

Mutual recognition

The Danish report

Mutual recognition

The Danish report

2002

Contents

Mutual recognition

© 2002 The Danish
Evaluation Institute
Printed by Vester Kopi

Copying allowed only
with source reference

This publication can be
ordered from:

The Danish Evaluation
Institute
Østbanegade 55.3
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø

T +45 35 55 01 01
F +45 35 55 10 11

E eva@eva.dk
H www.eva.dk

ISBN 87-7958-064-5

Foreword	3
1 Introduction	4
1.1 The purpose of mutual recognition	4
2 Background	5
2.0 Purpose	5
2.1 The brief history of the agency	5
2.2 Description of the legal framework and other formal regulations concerning the agency	6
2.3 A brief outline of the national higher education system	7
2.4 The internal organisation of the agency	8
2.5 Other responsibilities of the agency besides evaluation of higher education	9
2.6 The main stakeholders of the agency	9
2.7 Number of conducted evaluations and number of units evaluated	9
3 Ownership and purpose	11
3.1 Ownership and the right to initiate evaluations	11
4 Evaluation method	13
4.1 General planning	13
4.2 Documentation	17
4.3 Reporting	19
5 Quality assurance of agency procedures	21
5.1 Procedures and systems	21
5.2 Effect documentation through quality assurance	23
6 Core issues of mutual recognition	25
7 Compliance with ENQA provisions	26
7.1 Provisions for membership	26
7.2 Methodological provisions	27
8 Description of the process	28
9 Annexes	29

Foreword

During the last decade a new international situation has developed with implications for national quality assurance that must not be underestimated. Two of the main characteristics of this development are the growing competition between higher education institutions and an international market for academic jobs and research. In a European context, the Bologna Declaration marks a turning point with the commitment to transparent and comparable degrees, transparent and harmonised degree structures and the promotion of student mobility. Furthermore, the Bologna Declaration calls for a European dimension in quality assurance.

Therefore, internationalisation of higher education is an important issue for all national evaluation agencies and governments because existing national quality assurance systems are not necessarily adequate in the new international context.

EVA welcomes the pilot project on mutual recognition as one way to create a system for the quality assurance of agencies that is suited to respond to the new international situation. Thus, EVA is pleased to participate in this project as one of the two agencies under review with the dual objective to promote internationalisation of quality assurance and to secure and enhance the evaluations conducted by EVA.

Christian Thune
Executive Director

This report has been prepared as part of a pilot project on mutual recognition among quality assurance agencies. The project was initiated by the Nordic Network for Quality Assurance Agencies to strengthen the internationalisation of quality assurance of higher education. The purpose of the project is to develop and test a method for mutual recognition.

This report has been drafted as prescribed in the document *Protocol for self-study*.¹ In accordance with the protocol, this report aims at giving a precise description of the items presented here in order to present a basis for the solid judgement of whether mutual recognition between EVA and other Nordic agencies is possible. Hence, while the report presents the practice of EVA's evaluation processes, it does not comprise an analysis and judgement of EVA's practices.

1.1 The purpose of mutual recognition

As presented in the protocol, mutual recognition might eventually provide higher education with an evaluation system that comprises both a national and an international dimension. Such an evaluation system might accommodate national differences, while having international legitimacy. The national element would consist of the agencies with their place in a specific national system of higher education. The international dimension would consist of the international accord regulating the mutual recognition system and of the international features of the recognition process. Furthermore, mutual recognition could serve as an external quality assurance and, thereby, provide accountability for the evaluation agencies and strengthen their development.

In a broader perspective, this pilot project might feed into the debate on recognition of degrees. In the long run, mutual recognition could support a framework for the mutual recognition of degrees, if the relevant authorities decided to establish such a framework. Furthermore, mutual recognition could potentially facilitate operational co-operation among the recognised agencies.

¹ *'Self-study protocol - Pilot project on mutual recognition between Nordic Evaluation Agencies', 2001. The document has been prepared by EVA (Denmark), FINHEC (Finland), the National Agency for Higher Education (Sweden) and the Network Norway Council (Norway).*

This section provides the background information required in order to understand the context in which the agency is operating.

2.0 Purpose

The main purpose of the Danish Evaluation Institute (EVA) is to contribute to the quality assurance and development of teaching and learning in Denmark. This is a mandatory requirement (annex 1). It is specified in the Danish Evaluation Institute Act that EVA must initiate and conduct evaluations of teaching and learning at all levels of the educational system, excluding doctoral level. The evaluations encompass public educational establishments and private institutions that are state subsidised. Furthermore, EVA must establish itself as a national centre of knowledge ('videnscenter'). EVA is thus required to produce, collect and disseminate knowledge of national and international experiences within the evaluation of teaching and learning. In relation to this, EVA must advise and co-operate with the Ministry of Education on matters relating to evaluation and quality assurance.

In order to fulfil its purpose of initiating processes of both quality assurance and development, EVA must ensure that both a dimension of transparency and quality control and a dimension of enhancement and quality development are included in all evaluations, including the field of higher education. The quality control and transparency dimension is primarily ensured through the involvement of an external evaluation group and public reports, whereas the enhancement dimension is primarily ensured through an emphasis on self-evaluation and through the analysis and recommendations provided by the external experts.

2.1 The brief history of the agency

In the late 1980s, the evaluation of higher education became an important item on the political agenda in Denmark. Evaluation was regarded as the natural consequence of a number of parallel developments in higher education in Denmark, as well as in many other European countries.

In Denmark, the request for evaluation, which arose in the beginning of the 1990s, was closely related to political efforts to increase the competence and the responsibility of educational institutions. The first evaluations were carried out from 1990 to 1992. The National Education Council for Social Sciences evaluated three programmes, and the National Education Council for Technical Sciences, the National Education Council for Natural Sciences and the National Education Council for Humanities evaluated one programme each. In addition, a variety of less extensive evaluations of programme structures and teaching methods were carried out by individual educational institutions. They were not part of a broader scheme, were varied in form and objective and were to a large extent dependent upon individual initiatives.

In 1992 the Centre for Evaluation and Quality Assurance of Higher Education (EVC) was established. The establishment of EVC was thus based upon the intention of the government to provide the necessary organisational resources to develop a systematic, reliable and impartial framework for the external evaluation of higher educational programmes. The establishment of EVC was related to the University Act passed by the Danish parliament in 1992, which granted more autonomy to the universities. EVC was established for a five-year period from 1992 to 1997. In 1996 the Centre's mandate was extended to 1999. The Centre had to apply the same methods in all evaluations (see section 4).

In the summer of 1999, the Danish Evaluation Institute (EVA) was established under legislation passed by the Danish parliament (annex 1). EVC was integrated into EVA.

The task of EVA is broader than that of its predecessor, EVC. EVA initiates and conducts evaluations of teaching and learning – from primary school to higher education and adult and post-graduate education, whereas EVC only covered higher education.

With the integration of EVC into EVA, the agency was also given a new task as the Danish centre of knowledge for evaluation of teaching and learning with the responsibility to compile, produce and communicate national as well as international experiences within the field of evaluation of education.

In the following text, “EVA” will be used as a reference for the activities carried out by the Danish Evaluation Institute as well as the Centre for Evaluation and Quality Assurance of Higher Education since the former with regard to evaluation of higher education can be seen as a continuation of the latter.

Since 1992, EVA has completed a cycle of programme evaluations encompassing almost all higher education programmes in Denmark. The basic model for this has been an evaluation approach based on self-evaluation, an external expert team, a user survey and a site visit. This process corresponds to the European pilot project recommendations.²

In addition to evaluations that have applied the model used during the first eight years, a number of pilot projects have been conducted in the period since 1999. These pilot projects are conducted in order to gain experience with other methods besides programme evaluation, and they will form the basis for future decisions on how higher education will be systematically evaluated. It should be mentioned, however, that the pilot projects are carried out within the framework recommended in the European pilot project. Some of the pilot projects are experimenting with the use of explicit criteria, as opposed to the fitness-for-purpose approach used previously. Other projects differ in relation to the units evaluated. Thus, a subject evaluation and an institutional evaluation are conducted.

In summary and in relation to higher education, EVA builds on the experiences from the first cycle of programme evaluations of higher education and continues to use the same methodological core elements. In this respect, the consequences of becoming an institute have been relatively insignificant. The main consequences of the transformation from EVC to EVA have been a strengthened independence in relation to the Ministry of Education, due to the formal right of EVA to initiate evaluations, and methodological freedom.

2.2 Description of the legal framework and other formal regulations concerning the agency

Two legal documents regulate EVA's activities. The most important one is the Danish Evaluation Institute Act (annex 1). The Ministry of Education has established a set of regulations for EVA that specifies the act (annex 2). The regulations are as legally binding for EVA as the parliamentary act, but it is within the authority of the Minister of Education to amend the regulations within the framework of the parliamentary act.

The legal framework regulates the relationship to the Ministry of Education and specifies:

- EVA's right to initiate evaluations;
- the governance of the agency;
- the distribution of responsibilities with regard to evaluation;
- core methodological principles.

² *Evaluation of European Higher Education: A Status Report. Prepared for the European Commission, DGXXII, by the Centre for Quality Assurance and Evaluation of Higher Education, Denmark in co-operation with Comité National d'Evaluation, France, September 1998.*

The specifics of the legal framework are mentioned below where appropriate.

2.3 A brief outline of the national higher education system

Higher education in Denmark is characterised by a binary structure, based on a separation of the non-university sector and the university sector. The non-university sector offers short-cycle higher education and medium-cycle higher education with a vocational orientation. The university sector offers long-cycle higher education programmes within a bachelor/master structure.

2.3.1 Degree structure

Danish institutions of higher education award eight different degrees: five at university level and three at non-university level. Two of the degrees are only available as continuing education, which means that they are taken on a part-time basis in addition to another degree at higher education level.

The university level degrees are:

- Bachelor;
- Master (continuing education);
- Traditional master (in Danish: 'kandidat');
- PhD;
- Traditional Doctor.

The non-university sector awards the following degrees:

- Sub-degree level qualification (in Danish: 'AK');
- Vocational bachelor degree;
- Diploma, approximately at degree level (in Danish: 'diplom') (continuing education).

2.3.2 Institutional structure

In the non-university sector a large number of institutions offer study programmes of varying lengths and levels:

- The short-cycle higher education sector comprises 70 institutions
- The medium-cycle higher education sector comprises 112 institutions
- The university sector comprises 11 institutions

Furthermore, the Ministry of Cultural Affairs administers 21 schools, which are either medium-cycle or long-cycle higher education institutions.

2.3.3 Procedures and parties involved in establishing new subjects, programmes and institutions

The Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Science, Technology and Development approve all new programmes as well as institutions. Neither universities nor other higher education institutions are allowed to offer any programme not based on a ministerial order. The ministerial orders are established on the basis of an administrative procedure that involves a hearing by the relevant educational council. No independent, systematic pre-test of new programmes is conducted, however.

Traditionally, new institutions have been established on an ad hoc basis. However, with the institutional reform of the medium-cycle higher education sector passed by the Danish parliament in 2000, the Ministry has established a procedure for the recognition of both mergers of institutions and individual institutions as Centres for Higher Education. The recognition is subject to legal approval by the Minister. The recognition takes into consideration factors such as intake, staff, educational profile, co-operation with university-level institutions, employability, management and regional factors. The recognition does not involve an independent systematic evaluative procedure.

The subject level is not subject to governmental regulations.

2.3.4 Other quality assurance procedures (e.g. external examiners)

Denmark uses external examiners extensively compared with most other countries. It is mandatory that external examiners participate in a third of all exams in a higher education programme. It is often the case, however, that external examiners are involved in a majority of the exams. It is the responsibility of the external examiners to ensure that the exams (both oral and written) are conducted according to the regulations laid down in the ministerial order for the specific programme. External examiners must also ensure that students are treated fairly and equally. Finally, the external examiner must give the institution feedback on quality issues. Thus, the system of external examiners is part of the quality assurance system in higher education.

2.3.5 Status of Higher Education institutions in relation to the government

Institutions for higher education are either independent self-governing institutions ('selvejende') or owned by the state:

- Institutions offering short-cycle higher education are independent, self-governing institutions.
- Medium-cycle level institutions can be independent, self-governing institutions or owned by the state. However, both types of institutions enjoy a large degree of operational independence, ensured by a board management structure.
- Nursing schools are owned by the county authorities ('amter').
- At university level, both forms of ownership exist. However, in relation to the content and quality of the research and teaching, the governing form makes little difference as all universities enjoy a large degree of autonomy, founded in the University Act.

2.4 The internal organisation of the agency

EVA is organised in two centres: a centre of knowledge and a centre for evaluation. (This centre for evaluation should not be mistaken for the Danish Centre for Evaluation and Quality Assurance of Higher Education (EVC) integrated in EVA.) The two centres correspond to the two purposes in the act, namely, that EVA must conduct evaluations and function as a centre of knowledge (annex 9). The activities of the two centres are interdependent. The management consists of an Executive Director and a Director for each of the centres. The evaluations are carried out by evaluation officers. The evaluation officers have responsibilities within both centres.

The centre of knowledge is organised in eight units:

- Four units related to educational areas (primary education, secondary education, higher education and adult and continuing education) with the responsibility for compiling and processing national and international experiences in the field of evaluation of education. The staff in these units are evaluation officers with the task of conducting evaluations in the evaluation centre. Altogether, 23 evaluation officers are presently employed, seven of these in the Higher Education Unit.
- The Adult and Continuing Education Unit is responsible for the continuing higher education programmes. Thus, the evaluation officers from this unit are also involved in higher education to some extent as these education activities take place at higher education institutions.
- An Information Unit with the responsibility of collecting and disseminating knowledge of evaluation and providing linguistic support for the drafting of the report (annex 33). In addition, this unit manages the library, internal information sharing and gives advice internally on information matters (annex 34, 35). Four staff are employed in this unit.
- A Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit with the responsibility for ensuring the quality of user surveys and for conducting internal quality assurance projects (annex 36, 37). Four staff are employed in this unit.
- Two support units (IT and administration) with the responsibility for ensuring the operation of IT and administrative functions. 10 persons are employed in these units.

The centre for evaluation is organised in project teams independent of the structure in the centre of knowledge. Evaluation officers may be involved (and are involved) in evaluation

projects outside their educational unit, too. At the moment, two evaluation officers from the unit of higher education are involved in projects not related to higher education. On the other hand, four evaluation officers from other education units are working with evaluation of higher education. Adult education and continuing education projects at the level of higher education are included as higher education projects.

The centre for evaluation also employs evaluation assistants who are part time staff and senior students. They are part of the project teams and offer assistance to the evaluation process, e.g. taking minutes and conducting data processing tasks. Evaluation assistants must have completed at least two years of studies. The majority are bachelors. At present, 17 evaluation assistants are employed.

2.5 Other responsibilities of the agency besides evaluation of higher education

Since EVA is required to initiate and conduct evaluations of teaching and learning at all educational levels, EVA must carry out evaluations outside the higher education sector. EVA may also conduct evaluations that include more than one level of education at the same time, e.g. one evaluation has focused on the transition from vocational upper secondary education ('de erhvervsgymnasiale uddannelser') to higher education. As mentioned above, another task is to function as the governmental centre of knowledge for evaluation of education, and part of this duty is to compile, produce and communicate information on national and international experiences in the field of evaluation of education, internally as well as externally.

A final task is the accreditation of private courses, normally at short-cycle higher education level and further education level. The accreditations are part of the Ministry of Education procedure to determine whether students at private teaching establishments (who do not receive a state subsidy) should receive the Danish state student grant. EVA conducts the accreditation procedure, whereas the Ministry of Education is the approving authority. The Ministry of Education can approve the grant for a period of four years after which the institutions must be re-accredited. The accreditation framework consists of more than forty criteria formulated within thirteen areas.

Thus, EVA has other major responsibilities that are not related to the evaluation of higher education, and as a consequence part of the staff is not involved in evaluation of higher education (see section 2.4).

2.6 The main stakeholders of the agency

Within the field of higher education, the Ministry of Education and the new Ministry of Science, Technology and Development (established after the Danish election November 2001) represent the main stakeholders, e.g. they have to approve the annual plan of action (annex 5, 6, 7) and the budget. Besides these formal relations, EVA has regular contact-meetings with the Ministry of Education and is in the process of establishing a network at staff level.

In addition to the ministries, EVA has maintained contact with stakeholders from the higher education community. EVA meets with the Danish Rectors' Conference, which represents all universities in Denmark, and EVA's Committee of Representatives (annex 11), which comprises members from different sectors of the education system (see section 3.1.1).

2.7 Number of conducted evaluations and number of units evaluated

EVA has produced a total of 67 evaluation reports concerning higher education. Most of the reports dealt with more than one institution. In total, the institutions were involved in these evaluations 212 times. Some evaluations have covered more than one programme at each institution.

36 of these reports have been produced during the last five years. Institutions were involved 132 times.

3 Ownership and purpose

This section includes an account of the ownership of the agency and of its purpose.

3.1 Ownership and the right to initiate evaluations

3.1.1 Ownership

EVA is an independent institution formed under the auspices of the Danish Ministry of Education. Eva is governed by a board (annex 10). The Board is responsible for the overall supervision of the Institute, including the annual action plan, and appoints the management of the Institute. The appointment of the Executive Director must be formally approved by the Minister of Education. The Executive Director manages EVA and is responsible to the Board. The Board formally approves the appointment of other staff.

The establishment of the agency. The Ministry of Education established EVC in 1992 on the basis of the University Act passed the same year. EVC was integrated into EVA in the summer of 1999 under legislation passed with a considerable majority by the Danish Folketing (parliament). In both cases it was the Minister of Education who initiated the acts (annex 1).

Financial resources of the agency. EVA is financed in two ways. Primarily through the Finance Act, which allocates financial resources to all evaluations initiated by EVA (see below).

In addition to the resources from the Finance Act, EVA also has a mandatory responsibility to conduct evaluations as an income-generating activity upon request from government, ministries and advisory boards, local authorities and educational institutions.

The Board draws up EVA's budget, which must be approved by the Minister of Education.

The nomination, appointment and composition of the Board. The Board consists of 10 members and a chairman. The Danish Minister of Education nominates the Chairman. The 10 members are appointed by the Minister upon the recommendation of the Ministry's advisory boards (annex 1, §5, annex 10). Thus, the Board does not automatically include representatives of the higher education institutions.

The Board is appointed for a three-year period with the possibility of reappointment.

In addition to the Board, a Committee of Representatives is established as a mandatory part of EVA's organisational set-up (annex 11). The Committee of Representatives comments on EVA's annual plan of action (annex 5, 6, 7), the annual report (annex 4) and the priority of planned activities. The Committee comprises 27 members. They are appointed by organisations from the following sectors: school proprietors, school associations, school boards and employers; rector's conferences and school managers; management and labour organisations; teachers' organisations and students and pupils bodies. In addition, the Committee of Representatives itself appoints two experts with international evaluation experience.

3.1.2 The right to initiate evaluations

The Board draws up the programme for the next year's activities based on the recommendations of the Executive Director. The Minister of Education approves the annual

³ Compliance with ENQA membership provisions is included in the description below (for a detailed description of each criterion, see section 6.1).

plan of action (annex 5, 6, 7). In addition to the evaluations conducted on its own initiative, EVA may conduct evaluations on the request of authorities responsible for education.

3.1.3 The role of the agency in the follow-up of evaluations: consequences and sanctions

The EVA Act states that the Ministry of Education and the institutions are responsible for the follow-up of evaluations (annex 1, §11). The institutions are formally expected to initiate a follow-up process. The Ministry of Education is authorised to initiate follow-up procedures if the institution does not take this initiative or if the Minister finds the initiated procedure insufficient. The universities, however, are a special case since they alone are responsible for the follow-up.

The Ministry of Education is working on a decree on follow-up. However, as a consequence of the Danish University Act, the demands upon universities can only be procedural, e.g. related to activities that universities are obliged to do, such as provide the Ministry with an action plan. Thus, the decree will, presumably, only provide the Minister with jurisdiction in relation to short and medium-cycle professional higher education.

3.1.4 The purpose of the agency

See section 2.0

This section concerns the method and models used for evaluation. It is divided into three subsections. The first deals with the general planning of the evaluation, the second with the procedures for collecting documentation and the third and final section with the analysis of documentation and drafting of the report.⁴

As a general note, it should be said that in the first seven years of operation, EVA conducted a cycle of programme evaluations according to a standardised model and with a large degree of similarity between the different evaluations. Since 1999 some evaluations have been conducted according to the framework used in the cycle of programme evaluations, whereas some have been conducted as pilot evaluations with an evaluation method adapted to the specific evaluation. It should also be noted that whereas programme evaluations were the primary activity during the first seven years, EVA is currently also conducting evaluations of institutions and subjects/disciplines.

EVA is currently conducting an evaluation on faculty level. The first subject evaluation is due to be finalised in 2002. In the future, this could be complemented with thematic evaluations, e.g. examinations. So far, a survey of the supervision of students writing theses at universities has been conducted.

Within the coming years, EVA will decide upon the approach for future evaluations, including whether or not to have standardised procedures.

4.1 General planning

This subsection accounts for the overall planning of an evaluation.

4.1.1 Procedures related to establishing the terms of reference/project plan

Prior to each evaluation, EVA conducts a preliminary study. The preliminary study will typically involve a dialogue with the main parties involved in the course of education. The preliminary study also encompasses existing material relating to the field of education, e.g. regulations, ministerial orders, study plans and curricula, etc.

The preliminary study is descriptive and analytical and provides the internal project team with fundamental knowledge of the field of evaluation, which is essential for the preparation of terms of reference and information to the evaluation group (see description of the evaluation group (experts) in section 4.1.3). The Board approves the terms of reference.

The terms of reference are designed to ensure consistency throughout the different evaluations. They are drafted in accordance with internal guidelines (annex 17). These guidelines specify what the terms of reference must include:

- the background and purpose of the evaluation;
- time schedule;
- the scope of the evaluation (higher educational units involved);
- items to be included;
- the division of responsibilities between the evaluation group and EVA (see sections below);
- the general framework for the evaluation, including the methods to be applied;

⁴ Compliance with ENQA methodological provisions is included in the description below (for a detailed description of each criterion, see section 6.2).

- expected results.

In summary, the terms of reference are the formal basis for an evaluation. They are drafted by EVA and approved by the Board. They function as an instrument to ensure the adequacy of the design of the evaluation including the main methodological elements (see example of terms of reference in annex 23).

4.1.2 Reference(s) for evaluation (predefined criteria, legal documents, subject benchmarks, professional standards, the stated goals of the evaluated institution)

It is customary in the European evaluation community to position evaluation models between a fitness-for-purpose approach and a predefined standard approach. A fitness-for-purpose approach utilises the institutions' or programmes' own objectives as the point of reference for the evaluation, whereas a predefined standard approach specifies explicit criteria for the evaluation prior to the evaluation process and is independent of the institution or programme under review.

All evaluations finalised until now have leaned towards a fitness-for-purpose approach. The fitness-for-purpose approach has, however, been modified in two ways. The nationally defined objectives have been taken into consideration, as they are formulated in ministerial orders covering the programmes. However, these ministerial orders normally have a rather general character. In addition to this, all evaluations have been focused on the items specified in the terms of references. These items have been established by taking into consideration international models and national requirements.

In previously conducted programme evaluations, the following items were included (annex 48, section 6):

- the objectives of the programme;
- management, organisation and resources;
- structure of the programme;
- content of the programme;
- practical learning;
- methods of teaching and training;
- lecturers/professors, including pedagogical competencies;
- exams and evaluation of students;
- student entry levels and progression;
- internationalisation;
- relations to other institutions and society;
- quality assurance.

The physical environment and learning resources have also been regularly included.

Institutional evaluations conducted have focused upon:

- profile/mission;
- organisation and management;
- quality assurance;
- relationship between research and education;
- study facilities;
- resources.

However, two of the evaluations presently being conducted include a predefined standard dimension. They utilise explicit criteria as a point of reference for the evaluation. One is an international evaluation of agricultural science involving institutions from four different

European countries. The other is an evaluation of continuing education master programmes within the field of administrative science.

In summary, all evaluations conducted by EVA are based on a number of specified items that must be taken into account in the evaluation. These items correspond with international practice and have been developed to address the issues with which Danish institutions of higher education are faced. In all the previous evaluations, the judgements made in relation to these items have primarily been based on the programmes' or institutions' own objectives. However, some of the pilot projects currently in progress experiment with explicit criteria. These projects are related to international developments, such as the need for transparency and the discussions and initiatives related to the possible introduction of accreditation (see annex 48, section 6 for EVA's principles for good criteria).

4.1.3 Procedures related to the identification and appointment of experts

For each evaluation, EVA appoints an evaluation group. The members have special expertise within the field to be evaluated. The group consists of four to six experts. The qualifications and integrity of the members of the evaluation group are crucial. EVA does its utmost to ensure that the competencies of the experts are well acknowledged. All members must be independent of the programmes/institutions evaluated. This is ensured by obtaining an official statement from the potential experts and through a hearing of the institutions involved in the evaluation, in addition to desk research done by EVA. In the statement, the expert must state whether he/she has been employed, been invited to give lectures or in any other way associated with the programme or institution under review. The experts must also state whether they have a spouse, child or near friend that has studied or been employed by the programme or institution under review. On the basis of this information, an individual judgement will be made. Normally, it is the personal connections of the expert that carry most weight, but strong family ties to an institution might result in the expert being considered not to be independent.

EVA employs a multi-professional peer concept and not a collegial peer concept. As a basis for the selection of the experts, the project team drafts a list of academic and professional profiles to be included in the group. These profiles, which are determined by the focus of the evaluation, normally include:

- academics with expertise in the evaluated subject/field;
- experts that employ graduates from the programmes or institutions under review (labour market representatives);
- experts with managerial experience or special knowledge of areas within higher education.

These expert profiles create a balance between experts with an institutional perspective from within the higher education community and experts with an external perspective representing society.

As a general rule, EVA tries to recruit at least one Scandinavian member for each evaluation. Not only do Scandinavian experts provide an extra-national perspective to the evaluations, they also strengthen the independence of the evaluation group from the Danish academic context. Sometimes a person with professional and/or practical evaluation experience will also be among the experts.

In addition to the list of profiles, the project team will put forward specific names to match the different profiles. These specific names are often identified through the network of agency staff and former members of evaluation groups. The Nordic network is sometimes involved in recommending Scandinavian experts.

Both the list of the profiles and the specific names are submitted to the Board who approve profiles as well as specific experts. Whether the evaluation group will consist of four, five or six experts, depends on the number of profiles needed and on how many profiles each expert

covers. One person might, for instance, cover more than one profile, e.g. having experience with both university governance and research.

In short, experts are appointed on the basis of a draft of the profiles needed in the evaluation. EVA operates with a definition of an expert that goes beyond an academic peer. Employers and other non-academics are involved in the evaluations to provide a perspective which is external to the higher education community.

4.1.4 Identification and appointment of the internal project team

For each evaluation, EVA appoints an internal project team among its staff members. A team consists of two evaluation officers and one evaluation assistant. The internal project team is assembled in such a way that the competencies of the different staff members supplement each other (annex 8, p. 14). One of the evaluation officers is appointed as co-ordinator for the project with responsibility for the budget and contact with experts and institutions. Furthermore, the co-ordinator is also responsible for the time schedule, the supervision of the evaluation assistant and the contact with the management representative of the project.

4.1.5 The role of the internal project team

The internal project team holds the practical and methodological responsibility for each evaluation. The project team is involved throughout the process. The team will:

- conduct the preliminary study;
- draft the terms of reference;
- provide the evaluation group with drafts for the self-evaluation guidelines;
- prepare the project outline and invitation to tender for user surveys (see section 4.2.3);
- provide contact and supervision to the consultancy firm conducting the user surveys (in co-operation with the Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit);
- prepare the programme for the site visit;
- prepare interview guides for the site visit;
- participate in the site visit, including preparation of minutes from the meetings;
- draft the report to be discussed with and approved by the evaluation group.

The project team is thus involved extensively as a secretarial function, partly to ensure that the evaluation is conducted as specified in both the terms of reference and EVA's formal regulations. This includes assurance of the methodological consistency and the quality of the documentation in each evaluation and the methodological consistency between the evaluations. This means that the evaluation officers must have adequate knowledge of the educational system and substantial insight in evaluation procedures.

4.1.6 Briefing/training of experts

The experts are informed by means of written documentation before the first meeting. This information includes general information about EVA (annex 14) and information about the specific evaluation. At the first meeting the evaluation groups are introduced to EVA and to the evaluation process. A more detailed briefing is given during the evaluation, especially as part of the preparation for the site visit. In the future, evaluation groups will be introduced to interview techniques in order to further prepare them to act as a group at the site visit (annex 21).

4.1.7 Briefing of and communication with the evaluated institution

Institutions under review are informed of the evaluation process in writing. It is mandatory that EVA informs institutions on (annex 2):

- the legal basis for the evaluation, including the rights and obligations of the involved institutions;
- the purpose of the evaluation;
- the terms of reference, time schedule, type of evaluation and methods employed;
- the members of the evaluation group;

- expectations to the institutions' own contribution to the process.

This information is provided in documents when the evaluation begins. The project team will also have at least one meeting with all the involved institutions at the beginning of the evaluation.

Besides the legal requirements, this information is supposed to give the institutions a comprehensive understanding of the evaluation, including its purpose, and to ensure that they are committed to participating in the evaluation with positive expectations towards the potential results of the process.

4.1.8 Meetings between experts: number, scope and time schedule in relation to the overall evaluation process

The evaluation group normally meets five times including the site visit. The *first meeting* takes place just after the terms of reference have been approved and the evaluation group is established. The agenda for the first meeting includes a discussion of the draft self-evaluation guidelines and the project plan for user surveys in addition to a presentation of general information about the evaluation process and EVA.

The second meeting is normally scheduled a month before the site visit. Key issues on the agenda for the second meeting are:

- discussions of the results of the self-evaluation;
- preparation of the site visit;
- discussion of user surveys.

The site visit includes preliminary discussions of the analysis and recommendations of the evaluation report. These will form the basis for the first draft of the report.

At *the third meeting* the key issue will be the first draft of the report.

The fourth meeting will conclude the discussions of the draft evaluation report. After this meeting, modifications to the report can be made by the project team, and then the evaluation group gets a final draft for approval.

Sometimes an additional meeting or an exchange of written comments is necessary to finalise the discussions concerning the evaluation report.

The final meeting will take place on the basis of the feedback from the institution concerning the draft report (see section 4.3.3).

Thus, the evaluation group is involved throughout the process and not only in the site visit and the report-drafting phase. The involvement of the evaluation group in the production of self-evaluation guidelines and questionnaires for the user surveys is an important instrument to ensure the quality of the evaluation. Furthermore, the early involvement provides the experts with a comprehensive understanding of the evaluation process.

4.2 Documentation

This subsection accounts for the procedures for collecting documentation.

4.2.1 Procedures related to self-assessment

Self-evaluation is a mandatory part of EVA's evaluation procedure. The evaluated unit must conduct a self-evaluation, describing and assessing what it sees as its own strengths and weaknesses. The self-evaluation process has a dual function:

- to stimulate discussions within the unit under review of its own strengths and weaknesses and to enhance the continuous improvement of the quality of the unit;

- to provide documentation to be used by the panel of experts and EVA in relation to the site visits and the preparation of the final report.

To combine these two different functions, EVA provides the programmes/institutions under evaluation with guidelines for self-evaluation. (Two self-evaluation guidelines are enclosed in annex 25.) The guidelines are provided to ensure that the documentation prepared is relevant to the evaluation and covers all important areas. Furthermore, the guidelines should serve the purpose of making the institutions reflect upon their practice and generate ideas for an alternative and more efficient practice.

The guidelines for self-evaluation are drafted to correspond with the focus specified in the terms of reference. It is prepared by the project team and discussed and approved by the evaluation group.

The specification of content in the protocol provided by the agency. The self-evaluation guidelines provide a structure for the self-evaluation and describe the items that must be included. The guidelines are established with regard to the items stated in the terms of reference (see section 4.1.1). They contain several questions in relation to each item (annex 25).

The procedural advice provided by the agency. In the guidelines, the Institute advises the institution to establish an internal team to be responsible for the preparation of the self-evaluation. It is recommended that the team consists of representatives from all internal stakeholders/parties with relations to the evaluated unit.

Training/information of self-evaluation teams. The self-evaluation team is informed through the self-evaluation guidelines. Besides this, the project team meets with representatives from the unit under evaluation.

Time available for conducting the self-evaluation. Normally, the self-evaluation has to be carried out within two to four months.

In summary, the guidance to the self-evaluation is provided in order to accommodate a self-evaluation process that on the one hand promotes internal development and on the other hand results in a report that will function as the primary documentation for the judgements of the evaluation group. In other words, the guidance to the self-evaluation process provides the framework for the report, the selection of representatives and for the self-evaluation group, thereby leaving the details of the report and the organisation of the self-evaluation process to the institution.

4.2.2 Procedures related to the site visit

The evaluation group and the evaluation officers visit the programmes/institutions under review. The visit is planned in agreement with the unit under review. In general, the visit takes one day per institution and involves meetings with academic staff (sometimes divided into full and part-time staff), students, management and the team that prepared the self-evaluation report. Sometimes, the visit will also include meetings with the administrative staff. Thus, a site visit will include meetings with five different groups as a rule. Normally, EVA provides guidelines on how the different groups should be selected in order to be representative.

Thorough preparation is a critical factor when the site visit is relatively short. The project team produces meeting protocols/guidelines as a basis for the different interviews (annex 24). These protocols are based on scrutiny of the self-evaluation reports and of user surveys and include the discussions from previous meetings in the evaluation group. Before the visit the evaluation group will decide upon a draft of the interview protocol. The protocol helps focus the interviews on the essential questions.

EVA's staff take minutes from the meetings at the site visit. The minutes are used when the report is drafted. They are used as checklists for the evaluation groups. Depending on the specific time schedule, the minutes are usually distributed to the evaluation group.

To sum up, the procedures related to the site visit are set up in order to ensure a systematic and effective collection of documentation essential to ensure the quality of a relatively short site visit. The procedures include a programme for the visit, interview guidelines for each meeting and minutes from the meetings.

4.2.3 Other kinds of documentation (surveys, statistical material)

In connection with each evaluation, user surveys are normally conducted among students, graduates, employers or other groups. Consultancy firms carry out the user surveys. The user surveys may be qualitative or quantitative depending on the object of the evaluation and the size of the relevant population. The type of user survey is specified in the terms of reference. EVA decides on the focus of the user survey in conjunction with the evaluation group.

Qualitative surveys include interviews with single persons or groups, whereas quantitative surveys include postal questionnaires, telephone interviews and questionnaires on the Internet. The consultancy firms produce a descriptive report for EVA with the collected material (statistics or interview minutes) and an analysis of the collected data. These reports are available to the general public and published together with the evaluation report (annex 29).

User surveys are an important element in the evaluations because they constitute documentation that is produced completely externally in relation to the institutions or programmes under review. Such material thus provides an external perspective for assessing the information provided by the institution in the self-evaluation and on the site visit.

4.3 Reporting

This subsection accounts for the analysis of the documentation and the drafting of the report.

In the final evaluation report the evaluation group presents its analysis, assessments and recommendations for developing the quality of the unit in question. The project team holds the practical responsibility for the writing of the report. All evaluation reports are published.

4.3.1 Purpose of the report

The report has a dual purpose. It must include recommendations for future development of the evaluated unit. Furthermore, the report should provide stakeholders with information about the evaluated unit.

4.3.2 Format of report (design and length) and content of report (documentation or only analysis/recommendations)

All reports include a presentation of the documentation, analysis and recommendations in relation to all the items specified in the terms of reference. This means that the reports are usually quite long (between 100 and 200 pages).

The report will always contain (see annex 18):

- a preface by the executive director and the chairman of the evaluation group;
- an executive summary of the main conclusions and recommendations;
- an introduction that includes the purpose of the evaluation, the names of the members of the evaluation group, a presentation of the method employed in the evaluation and the structure of the report;
- analytical sections related to the programmes/institutions evaluated and to the items specified in the terms of reference.

EVA produces rather long reports in order to fulfil their dual purpose. EVA believes that reports, which include documentation as well as analysis in addition to the evaluation, have a higher degree of legitimacy compared with reports that do not. Legitimacy is the precondition for the institutions' acceptance of the conclusions and recommendations of the reports. In addition to this, the extensive reference to documentation contributes directly to the aim of providing transparency between the documentation, conclusions and recommendations. (Two reports are provided as annex 26.)

4.3.3 Principles for feedback from the evaluated parties on the draft report

A draft of the report is sent to the evaluated unit for comments. This is a mandatory part of the evaluation. Usually, the comments are given to EVA in written form before a discussion of the report at a hearing. At the hearing the evaluation group is present, together with representatives from the evaluated programmes/institutions and the internal project team.

4.3.4 Publication procedures and policy (e.g. handling of the media)

All evaluations are published. When the evaluation group has given its final consent to the final report, this is sent to the Board. The Board cannot make changes in the report, but it may comment on the report. The report with comments and a press release are sent to the Ministry, the institutions, the press and other stakeholders. The Ministry must receive the report two weeks before it is made available to the general public.

The clear focus on dissemination is evident in the fact that approximately 175 reports are distributed as part of the publication procedure. In addition to this, the reports are available on the Internet and are sold in paper copy. Since 1994 approximately 1,500 copies have been sold per year in total.

4.3.5 Follow-up

As described in section 3.1.3, the follow-up procedure places the primary responsibility with the education institutions and the secondary responsibility with the Ministry of Education. EVA has no responsibility in relation to follow-up.

5 Quality assurance of agency procedures

5.1 Procedures and systems

This section accounts for the quality assurance procedures. It should be noted that the Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit plays a vital part in the quality assurance of EVA's activities. The unit has been strengthened during the last year, both in terms of staff resources available and staff competencies. The unit is responsible for the quality of the user surveys conducted by external consultancy firms and for the use of statistical data in the evaluation. In addition to these tasks, the unit is responsible for the quality assurance activities (see below).

5.1.1 Qualifications and skills of professional staff and management, including recruitment, training and qualification development

EVA's policies regarding competencies and qualifications are described in 'Kompetenceudvikling 2001' (annex 27). This paper describes the competence profile of each group of employees. The main features are described below.

Management: General managerial abilities and special skills, e.g. knowledge of the education system in general and the present politics of education; knowledge of methods of evaluation, audit and international evaluation.

Evaluation officers: Interpersonal skills and the ability to co-operate in a project team; knowledge of the educational system in general and current educational trends and policies; knowledge of, and skills for working with different methods of evaluation.

Evaluation assistants: Two years of higher education; co-operation and good writing skills, including techniques for writing minutes and summaries.

When new staff are recruited, attention is directed toward the profiles described in 'Kompetenceudvikling 2001', including those mentioned above, and focus is placed on special skills of methodology or special knowledge of the education sectors. All new staff members are employed on the basis of a written application and two separate interviews with representatives from management and staff.

New members of the staff start their career at EVA with an introductory course. This course introduces the new staff to EVA's evaluation method and administrative procedures and policies (annex 32).

The policies of training and qualification development are described in 'Personalepolitik' (annex 28). Some courses are compulsory. All evaluation officers and assistants participate in a writing course, which introduces EVA's policy for written communication (see annex 33, 34). Furthermore, all evaluation officers must participate in a course on presentation skills and a course on press relations.

The individual employee's competence profile and the need for future qualification development are discussed in a personal development interview ('medarbejderudviklingssamtale') once a year. The purpose of this interview is to secure a continuous development of both employee qualifications and the organisation. The personal development interview is structured by guidelines (annex 30).

The development of competencies is partly based on the individual employee's present needs, engagement and skills, and partly on EVA's goals and needs.

5.1.2 Continuous quality assurance systems in place (e.g. feedback from institutions, experts and stakeholders and internal accumulation and dissemination of knowledge and experience)

Quality assurance systems. It is the ambition of EVA to establish quality assurance systems in all relevant areas of activity. These systems should accumulate internal knowledge and, thereby, on the one hand monitor internal compliance with established policies, and on the other hand constitute a basis for decisions on alteration of policies and procedures. The Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit is responsible for these systems, which include:

- a survey of all evaluated institutions with focus on the co-operation with EVA (in progress). The first cycle is being conducted with assistance from an external consultancy firm (annex 60);
- a survey of the co-operation between EVA and the experts who have finalised evaluations (in progress). To be conducted annually (annex 54, 55);
- feedback from the project teams on the co-operation between project team and consultancies responsible for user surveys (annex 53);
- internal evaluation of the methods used in evaluations by the project team. The feedback is structured by an open-ended questionnaire (annex 51).
- In 2002, EVA is planning a methodology project investigating how to produce an assessment of the effects of the evaluations carried out as part of the annual plan for 2000 (annex 7).

In addition to these surveys, and directly related to evaluations, three surveys related to dissemination are being conducted:

- Survey of conferences held by EVA. The respondents are the conference participants (annex 52).
- Survey of satisfaction with EVA's magazine 'EVALuering' (in progress). The respondents in this survey are the readers of the magazine.
- Survey of satisfaction with EVA's homepage (annex 57).

Contact with key stakeholders. Feedback from the key stakeholders is ensured through meetings with the Ministry of Education and meetings with the Danish Rectors' Conference. Besides this, the Committee of Representatives (see section 3.1.1), which represents a broad selection of stakeholders, meets three times a year to comment on EVA's annual programme of action, EVA's annual report and the priority of planned activities.

Internal dissemination of knowledge and experience. At EVA information is shared by means of regular meetings, an annual two-day seminar and the Intranet.

Regular meetings take place at three levels:

- Institute meetings ('institutmøder') once a month for all employees with discussions of issues of interest for the whole institute.
- Co-ordination meetings ('koordinationsmøder') every second week with evaluation officers and assistants. At these meetings issues are typically related to general procedures and methodological questions which are of interest to more than one educational level.
- Meetings in the education units ('enhedsmøder') with evaluation officers. These meetings are a relatively new feature. Typical issues at these meetings are expected to be the general development of the area covered by the unit, the future strategy of evaluation for the area and information sharing and feedback in relation to projects in progress.

Once a year, a two-day seminar takes place with the participation of all staff members and management. At this seminar general issues of interest for the whole institute are discussed, such as the overall strategy for the institute, staff policy ('personalepolitik') and internal co-

operation. Another important aim of the two-day seminar is to follow-up on experiences with the methods and models used for evaluation during the past year.

Finally, the Intranet, ADAM, serves as a daily source of information and as a collection of important memos on procedures and regulations. Furthermore, the Intranet is updated daily with relevant links including press coverage of educational issues and information about conferences.

5.1.3 Evaluation of the agency

In addition to the continuous systems for quality assurance, projects are conducted on an ad hoc basis. In a five-year period this has included both externally and internally initiated projects.

An external evaluation was initiated in 1997 by the Ministry of Education to assess the extent to which EVC had achieved its objectives. The evaluation included a self-evaluation conducted by EVC (annex 47, 48), a survey of the effects of the evaluations, conducted by a consultancy firm (annex 59), and an external expert evaluation (annex 58). The expert evaluation made use of the self-evaluation, in addition to other material, and interviews with staff members, management, experts that had been involved in finalised evaluations and the Ministry of Education.

The evaluation of EVC provided part of the background for the establishment of EVA.

At the moment three different internally initiated evaluations are taking place:

- Evaluation of the co-operation with the Board (in progress). The Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit is conducting an evaluation of the Board members' perception of the co-operation with the Institute (annex 49).
- Evaluation of the co-operation between the Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit and the project teams. The evaluation concerns the evaluation officers' assessment of the co-operation with the unit in relation to the planning and implementation of user surveys. The Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit is responsible for the evaluation (annex 50).
- Evaluation of the appraisal interview. The Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit is currently evaluating the last cycle of appraisal interviews (annex 31).

5.1.4 General initiatives to keep the agency informed of state of the art and new developments within the field of evaluation of higher education (membership of domestic and international organisations, partnerships and networks)

EVA is a member of the European Network for Quality Assurance (ENQA), the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE), the Nordic Network for Quality Assurance, the Danish Association of Evaluation (Dansk Evalueringselskab), European Association for Institutional Research (EAIR) and the European Evaluation Society. In addition to participating in the general assemblies and other regular conferences, EVA makes an effort to participate in seminars, workshops and working parties on relevant issues.

On the domestic level, EVA is involved in working groups on issues relevant to higher education, especially in relation to the follow-up of the Bologna process.

5.2 Effect documentation through quality assurance

The agency reports on the effects of its work as documented by the quality assurance systems and evaluations mentioned above.

In 2001 EVA produced an Annual Financial Report ('virksomhedsregnskab') for 2000, in accordance with a Danish government concept for economic reporting from state institutions (annex 3). In the Annual Financial Report there is a brief report describing EVA and a statement of the results for the previous year.

The external evaluation of EVC in 1997 was generally positive in its assessment of the evaluation activities. The experts concluded that objectives were met and that evaluations were

conducted in a sound and systematic way. The expert panel found that the evaluations combine quality development and control in a well-functioning way, even though the quality improvement aspect could have been emphasised more (see annex 58 for a full description).

A survey of the evaluated parties from evaluations conducted in 1992-1997, completed by the consultancy firm PLS Consult, was part of the documentation in the external evaluation (annex 59). The overall conclusion was that:

- The institutions had a positive assessment of the evaluation method;
- The majority of the institutions reflected on the recommendation(s) in the reports;
- The majority of the programmes have introduced changes following the evaluation;
- The evaluations have contributed to these changes;
- The majority of the institutions were satisfied with the evaluation report and found that the recommendations were documented and well-founded.

There are differences and variations between the different levels of higher education. The non-university sector was generally more positive than the university sector (annex 59).

EVC conducted a survey of the evaluation groups' members and their assessment of the evaluation process and EVC. This survey concluded that experts had a positive opinion of the evaluation process and the role of EVC (annex 54).

The follow-up to the evaluation of EVC was an approval by the Ministry of Education of the methods used, and the result was the establishment of EVA.

EVA has integrated the results of the evaluations of EVC in pilot studies of new methods of evaluation.

6 Core issues of mutual recognition

This section is related to the final reporting on the pilot phase of the mutual recognition project and not to the evaluation of the agency. It presents an account of relevant criteria and methodological elements that the agency finds essential in the recognition of another agency - both in terms of criteria that another agency should meet in order to be recognised, and in terms of the methods that should be employed.

EVA regards all the criteria in the ENQA membership provisions to be essential if the evaluations of another agency are to be recognised as substantially equal to the evaluations conducted by EVA. However, EVA also sees a need for clarification of the provision that agencies must produce a public manual. It is important to EVA that the evaluation process is transparent and that the general procedure is described. A demand for a public, standardised manual may to some extent conflict with the ambition of an evaluation model that is suited to the individual institution or programme.

Besides the ENQA membership provisions, EVA considers it essential that an agency:

- is committed to improvement and control. It must be established that both of these objectives are pursued by the agency;
- has a strong quality assurance organisation. The agency must be able to provide evidence of an effective quality assurance system that covers all the main elements of the evaluation process and that involves the key stakeholders;
- has mechanisms to ensure that all evaluations meet a threshold quality level, e.g. a high degree of involvement from agency staff in the process or a detailed description of the procedures and expectations for each part of the process, such as self-evaluation, site visits and reporting;
- has complete operational autonomy. This implies that there are mechanisms that prevent interference with the assessments made by the experts provided these correspond with the terms of reference, or similar regulations. It further implies that the specifics of the different elements of the evaluation (e.g. the self-evaluation guidelines and provisions for user surveys) are under the authority of the agency. However, it could be accepted that, for instance, governmental bodies defined the general type of evaluation or general elements to be included in the evaluation;
- is able to provide evidence of the quality of its evaluations.

Finally, EVA considers it essential that mutual recognition is to some extent based on trust in addition to pre-determined criteria and evaluative procedures. Therefore, a scheme for mutual recognition that is open to new members should include a mechanism for pre-qualification, e.g. that potential new members are only eligible for consideration if they have been recommended by agencies already recognised within the scheme.

7 Compliance with ENQA provisions

7.1 Provisions for membership

7.1.1 The agency undertakes external quality assessments (at institutional or discipline level) on a regular basis

EVA has conducted evaluations of higher education every year since 1992. On average, seven evaluations have been conducted every year for the last five years. On average, 26 institutions have been involved annually. In the 2000 programme of action, two evaluations were conducted covering 11 units. In 2001, three evaluations have been conducted covering eight units (three of which are foreign).

7.1.2 These quality assessments may involve evaluation, review, audit, assessment or accreditation, and they should belong to the core functions of the agency

EVA has conducted evaluations primarily at programme level. However, a small number of institutional evaluations have been conducted by EVA.

7.1.3 The agency should be involved in external quality assurance of more than one subject/field

EVA is responsible for the evaluation of all higher education programmes in Denmark and has conducted evaluations within all fields.

7.1.4 The agency must act outside higher education institutions. An organisation or entity inside a higher education institution is not considered an external quality assurance agency by ENQA

EVA is an independent agency and fully independent of higher education institutions (annex 1).

7.1.5 The agency has been recognised as a national or regional quality assurance agency by the competent public authorities

EVA is recognised by a parliamentary act ('Lov om Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut', annex 1) as the national agency for evaluation of all education in Denmark.

7.1.6 The agency must have been operating for a minimum of two years to be adopted as a regular member. Until that time the agency holds a provisional status

EVA has been in operation since 1992 (annex 13).

7.1.7 Professional organisations can be adopted as associate members only

Not relevant as EVA is not a part of, established by, owned or influenced by any professional organisation.

7.1.8 Agencies or organisations operating on a commercial basis cannot become regular members

EVA is a non-profit public organisation funded by governmental grant. However, EVA is required by law to conduct evaluations commissioned and paid for by ministries and other parties.

7.2 Methodological provisions

The following section accounts for EVA's compliance with the methodological provisions of ENQA.⁵

7.2.1 Assessments (evaluation, review, audit, accreditation) are conducted on a regular basis

See section 7.1.1.

7.2.2 The agency's procedures are along the lines of the recommendations of the European pilot project

All evaluations involve self-evaluation, an external expert team, a user survey and a site visit. The evaluations are, therefore, in accordance with the recommendations of the European pilot project (annex 14). With the exception of the site visit, all of the methodological recommendations of the European pilot project are mandatory for EVA, as stated in the act and the regulations (annex 1, 2).

Autonomy and independence in terms of procedures and methods concerning quality evaluation from both government and higher education institutions. This independence is ensured by the parliamentary act (annex1).

Self-assessment. Self-evaluation is a mandatory part of all evaluations conducted by EVA (annex 2).

External assessment by a peer-review group (group of experts) and site visits. An expert group is a mandatory part of all evaluations conducted by EVA. A site visit is not mandatory, but is included in all evaluations within the field of higher education (annex 14).

Publication of a report. All evaluations conducted by EVA are published. It is a mandatory requirement (annex 1).

7.2.3 The agency is working on the basis of a public manual/protocol

EVA's general method is published, and to some extent specified in the Danish Evaluation Institute Act (annex 1 & 2, see also annex 14). The guidelines for self-evaluation and other materials are broadly consistent from evaluation to evaluation, but tailored to meet the need of the specific evaluation. It was decided in 2000 that all self-evaluation guidelines must be available on the Internet.

All material sent to or from EVA as part of the evaluation process is publicly available as a mandatory requirement. This includes self-evaluations with annexes, self-evaluation guidelines, visit programmes and terms of reference. However, material exchanged between the agency and the evaluation groups is not available to the public since the members of the evaluation groups are regarded as part of EVA in this respect.

⁵ *Regulations of the European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education concerning methodological elements to which agencies applying for the regular membership must apply on the request of the membership review committee (decided by the general assembly 22-23 may 2001).*

8 Description of the process

This self-study report has been drafted with input from the management, the Higher Education Unit, the Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit and the Information Unit. The first step in the process was clarifying and listing all relevant documents. Thereafter, several drafts were discussed with different parties before it was finalised. Evaluation Officer Charlotte Rotbøll and Evaluation Officer Tobias Lindberg have drafted/edited the report, whereas Director Dorte Kristoffersen has been the project manager.

The following meetings have taken place:

November 13, 2001	Internal project organisation decided;
November 14, 2001	Brief information to all EVA staff members;
November 23, 2001	Meeting with Information Unit in order to clarify the relevant documents for the process;
November 27, 2001	Meeting with Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit in order to clarify the relevant documents for the process;
November 27, 2001	Meeting in Higher Education Unit. The mutual recognition process was discussed as a part of the agenda;
December 5, 2001	Meeting with management in order to clarify the relevant documents for the process and establish consensus on the further process;
December 7, 2001	Meeting with the project manager on a tentative draft of the report;
December 18, 2001	First draft discussed with the Higher Education Unit and project manager;
January 3, 2002	Second draft discussed with the Executive Director;
January 9, 2002	Third draft presented as a part of the agenda at an institute meeting.

Annex number	Title of the document	Translated title
1	Lov om Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut	The Danish Evaluation Institute Act
2	Vedtægt for Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut (EVA)	Regulations for the Danish Evaluation Institute (EVA)
3	Virksomhedsregnskab 2000	Annual Financial Report 2000
4	Årsberetning 2000	Annual report 2000
5	Handlingsplan 2000	Annual plan of action 2000
6	Handlingsplan 2001	Annual plan of action 2001
7	Handlingsplan 2002	Annual plan of action 2002
8	Strategi 2001-2003	Strategy 2001-2003
9	Organisationsplan	Organisation chart
10	Bestyrelse	Members of the Board
11	Repræsentantskab	Members of the Committee of Representatives
12	Ind i fremtiden, Strategi og udvikling for Evalueringscenteret, 1998	Into the Future, Strategy and Development of the Centre for Evaluation and Quality Assurance of Higher Education, 1998
13	Report 1992-1997	Report 1992-1997
14	The Danish Evaluation Institute	The Danish Evaluation Institute
15	Overvejelser om Evalueringscenterets metodegrundlag 1992-1999	Reflections on the methods used in the Centre for Evaluation and Quality Assurance of Higher Education (EVC)
17	Det gode kommissorium*	Guidelines for producing terms of reference
18	Minimumskrav til evalueringsrapporter*	Obligatory elements in evaluation reports
21	Det kollektive interview. Kursus for evalueringsgrupper	The collective interview. Course for evaluation groups
22	Skabelon for tidsplan (Produktionsplan for evalueringsrapport)	Production plan for evaluation reports

23	Eksempler på kommissorier: - Kommissorium for evaluering af basisuddannelserne - Kommissorium for evaluering af socialrådgiver- og socialformidleruddannelserne	Examples of Terms of Reference
24	Eksempler på spørgeguides:* A) Spørgeguide for det humanistiske fagpanels møde med studerende på RUC B) Spørgeguide til evalueringsgruppens institutionsbesøg i forbindelse med evalueringen af socialrådgiver- og socialformidleruddannelserne	Examples of interview protocols
25	Eksempler på vejledning til selv-evaluering: A) Evaluering af basisuddannelserne ved Roskilde Universitetscenter og Aalborg Universitet B) Evaluering af socialrådgiver- og socialformidleruddannelserne i Danmark	Examples of guidelines for self-evaluation
26	Eksempler på rapporter: A) Basisuddannelserne ved Aalborg Universitet og Roskilde Universitetscenter B) Socialrådgiver- og socialformidleruddannelserne	Examples of evaluation reports
27	Kompetenceudvikling	Framework for competence development
28	Personalepolitik (under revision)	Human resource policy (under revision)
29	Eksempel på brugerundersøgelse: A) Bilag til basisuddannelserne ved Aalborg Universitet og Roskilde Universitetscenter B) Bilag til Socialrådgiver- og socialformidleruddannelserne	Example of user survey
30	Forberedelseskemaer til medarbejderudviklingssamtaler, se bilag 27	Questionnaire for preparation for personal development interview, see annex 27
31	Evaluering af medarbejderudviklingssamtaler	Evaluation of personal development interview
32	Introduktionsprogram for nyansatte	Introductory course for new staff
33	EVA's informationsarbejde – strategi og politik*	EVA's approach to dissemination – strategy and policy
34	Skrivepolitik	Policy on written communication
35	Designmanual	Design manual
36	Strategi for dataenheden (under revision)*	Strategy of the Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit (under revision)

37	Procedure for samarbejde mellem dataenheden og projektgrupper*	Procedures for co-operation between the Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit and the project teams
45	Samarbejdsaftale med Undervisningsministeriets Statistik og Informationskontor (SIK)	Co-operation agreement with the office of statistics and information at the Ministry of Education
47	Selvevalueringsrapport (Evalueringen af Evalueringscenteret)	Self-evaluation report (Evaluation of the Centre for Evaluation and Quality Assurance of Higher Education)
48	Bilag til selvevalueringsrapport (Evalueringen af Evalueringscenteret)	Annexes to the self-evaluation report (Evaluation of the Centre for Evaluation and Quality Assurance of Higher Education)
49	Spørgeskema til evaluering af samarbejdet med bestyrelsen	Questionnaire for evaluating the co-operation with the Board
50	Evaluering af samarbejdet mellem dataenhed og projektgrupper*	Evaluation of the co-operation between the Data Processing and Quality Assurance Unit and the project teams
51	Evaluering af metoderne anvendt i HP-2000 projekterne*	Evaluation of the methods used in the projects in the annual plan of action 2001
52	Evaluering af konferencer (skemaer + resultater)*	Evaluation of conferences (questionnaires and results)
53	Evaluering af samarbejdet mellem konsulentfirmaer og projektgrupper (skemaer + resultater)*	Evaluation of the collaboration between consultancy firms and project teams (questionnaires and results)
54	Afsluttet styregruppeevaluering af Evalueringscenterets projektledelse (se bilag 48)	Finalised steering committee evaluation of project management in the Centre for Evaluation and Quality Assurance of Higher Education (EVC), see annex 48
55	Igangværende evaluering af samarbejdet mellem evalueringsgrupper og EVA	Ongoing evaluation of the co-operation between evaluation groups and EVA
57	Brugertilfredshedsundersøgelse af hjemmeside	Survey of homepage user satisfaction
58	Mellem fag og politik (Evalueringen af Evalueringscenteret)	Between subject and politics (evaluation of the Centre for Evaluation and Quality Assurance of Higher Education (EVC))
59	Undersøgelse af effekterne af uddannelsesevalueringerne	Survey of the effects of evaluation of education
60	Spørgeskema til den aktuelle evaluering af samarbejdet mellem EVA og evaluerede institutioner	Questionnaire for the ongoing evaluation of the co-operation between EVA and evaluated institutions

Note: The annex marked with an * will be available to the panel at the site visit. These annexes are internal material, working papers not yet published, confidential preliminary documents related to evaluations and documents on the relations to the external consultancy firms.