

Prof. Ana M. Bravo del Moral
President
European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education (EAEVE)
Hietzinger Kai 87
A-1133 Vienna
Austria

Bern, 07 May 2018

Subject: Membership of EAEVE in ENQA

Dear Prof. Bravo del Moral,

I am pleased to inform you that, at its meeting of 19 April 2018, the Board of ENQA took the decision that EAEVE meets the necessary requirements for being granted ENQA Membership for five years from the date of the decision. The Board's decision was based on the review report and report scrutiny, and overall, the Board got a positive impression of EAEVE's commitment and progress in reaching substantial compliance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). The Board acknowledges the significant work that EAEVE has undertaken and the major changes that have been implemented to address the recommendations of the 2013 review. At the same time, EAEVE is encouraged to keep developing its activities, for instance, by involving students in its decision making body, the European Committee of Veterinary Education (ECOVE), as recommended by the review panel.

The Board acknowledges that EAEVE is working in a specific professional setup where a holistic integration of the professional standards with the ESG can be challenging. Nevertheless, EAEVE is encouraged to put a specific focus on panel recommendations under the standards ESG 2.1 and 2.5 in order to fully integrate the professional approach with the ESG.

The ENQA Board would also like to provide their articulation regarding the specific standards of the ESG, where the Board's view differs from that of the panel:

ESG 2.6 Reporting

In the light of the evidence provided, the Board acknowledges that consultative visitations are not a separate quality assurance activity but a step in the ESEVT procedure applied in some predefined cases, as described in the review report: *“Admission into EAEVE for veterinary teaching establishments within the EU is based on a simple request. On the other hand, membership candidates from outside the EU have to undergo a screening procedure including a consultative on-site assessment”*. The Board understands that the idea behind the consultative reports is to observe whether the establishment reaches the threshold level to apply for a full visitation by EAEVE but that it does not lead to any decision. Therefore, the Board agrees with the ENQA Review Committee that the panel’s judgement “Substantially compliant” of the ESG 2.6 is overly strict. The Board is of the opinion that only reports resulting from the agency’s quality assurance activities should be published.

The Board expects a follow-up report to be based on the recommendations found in the panel report (as outlined in the attached annex) within two years of its decision, i.e. by May 2020.

In addition, the Board encourages EAEVE to take advantage of the voluntary progress visit – a new enhancement-led feature in the review process. The visit would take place after the submission of the follow-up report, in about two years’ time from this decision. The ENQA Secretariat will be in touch with you in about a year’s time to discuss this possibility. The costs of this visit have already been included as part of the review fee and are non-refundable except for the travel costs of the experts. More information about the progress visit can be found in the [Guidelines for ENQA Agency Reviews](#).

Please accept my congratulations to EAEVE for the positive review outcome and I look forward to fruitful future cooperation.

Yours sincerely,



Christoph Grolimund
President

Annex: Areas for development

Annex: Areas for development

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

ESG 3.4 Thematic analysis

EAEVE is recommended to strengthen its thematic analysis by selecting specific themes, eventually proposed by its members and stakeholders, such as for example: ‘student centred learning’, ‘development of academic staff’, ‘recognition’ or other relevant themes. A thorough and careful analysis of the information can show more developments, trends and areas of good practice or persistent difficulty. EAEVE has to define a cyclic period for its thematic analysis.

ESG 2.1 Consideration of internal quality assurance

It is recommended that the technique suggested and provided by the ESEVT SOP for assessing the ESG 2015 Part 1 is reviewed to make it more fit for purpose and in order to avoid misconceptions and either overlaps or omissions. Instead of seeing the ESG 2015 Part 1 as an add-on feature of quality assurance, it is recommended to integrate the ESG 2015 Part 1 standards and guidelines holistically and directly into the other standards provided in the ESEVT SOP concepts and hands-on templates for writing SERs and evaluation reports. This may render better services to developing and assessing quality and quality assurance policies and practices of higher education institutions.

ESG 2.5 Criteria for outcomes

EAEVE is strongly recommended to review its template for experts’ reporting, in addition to reviewing its template for drafting the SERs, in order to align the template content to the quality criteria (rubrics) laid out in the SOP chapters, and to do so by integrating the ESG 2015 Part 1 (standard 11 of the SOP 2016) holistically into the quality assessment criteria presented in standards 1 – 10 of the SOP 2016 in order to both avoid undue overlap and promulgate better understanding of the quality concepts fostered by ESG 2015 Part 1.

It is also recommended to check more intensely that all reports explicitly cover all the quality parameters in a more holistic and systematic way.

ESG 2.7 Complaints and appeals

EAEVE is recommended to make the complaints procedure (concerning procedural faults, as contrasted by appeals concerning flaws of judgement) explicit by explaining its existence and its

procedures, e.g. in the SOP. Whether or not the complaints procedure can be integrated into the same framework as the appeals procedures, thus creating only one type of process, is a matter of judgement open to EAEVE policy.

Since the appeal procedures can take a lot of time due to fact that ECOVE meets only twice a year, abbreviations in process should be considered, e.g. by using telephone conferences or Skype meetings.