

Prof. Dr. Vladimir Navodnov  
Director  
National Centre of Public Accreditation (NCPA)  
206A Volkova Street  
424000 Yoshkar-Ola  
Russia

Bern, 28 June 2019

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

Dear Prof. Dr. Navodnov,

I am pleased to inform you that, at its meeting of 20 June 2019, the Board of ENQA agreed to reconfirm the NCPA membership of ENQA for five years from that date. The Board concluded that NCPA is in compliance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015) and thus fulfils the membership criteria according to article 6, paragraph 1 of ENQA's rules of procedure.

Overall, the Board commends the efforts NCPA is making to promote European standards of external quality assurance to the higher education sector in Russia.

The Board would like to provide an articulation regarding standard 3.1 Activities, policy and processes for quality assurance, where its opinion differs from that of the panel:

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

The review panel notes that NCPA should *“amend its Statute to explicitly assign the responsibility for overseeing the implementation of its strategy to the General meeting of Founders; to involve a mechanism of risk identification into NCPAs strategic planning; and to revise NCPAs mission statement that it clearly defines the full range of its activities”*. While the recommendation of the review panel under this standard remains justified and relevant, the Board is of the opinion that the panel's judgement of the standard 3.1 as substantially compliant is overly strict as the requirements of the standard are met. Therefore, in the opinion of the Board, the standard 3.1 can be considered as fully compliant.

Furthermore, in relation to standard 2.4 Peer-review experts, the Board would like to specifically highlight the recommendation of the panel and encourages NCPA to include students in all its external quality assurance activities.

The Board would like to receive a follow-up report within two years of its decision, i.e. by June 2021.

The Board also encourages NCPA to take advantage of the voluntary progress visit – an enhancement-led feature in the review process. The visit would take place 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. If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact the ENQA Secretariat.

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

Yours sincerely,



Christoph Grolimund  
President

Annex: Areas for development

### **Annex: Areas for development**

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

#### **ESG 3.3 Independence**

NCPA is recommended to limit membership to the NAB to people who are not involved at any other stage of the EQA procedure. Furthermore, NCPA is recommended to define clearer, more explicit and transparent regulations regarding the members, stakeholder percentages, and terms of office of the NAB.

#### **ESG 3.4 Thematic analysis**

NCPA is recommended to focus on analysis of the material available in its accreditation reports and produce thematic analyses on this basis to support further development of quality assurance in higher education institutions by sharing good practice and bringing enhancements. This practice should also be included in the Internal Quality Assurance System.

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

NCPA is recommended to improve consistency of text in the documents available for internal and external use.

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

NCPA is recommended to review its practice of accreditation of clusters of programmes to ensure its fitness for purpose. Either the practice has to be adjusted to the methodology of programme reviews or the activity has to become a separate activity with its own methodology. This review should include regulations for clusters (qualitative and quantitative) that have to correspond with experts (qualitative and quantitative) and also cover the impacts for site visit schedules and reports as well as final decisions. NCPA is also recommended to separate accreditation procedures of basic programmes of vocational education.

#### **ESG 2.3 Implementing processes**

NCPA is recommended to publish follow up reports on the website to ensure transparency and consistency of NCPA's operations.

#### **ESG 2.4 Peer-review experts**

NCPA is recommended to include students' representatives in the public accreditation of study programmes delivered by further professional education institutions, as well in the accreditation procedure of the further education institutions.

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

NCPA is recommended to improve the evidence base in the expert reports in order to allow consistency in the decision-making process. Furthermore, NCPA is recommended to

implement procedures and criteria allowing different decisions in accreditation procedures of a cluster of programmes.

### **ESG 2.6 Reporting**

NCPA is recommended to adjust its publication practice and publish accreditation decisions together with the full reports. Secondly, NCPA is recommended to assure transparency regarding the publication of reports on the English website. Thirdly, NCPA is recommended to assure that reports contain an adequate evidence basis and analysis in order to explain recommendations in a comprehensible way.

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

NCPA is recommended to continue to refine the appeals procedure to allow appeals to all formal decisions and establish a complaints procedure.