# CONTENTS

[CONTENTS 1](#_Toc88481798)

[EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3](#_Toc88481799)

[INTRODUCTION 4](#_Toc88481800)

[Background of the review and outline of the review process 4](#_Toc88481801)

[Background of the review 4](#_Toc88481802)

[Scope of the review 4](#_Toc88481803)

[Main findings of the [year of previous review] review 4](#_Toc88481804)

[Review process 5](#_Toc88481805)

[Higher education and quality assurance system of the agency 6](#_Toc88481806)

[Higher education system 6](#_Toc88481807)

[Quality assurance 6](#_Toc88481808)

[[agency] 6](#_Toc88481809)

[[Agency]’s organisation/structure 6](#_Toc88481810)

[[Agency]’s functions, activities, procedures 6](#_Toc88481811)

[[Agency]’s funding 7](#_Toc88481812)

[FINDINGS: COMPLIANCE OF [AGENCY] WITH THE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (ESG) 8](#_Toc88481813)

[ESG Part 3: Quality assurance agencies 8](#_Toc88481814)

[ESG 3.1 Activities, policy, and processes for quality assurance 8](#_Toc88481815)

[ESG 3.2 Official status 9](#_Toc88481816)

[ESG 3.3 Independence 10](#_Toc88481817)

[ESG 3.4 Thematic analysis 11](#_Toc88481818)

[ESG 3.5 Resources 12](#_Toc88481819)

[ESG 3.6 Internal quality assurance and professional conduct 13](#_Toc88481820)

[ESG 3.7 Cyclical external review of agencies 14](#_Toc88481821)

[ESG Part 2: External quality assurance 15](#_Toc88481822)

[ESG 2.1 Consideration of internal quality assurance 15](#_Toc88481823)

[ESG 2.2 Designing methodologies fit for purpose 16](#_Toc88481824)

[ESG 2.3 Implementing processes 17](#_Toc88481825)

[ESG 2.4 Peer-review experts 18](#_Toc88481826)

[ESG 2.5 Criteria for outcomes 19](#_Toc88481827)

[ESG 2.6 Reporting 20](#_Toc88481828)

[ESG 2.7 Complaints and appeals 21](#_Toc88481829)

[ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS (optional section) 23](#_Toc88481830)

[Heading 1 23](#_Toc88481831)

[Heading 2 23](#_Toc88481832)

[CONCLUSION 24](#_Toc88481833)

[Summary of commendations 24](#_Toc88481834)

[Overview of judgements and recommendations 24](#_Toc88481835)

[Suggestions for further improvement 24](#_Toc88481836)

[ANNEXES 25](#_Toc88481837)

[Annex 1: Programme of the site visit 25](#_Toc88481838)

[Annex 2: Terms of Reference of the review 26](#_Toc88481839)

[Annex 3: Glossary 27](#_Toc88481840)

[Annex 4. Documents to support the review 28](#_Toc88481841)

[Documents provided by [the agency] 28](#_Toc88481842)

[Other sources used by the review panel [if any] 28](#_Toc88481843)

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*This section states briefly (max 2 pages) the aims and purposes of the review and provides a brief description of the agency subject to review. More specifically, this section should state the following:*

*• the agency was reviewed against the ESG following the methodology described in the Guidelines for ENQA Agency Reviews,*

*• the purpose of the review (i.e., ENQA membership application/renewal of membership, registration in EQAR and/or any other purpose)*

*• the review period (from the date of the terms of reference to the finalisation of the external review report), including the site visit dates*

*• a short description of the agency (including its vision and mission and key activities)*

*• the key outcomes of the review*

*• a summary of the degrees of compliance with the standards of Parts 2 and 3 of the ESG*

*• panel’s consideration on the agency’s overall compliance with the ESG.*

*This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*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.*

Lorem ipsum …

# INTRODUCTION

*The reason for commissioning the review should be included below (i.e., whether* the review *was conducted for the purposes of ENQA membership application/renewal of membership, registration in EQAR and/or any other purpose). 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 the date of the terms of reference until the finalisation of the review report), year].

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

### Background of the review

*This section should include information on the agency's past reviews against the ESG (successful and unsuccessful), previous membership status in ENQA and registration in EQAR that resulted from these reviews (if any), and previous affiliate status with ENQA (if any). This box to be deleted before publishing.*

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.

### Scope of the review

*This section lists all external quality assurance activities that are included in the terms of reference and are subject to this review. Should the terms of reference exclude any of the agency’s activities from the review, this is explained separately in this section as well. Additionally, the section lists and elaborates on possible additional external quality assurance activities as identified during the review process and fall within the scope of the ESG but were not listed in the terms of reference. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ….

### 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. In the case of a first review, this section should be deleted. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ….

### Review process

*This section describes how the review was carried out, e.g., what review methodology was followed, information on the composition of the panel, and timeline of the review’s key activities (including when was the self-assessment report received by the panel, briefing date of the panel, any other preparatory meetings of the panel, date and mode of site visit, period of drafting the review report, information on provision of factual check by the agency under review, and when the final review report was submitted to ENQA). The section additionally elaborates how consensus was reached within the panel, whether there were any obstacles in performing the review, and whether the panel had access to all documents and stakeholders it wished to consult during the review process. 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

Name and surname (job title), acted as the review coordinator.

*Please also mention above which of the panel members was an ENQA-nominated member, an ESU-nominated member, and 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.*

*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 ….

#### 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 should be provided in the annex). Additionally, this section elaborates on the frankness of communication and overall quality of the dialogue as experienced during the site visit. In the case of an online site visit, the report should state this clearly as well as that the panel members and the agency 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). Among others, the section lists general legal framework for higher education and the higher education degree structure used, ratio between public and private higher education providers, number of higher education institutions within the system (where relevant) and an overall number of students (including a brief reflection on trends in terms of the size of student population). This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ….

### Quality assurance

*This section provides a description of the history and 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. A particular attention is given to elaborating on the agency’s vision and mission and how are they implemented. Should the agency be a member of international organisations, this information can be provided in this section as well. 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 (if possible, the organisational organigram should be added to the report). The section should elaborate on the composition, key tasks, appointment procedure and length of term for each body 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, how these activities fit the agency’s profile, and the period of institutional or programme accreditation/evaluation/audit (where relevant). Should the agency be carrying out activities outside the scope of the ESG, these activities are separately introduced in this section as well, including their relation to the agency’s QA activities. Importantly, the section includes a table listing the number of procedures per each external QA activity of the agency as implemented per year for the last five years. A more detailed description of quality assurance activities that fall under the ESG is provided under ESG 3.1, whereas the processes of these activities are provided under ESG 2.3. 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 (sources of revenue and its main items of expenditure, and the overall change in the budget size in the last five years). 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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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. In particular, the evidence should refer separately to the agency’s organisational independence, operational independence, and independence of formal outcomes. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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.

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

Lorem ipsum….

**Evidence**

*In this part, evidence on implementation of the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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. Under this standard, the report should describe and analyse the way in which the agency addresses the IQA system of the institutions. The panel is expected to provide a mapping grid that summarises how each external QA activity of the agency meets the standards of Part 1 of the ESG. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 the ESG (including standard and guidelines) 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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**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”. Moreover, progress in respect to any previous review should be clearly indicated through analysis on how the agency has addressed the provided recommendations. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

*The link between evidence, analysis and conclusions should be mutually supportive. Also, any commendations/recommendations/suggestions for further improvement should be introduced and elaborated under evidence and analysis. This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel commendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel recommendations] [numbered if any]**

Lorem ipsum….

**[Panel suggestions for further improvement] [numbered if any]**

*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.*

Lorem ipsum….

**Panel conclusion: (compliant/partially compliant/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 suggestions 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

*This section includes a numbered list of panel commendations (if any).* *This box to be deleted before publishing.*

## Overview of judgements and recommendations

*This section includes a list of panel conclusions and numbered list of panel recommendations.* *This box to be deleted before publishing.*

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 improvement

*This section includes a numbered list of suggestions for further improvement.* *This box to be deleted before publishing.*

Lorem ipsum ….

# ANNEXES

## Annex 1: Programme of the site visit

*This section includes the schedule of the meeting. For privacy reasons the interviewees should be listed by including their positions and organisations but without their names.* *This box to be deleted before publishing.*

## 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]