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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*This sections states the aims and purposes of the review and provides a brief description of the agency subject to review. It summarises the degrees of compliance with the various ESG standards and provides the panel’s recommendation. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum …

# INTRODUCTION

*The reason for commissioning the review should be included below. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

This report analyses the compliance of [agency’s name] ([agency’s name in native language], [agency’s abbreviation]) with the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG). It is based on an external review conducted in [period in months (from self-analysis until the finalisation of the review report), year].

## Background of the review and outline of the review process

### Background of the review

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

As this is [agency’s name] first external review, the panel is expected to pay particular attention to the policies, procedures, and criteria in place, being aware that full evidence of concrete results in all areas may not be available at this stage.

**Or**

As this is [agency’s name] [second/third/etc.] review, the panel is expected to provide clear evidence of results in all areas and to acknowledge progress from the previous review. The panel has adopted a developmental approach, as the *Guidelines for ENQA Agency Reviews* aim at constant enhancement of the agencies.

## Main findings of the [year of previous review] review

*If the agency underwent a previous review, a summary of the conclusions/levels of compliance should be mentioned here (with a mention of the corresponding annex). This box to be deleted before publishing. In the case of a first review, this section can be deleted.*

Lorem ipsum ….

## Review process

*This section describes how the review was carried out, e.g. what was the work method employed, how consensus was reached within the Panel, what were the administrative support arrangements, etc.). This box to be deleted before publishing.*

The [year] external review of [agency’s name] was conducted in line with the process described in the *Guidelines for ENQA Agency Reviews* and in accordance with the timeline set out in the Terms of Reference. The panel for the external review of [agency’s name] was appointed by ENQA and composed of the following members:

* Name (Chair), position, country;
* Name (Secretary), position, country;
* Name, position, country;
* Name, position, country

*Please also mention above which of the panel members was an ESU nominated student member, which one was a nominee of EUA/EURASHE and, if applicable, which of the panel members was a representative of the employers/world of work.*

*Student expert nominated by ESU should be referred to as “Member of the European Students’ Union Quality Assurance Student Experts Pool ”.*

*This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ….

*Please note that ENQA’s editing guidelines require the words “agency”, “review panel”, “review”, etc. to not be capitalised. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

#### Self-assessment report

*This section includes a description of the self-assessment process, overview of SAR and an evaluation of its contents. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ….

**Site visit**

*This section offers a summary of the activities of the site visit and a generic list of stakeholders who were interviewed (the specific list of interviewees is in the annex). In the case of an online site visit, the report should state this clearly as well as that the panel members explicitly agreed to have an online site visit. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

## Higher education and quality assurance system of the agency

### Higher education system

*This section contains a description/history of the higher education system in which the agency predominantly operates (where relevant). This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ….

### Quality assurance

*This section provides a description of the history/role of quality assurance in the aforementioned higher education system/context (where relevant) and the main actors involved, as well as their relationships. For non-nationally and non-regionally placed agencies the role and relationship to eventual related national/regional agencies should be described. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ….

## [agency]

*This section explains the history/establishment/foundation of the agency. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

[Agency’s name] was established…

### [Agency]’s organisation/structure

*This section explains the organisation/structure and governance of the agency. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ...

### [Agency]’s functions, activities, procedures

*This section explains the functions/activities/procedures/methodologies of the agency in its “home” jurisdiction and abroad (if applicable). The external QA activities of the agency should be* *presented in a brief manner, elaborating primarily on the aims and objectives of each activity and how these activities fit the agency’s profile. A more detailed description of quality assurance activities that fall under the ESG is then provided under ESG 3.1. The section should also include a description of the international activities of the agency (other than quality assurance activities/cross-border activities which need to be addressed and described with the other quality assurance activities of the agency). This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ….

### [Agency]’s funding

*This section explains the funding of the agency. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ….

# FINDINGS: COMPLIANCE OF [AGENCY] WITH THE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (ESG)

## ESG Part 3: Quality assurance agencies

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

Standard:

Agencies should undertake external quality assurance activities as defined in Part 2 of the ESG on a regular basis. They should have clear and explicit goals and objectives that are part of their publicly available mission statement. These should translate into the daily work of the agency. Agencies should ensure the involvement of stakeholders in their governance and work.

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 3.2 Official status

Standard:

Agencies should have an established legal basis and should be formally recognised as quality assurance agencies by competent public authorities.

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 3.3 Independence

Standard:

Agencies should be independent and act autonomously. They should have full responsibility for their operations and the outcomes of those operations without third party influence.

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 3.4 Thematic analysis

Standard:

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

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 3.5 Resources

Standard:

Agencies should have adequate and appropriate resources, both human and financial, to carry out their work.

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 3.6 Internal quality assurance and professional conduct

Standard:

Agencies should have in place processes for internal quality assurance related to defining, assuring and enhancing the quality and integrity of their activities.

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 3.7 Cyclical external review of agencies

Standard:

Agencies should undergo an external review at least once every five years in order to demonstrate their compliance with the ESG.

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

## ESG Part 2: External quality assurance

### ESG 2.1 Consideration of internal quality assurance

Standard:

External quality assurance should address the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance processes described in Part 1 of the ESG.

*Under this standard, the report should describe and analyse the way in which the agency addresses the IQA system of the institutions and a mapping of the standards used by agency against the ESG Part 1 standards 1.1 – 1.10. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 2.2 Designing methodologies fit for purpose

Standard:

External quality assurance should be defined and designed specifically to ensure its fitness to achieve the aims and objectives set for it, while taking into account relevant regulations. Stakeholders should be involved in its design and continuous improvement.

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 2.3 Implementing processes

Standard:

External quality assurance processes should be reliable, useful, pre-defined, implemented consistently and published. They include:

* a self-assessment or equivalent
* an external assessment normally including a site visit
* a report resulting from the external assessment
* a consistent follow-up

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 2.4 Peer-review experts

Standard:

External quality assurance should be carried out by groups of external experts that include (a) student member(s).

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 2.5 Criteria for outcomes

Standard:

Any outcomes or judgements made as the result of external quality assurance should be based on explicit and published criteria that are applied consistently, irrespective of whether the process leads to a formal decision.

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 2.6 Reporting

Standard:

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

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

### ESG 2.7 Complaints and appeals

Standard:

Complaints and appeals processes should be clearly defined as part of the design of external quality assurance processes and communicated to the institutions.

**[Year of previous review] review recommendation [quoted, if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of not only the standard, but guidelines as well should be given with explicit reference to the written documents (SAR, agency methodologies, review reports, analytical papers, legislation, etc.), oral testimonies (of agency staff and other stakeholders), and any other available evidence when and if applicable. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Analysis**

*In this part, the panel is expected to provide an analysis (a consideration of how far, based on the evidence available, the agency does [or does not] meet the ESG standard and eventual reasons or explanations for lack of compliance) of the evidence provided under “evidence”. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

 **[Panel commendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement]**

*In this part, the panel can suggest areas or issues for the further improvement of the agency. These suggestions are different from compliance related recommendations as they are solely for development purposes. The agency has no obligation to follow up these suggestions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

**Panel conclusion: (fully/substantially/partially/non-compliant)**

# ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS (optional section)

*Even when the sole purpose of the review is to assess the agency’s compliance with the ESG for purposes of ENQA membership application, the review panel may include in its report any additional reflections or developmental recommendations that it may wish to offer. If these are extensive, they can be included in this optional additional section of the report, or if brief, as part of the conclusions. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

## Heading 1

Lorem ipsum…

## Heading 2

Lorem ipsum…

# CONCLUSION

## Summary of commendations

[A list of commendations in relation to each ESG standard if applicable]

## Overview of judgements and recommendations

[A list of judgements and recommendations in relation to each ESG standard]

In light of the documentary and oral evidence considered by it, the review panel is satisfied that, in the performance of its functions, [agency’s name] is in compliance with the ESG.

OR

In light of the documentary and oral evidence considered by it, the review panel considers that, in the performance of its functions, [agency’s name] does not comply with the ESG. The agency is recommended to take appropriate action to achieve compliance in all standards at the earliest opportunity.

## Suggestions for further development

*The panel would like to make some general and more detailed suggestions, extending beyond strictly interpreted ESG and/or linking several ESG, which [agency’s name] may wish to consider when reflecting on its further development. Some of them have already been signalled in the previous sections.* *This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ….

# ANNEXES

## Annex 1: Programme of the site visit

| SESSION NO. | TIMING | TOPIC | PERSONS FOR INTERVIEW | LEAD PANEL MEMBER |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [DD.MM.YYYY] |
| 1 | 120 min | Review panel’s kick-off meeting and preparations for day I | *(include name and title)* |  |
| 2 | As necessary | A pre-visit meeting with the agency’s resource person to clarify any remaining question after the online clarification meeting[[1]](#footnote-1) |  |  |
| [DD.MM.YYYY] |
| 3 | 30 min | Review panel’s private meeting |  |  |
| 4 | 45 min | Meeting with the CEO and the Chair of the Board (or equivalent) |  |  |
|  | 15 min | Review panel’s private discussion |  |  |
| 5 | 45 min | Meeting with the team responsible for preparation of the self-assessment report |  |  |
|  | 15 min | Review panel’s private discussion |  |  |
| 6 | 45 min | Meeting with representatives from the Senior Management Team |  |  |
|  | 15 min | Review panel’s private discussion |  |  |
| 7 | 45 min | Meeting with key staff of the agency/staff in charge of external QA activities |  |  |
|  | 60 min | Lunch (panel only) |  |  |
| 8 | 45 min | Meeting with department/key body of the agency 1 |  |  |
|  | 15 min | Review panel’s private discussion |  |  |
| 9 | 45 min | Meeting with department/key body of the agency 2 |  |  |
|  | 60 min | Wrap-up meeting among panel members and preparations for day II |  |  |
|  |  | Dinner (panel only) |  |  |
| [DD.MM.YYYY] |
| 10 | 60 min | Review panel’s private meeting |  |  |
| 11 | 45 min | Meeting with ministry representatives (where relevant) |  |  |
|  | 15 min | Review panel’s private discussion |  |  |
| 12 | 45 min | Meeting with heads of some reviewed HEIs/ HEI representatives |  |  |
|  | 15 min | Review panel’s private discussion |  |  |
| 13 | 45 min | Meeting with quality assurance officers of HEIs |  |  |
|  | 60 min | Lunch (panel only) |  |  |
| 14 | 45 min | Meeting with representatives from the reviewers’ pool |  |  |
|  | 15 min | Review panel’s private discussion |  |  |
| 15 | 45 min | Meeting with stakeholders, such as employers, students, local community |  |  |
|  | 15 min | Review panel’s private discussion |  |  |
| 16 | 45 min | Meeting with stakeholders, such as employers, students, local community |  |  |
| 17 | 60 min | Wrap-up meeting among panel members: preparation for day III and provisional conclusions |  |  |
| [DD.MM.YYYY] |
| 18 | 60 min | Meeting among panel members to agree on final issues to clarify |  |  |
| 19 | 60 min | Meeting with CEO to clarify any pending issues |  |  |
| 20 | 90 min | Private meeting between panel members to agree on the main findings |  |  |
|  | 60 min | Lunch (panel only) |  |  |
| 21 | 30 min | Final de-briefing meeting with staff and Council/Board members of the agency to inform about preliminary findings |  |  |

## Annex 2: Terms of Reference of the review

*This section includes a description of the main stages and timescale of the review. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

## Annex 3: Glossary

*This section provides an alphabetical listing of the abbreviations mentioned in the report, to be written out in their first use in the text and abbreviated each time thereafter. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ENQA | European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education |
| ESG | *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*, 2015 |
| HE | higher education |
| HEI | higher education institution |
| QA | quality assurance |
| SAR | self-assessment report |

…

## Annex 4. Documents to support the review

### Documents provided by [the agency]

[list]

### Other sources used by the review panel [if any]

[list]

1. Prior to the site visit, an online clarification meeting is organised with the agency’s resource person (see section 6.2.4 of the Guidelines). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)