups.
- If the Agency makes formal quality assurance decisions, or conclusions which have formal consequences, it should have an appeals procedure. The nature and

form of the appeals procedure should be determined in the light of the constitution of the Agency.

iii. The Agency is willing to contribute actively to the aims of ENQA.

Evidence

Consistency of Judgements

ECTNA states that "labels are completely consistent based as they are on fully published documentation". Apart from the already mentioned fact that there is no real public documentation, the consistency between the reviews done by partners and by ECTNA itself is not clearly established. Although there is an international agreement on Eurolabels between ECTNA and partners, the criteria about how to manage the reviews are different; for example: pool of experts, reporting structure, language of the report, criteria about publication of reports.

ECTNA explained during the site visit that the first reviews done by the partners were supervised by one member of the Label Committee.

Appeals

Appeals can be made to the President of ECTNA, but there is not any documented procedure. ECTNA explains that no institution has found it necessary to appeal on any points. The Panel re-affirms its point under ESG 3.7 that proper appeals procedures must be in place and that it is not a sufficient argument that no appeals have yet been launched.

Contribution to the aims of ENQA

It is the Panel's impression from the site visit that ECTNA has been actively engaged in the European arena and has been working actively "to be recognised as the preferred partner in all matters relating to the development of QA in the chemical sciences at the European level".

ECTNA's European vision is clear, being co-founder and member of European organizations such as EASPA (European Association for Subject-Specific and Professional Accreditation and Quality Assurance), but always focused on chemistry field.

The ECTNA leadership demonstrated clearly during the site visit their commitment towards associate membership of ENQA, which would allow them to work and share experiences with other European agencies.

Analysis

Analysis of ECTNA activities is offered above:

- in relation to consistency of decisions (ESG 2.3): ECTNA partially complies
- in relation with the appeals procedure (ESG 3.7): ECTNA does not comply

- the Panel considers that ECTNA in the future could contribute to the aims of ENQA

Conclusion

ECTNA partially complies with criterion 8

6. Conclusion and recommendations

6.1 Conclusion

After carefully considering the evidence the Panel must conclude that ECTNA is certainly only partially compliant with ESG and ENQA criteria for membership.

At the same time the Panel wishes to emphasize that throughout the review process it has been impressed by the seriousness of purpose of ECTNA as an organisation. The initiative to embark on a process of subject professional reviews of European chemistry programmes can only be applauded as can the very high level of motivation and subject professional qualifications characteristic of the ECTNA leadership representatives met by the Panel.

It is obvious to the Panel that ECTNA leadership has not been fully aware of the implications of demonstrating compliance with ESG and ENQA membership criteria. As a consequence ECTNA has not taken the opportunity to adapt key procedures to such an extent that compliance at a satisfactory level had been achieved before this review took place.

However, during the site visit and especially the final session with ECTNA leadership the Panel received positive indication that ECTNA is now prepared to readjust and revise its framework for reviews in the light of points made by the Panel. In the "Statement in Reference to the Draft Report" received 20 August by the Panel, ECTNA further indicates that by September 2013 the following changes in procedures and processes will take place:

- the training of experts will include compliance with the ESG
- a new template for reporting aims to enhance consistency by including a checklist and address strengths as well as weaknesses of the applicant
- site visit team reports will be published when the process is finalised (maximum a year after the site visit)
- members of a recently founded Group on Youth for Science Education will participate in site visits
- procedures of appeal including an appeal system outside ECTNA will be formalised and published

The Panel has agreed on a series of recommendations for the eventual process leading ECTNA towards a future renewed application. The proposed ECTNA changes cited above go towards meeting these recommendations, which are all listed in the next paragraph.

6.2 Recommendations

The Panel has decided on the basis of its review and analysis of ECTNA compliance with ESG and ENQA membership criteria that ECTNA would benefit from following the recommendations listed below.

In relation to ESG – part 2, the Panel recommends that:

1. ECTNA should make the link between the ECTNA criteria and ESG Part 1 more explicit in the review frameworks. ECTNA should at least increase focus on a label applicant's internal quality assurance.
2. ECTNA should strengthen the systematic involvement of external stakeholders in the development or modification of ECTNA frameworks. The Panel recommends an active dialogue with the higher education institutions on the outcomes of label reviews and the potential contribution of these to the further development of chemical study programs.
3. ECTNA should have a clear policy on its cooperation and division of labour with its partner organizations with a view to ensuring the necessary consistency of label reviews.
4. ECTNA should include students in its review panels. In this connection ECTNA should make contact with ESU with a view to cooperate on identifying students with relevant qualifications for reviewing chemistry programs.
5. ECTNA should include basic knowledge of broader quality assurance elements in higher education studies in training of experts. Training should also include practical training in the operational dimensions of external reviews such as handling documentation, conducting site visits and drafting reports.
6. ECTNA should develop more extensive and comprehensive reporting on Eurolabel reviews. These reports should contain more information on the criteria, the analyses, conclusions and recommendations of the review panel.
7. ECTNA should make final reports available to the general public for instance by publishing reports on the ECTNA website.
8. ECTNA should strengthen the systematic follow-up on its reviews.
9. ECTNA should look for ways to assure the periodicity of label reviews.
10. ECTNA should work to develop and publish system-wide analyses, drawing on the outcomes of its reviews.

11. In general, ECTNA should work to align its frameworks and evaluations more closely with the ESG.

In relation to ESG – part 3, the Panel recommends that:

1. ECTNA should develop a clear strategic plan deriving from its mission statement and make this the basis for an annual action plan.
2. ECTNA should develop explicit goals and objectives which make evident that external quality assurance processes are an ECTNA major activity.
3. ECTNA should make more transparent the regular and cyclical nature of its label review activities. This also includes delineating more clearly the division of labour with partner organizations.
4. ECTNA processes should include further to the publication of the report also transparent follow-up procedures.
5. ECTNA should develop an appeal procedure.
6. ECTNA should consider developing even a small secretariat with a professional and permanent staff and in this connection consider also to bolster its financial basis.
7. ECTNA should consider the introduction of a mechanism to ensure the quality of the reviews undertaken by its partner organizations, for example cross-agency processes and exchanges of good practices.
8. ECTNA should develop internal quality assurance procedures, which include a quality policy, plus solid external and internal feedback mechanisms.
9. ECTNA should give a priority to participation in ENQA events in order to get more contacts with people and organizations actually doing reviews according to the ESG.

Annexes

Annex 1-List of evidences received

Annex 2-Schedule of the Site Visit, June 2013

Annex 1: List of evidences received

- Statutes of ECTNA
- List of members of ECTNA
- List of awards
- ECTNA Management Plan
- ECTNA Budget Plan 2013-2014

- Files about Chemistry Eurobachelor Label:
 - Framework of Eurobachelor
 - Guidelines for Applications
 - Example of Eurobachelor Self Assessment
 - Example of Site Visit Report
 - Example of Award letter
 - Example of Certificate of Chemistry Eurobachelor
 - Examples of conditions or recommendations at the EuroBachelor level

- Files about Chemistry Euromaster Label:
 - Guidelines for Applications
 - Framework of Euromaster
 - Example of Euromaster Label application report
 - Example of Award letter

- Files about Chemistry Eurodoctorate Label:
 - Framework – designing European Third Cycle Programmes in Chemistry

- Guidelines for Applications
 - Example of Self-evaluation report
 - Example of Report
- Guidelines for Re-application
- Register of experts
- Criteria for joining the pool of experts
- Example of training process – link to website www.ecampus.echem.auth.gr
- International Agreement on Eurolabels

Annex 2. Shedule

ENQA Site Visit – Programme

Monday 10 June 2013				
1	09:30 – 10:30	<p>Initial meeting.</p> <p>The site visit programme</p> <p>Discussion of the ECTNA SER</p> <p>Introduction of eventual supplementary documents.</p>	Professor Varella and colleagues involved in the SER process and ENQA application	<p>E. Varella, ECTNA Past President</p> <p>O. Mò Romero, ECTNA Vice President</p> <p>R. Whewell, ECTNA Advisory Board member</p> <p>A. Smith, ECTNA Executive Secretary</p> <p>A. Laganà, Chair of VEC Committee</p>
2	10:30 – 11:30	Interview and Discussion	Administrative Council representatives	<p>E. Varella, ECTNA Past President</p> <p>O. Mò Romero, ECTNA Vice President</p> <p>G. Borzone, AC member</p> <p>A. Smith, ECTNA Executive Secretary</p> <p>A. Laganà, Chair of VEC Committee</p>
3	11:30 – 13:00	Interview and Discussion	Label Committee representatives	<p>R. Salzer, LC Chair</p> <p>E. Varella, LC Executive Secretary</p> <p>E. Rosenberg, LC Former Vice Chair</p> <p>J.A. Renuncio Rodriguez, LC member</p>

	13:00 – 14:00	Lunch	Panel	
4	14:00 – 15:30	Interview and Discussion	Experts with experience in reviewing programmes for Quality Label awards	R. Salzer, expert E. Varella, expert E. Rosenberg, expert J.A. Renuncio Rodriguez, expert G. Borzone, expert R. Whewell, expert
5	15:30-17:00	Interview and Discussion	Representatives of quality assurance agencies in partnership with ECTNA EuCheMS officer	A. Laganà, Italian Chemical Society N. Majcen, EuCheMS Secretary General J. Moehren, ASIIN (on the telephone)
	17:00 – 17:45	Wrap up session 1. Day	Panel	
Tuesday 11 June 2013				
6	10:00 – 11:00	Status on progress of site visit and eventual need for further documentation	Professor Varella and colleagues involved in the SER process and ENQA application	E. Varella, ECTNA Past President O. Mò Romero, ECTNA Vice President R. Whewell, ECTNA Advisory Board member R. Salzer, LC Chair A. Smith, ECTNA Executive Secretary G. Borzone, expert

7	11:30 – 12:30	Interview and Discussion	Quality Label holders	<p>E. Varella, Eurobachelor</p> <p>A. Smith, Euromaster</p> <p>Otilia Mò Romero, Euromaster for Consortium</p> <p>G. Borzone, Eurobachelor, Euromaster & Doctorate Eurolabel</p> <p>J.A. Renuncio Rodriguez, observant</p>
	12:30-13:30	Lunch	Panel	
	13:30 – 15:00	Wrap up session 2. day	Panel	
8	15:00 – 16:00	Final meeting and preliminary Panel feedback	Panel members & ECTNA leadership	<p>E. Varella, ECTNA Past President</p> <p>O. Mò Romero, ECTNA Vice President</p> <p>R. Whewell, ECTNA Advisory Board member</p> <p>A. Smith, ECTNA Executive Secretary</p>

