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**Summary**

In December 2009, after an official demand coming from four universities of the French community of Belgium (FCB), AEQES and CTI initiated collaboration in order to organize a joint mission in 2012-2013. The objective of this mission is twofold: the evaluation of engineering programmes by AEQES according to the legal requirements in Belgium; the accreditation of these programmes according to CTI’s criteria.

As CTI is one of the 7 agencies authorized to deliver the EUR-ACE label, this exercise would provide access to the expected outcomes of CTI’s accreditation: the “admission” of the programmes by the French government and the EUR-ACE label.

The collaboration between a generalist evaluation agency (AEQES) and an engineering accreditation agency (CTI) in order to perform a joint mission has brought to light a number of issues. The main theoretical and practical challenge of this project is to provide a satisfactory answer to the following questions: “How to combine evaluation and accreditation cultures? How to conciliate the sometimes contrasting objectives of quality enhancement and accountability in a single exercise?”

This paper presents the main outcomes of this collaboration up to now. After describing the institutional background of the two agencies, the origin and scope of the collaboration is presented, as well as the different phases of the project. As part of the conclusion, a number of questions are addressed to the audience concerning a number of fundamental issues that are being raised in the current phase of the collaboration.

1. **Institutional background: presentation of AEQES and CTI**
   1. *Presentation of AEQES*

AEQES was established by the French community of Belgium in 2002. The agency has been restructured by law in 2008. The decree defines the agency’s missions as follows:

* To ensure that the study programmes organized by the institutions are subject to regular evaluation, highlighting best practice and any inadequacies or problems which need to be resolved
* To promote, in collaboration with all higher education institutions, the introduction of best practice, allowing for enhancement in the quality of teaching in each institution
* To provide information to the Government, stakeholders and beneficiaries of higher education on the quality of higher education
* To formulate suggestions, addressed to policymakers, in order to improve the overall quality of higher education
* To make any proposals deemed to be of use for the accomplishment of its missions, at its own initiative or request
* To represent the French Community of Belgium in national and international bodies in matters concerning quality assurance in higher education.

AEQES uses a formative quality evaluation process, working in a context where an authorisation ("*habilitation*"[[3]](#footnote-3)) is granted *ex ante* by Government decree. The results of evaluations conducted by AEQES therefore have no formal effects in terms of an institution's funding or authorisation. AEQES does not carry out any scoring or ranking of institutions and believes that such an approach encourages the emergence of a quality culture among stakeholders involved in higher education, promoting its appropriateness and fostering creativity.

The bodies of the Agency are the Steering Committee, the Secretariat, and the Executive Unit. Agency decision-making is in the hands of the Steering Committee which is made up of 24 full members (representatives from Universities, *Hautes Écoles,* higher arts colleges and adult education institutions; student and trade union representatives, representatives from business, civic society and the arts, and the director-general of higher education).

The Secretariat, consisting of the president, vice-president and director of the Agency's Executive Unit is responsible for preparing the work of the plenary sessions, carrying out all tasks delegated by the latter and making decisions on current issues. The director-general of higher education can be present in an advisory capacity.

The Executive Unit is responsible for implementing the decisions taken by the Steering Committee and the Secretariat. Its main task is to make sure that all evaluation work is carried out smoothly.

AEQES is an active participant of the European higher education area and has recently been reviewed by ENQA in order to become full member.

* 1. *Presentation of CTI*

CTI (“Commission des Titres d’ingénieur”) is a nonprofit organization officially recognized as the independent body in charge of performing programme accreditation of engineering degrees in France. CTI was established by the French law in 1934.

CTI is composed of 32 members, appointed upon legislative order, coming from different origins (public and private higher education institutions, employer organizations, professional engineering associations and trade unions); it is thus an equitable organization in terms of professional and academic participation.

Its missions are respectively: the evaluation and accreditation of programmes in the fields of engineering and applied sciences; the development of quality in engineering education; the promotion of engineering curricula and careers in France and abroad.

Since 1997, all French engineering programmes must be periodically accredited every six years. Upon the result of CTI’s accreditation, the Engineering higher education institutions are authorized (“habilitées”) by the French ministry to deliver a particular Engineering degree (“Diplôme d’ingénieur”).

Upon demand of foreign institutions, CTI is also authorized by the French law to accredit engineering programmes abroad. The result of this accreditation may, upon the concerned governments' request, result in "State admission" of these degrees by the French government. Up to the current moment, CTI has accredited engineering programmes belonging to ten institutions outside of France in six different countries (Belgium, Bulgary, Burkina Fasso, China, Vietnam and Switzerland) [1].

CTI is a full member of ENQA (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education) since 2005 and it is registered in EQAR (European Quality Assurance Register) since 2010. CTI is also a founding member of ENAEE (European Network for the Accreditation of Engineering Education) and is one of the agencies authorized to deliver the EUR-ACE label (a quality accreditation label for engineering programmes developed by ENAEE) [2]. CTI also participates in the works of ECA (European Consortium for Accreditation).

1. **Origin and scope of the collaboration**

Since 2008, all higher education programmes in the French Community of Belgium must be evaluated regularly; engineering programmes are no exception. According to AEQES ten-year plan, engineering degrees must be reviewed in 2012-2013.

In October 2009, the concerned universities expressed their wish that AEQES established a partnership with CTI in order to organize a joint mission. An official letter was sent to AEQES in order to formalize this demand in February 2010.

The objective of this mission would be twofold:

* The evaluation of the programmes in order to comply with the requirements established by the 2008 AEQES decree (see section 1)
* The accreditation of the programmes according CTI’s accreditation criteria. This exercise would thus provide access to the expected outcomes of CTI’s accreditation: the “admission” of the programmes by the French government and the EUR-ACE label.

The demand includes five engineering programmes in the field of agronomic sciences and biological engineering and fifteen in the field of engineering sciences (see table 1); these programmes are delivered by the following institutions:

* Catholic University of Louvain (UCL)
* Free University of Brussels (ULB)
* University of Liège (ULg) (including Faculty of Agricultural Sciences of Gembloux - FUSAGx)
* University of Mons (UMons)

As a result of this demand, AEQES established contact with CTI in December 2009 and a joint working group was created in order to deploy the collaboration. Section 3 explains the different phases of this project as well as its current state.

*Table 1: engineering programmes and number of students per programme delivered by HEIs in the French community of Belgium (reference year : 2009)*



1. **Phases of the collaboration**

The collaboration between AEQES and CTI is currently being deployed according to the following planning:

* 1. *Preparatory phase: December 2009- January 2011*

The purpose of this preparatory phase was twofold:

* to assess the feasibility of the collaboration
* to agree on a set of common principles and a basic work framework (once the feasibility confirmed).

As a result of this preparatory phase, a formal collaboration agreement was signed between the presidents of the two agencies. Additionally, a number of issues were detected that would have to be carefully addressed during later stages (see section 4).

* 1. *Detailed design of the collaboration: January 2011- December 2011*

Since January 2011, after the signature of the formal agreement, the collaboration has entered a new phase. A number of specific documents and procedures have been developed, such as a common evaluation and accreditation framework and the selection procedure of the experts to compose the panels.

* 1. *Execution phase: January 2012- September 2013*

The execution of the collaboration (designation of the expert panels, specific training sessions, evaluation visits, etc.) has started in January 2012. Evaluation visits will start en October 2012.

According to the planning, this phase has not yet been completed and will not be further addressed in this paper.

1. **Development and main outcomes of the preparatory phase**
   1. *Assessing the feasibility of the collaboration*

As a preliminary step, during the preparatory phase, the feasibility of the AEQES-CTI collaboration was assessed. The feasibility assessment concerned three main issues:

* The compatibility of the two national quality assurance frameworks and the detection of possible legal and material barriers to the collaboration
* The compatibility of evaluation/ accreditation methods and procedures put in place by the two agencies
* The applicability of CTI’s accreditation framework to engineering programmes in the French community of Belgium.

*Compatibility of the two national frameworks; detection of legal and material barriers*

As explained in section 1, the French law authorizes CTI to accredit engineering programmes abroad, upon the concerned institutions’ and governments’ request. CTI is also authorized by ENAEE to deliver the EUR-ACE label to second cycle programmes in those countries, such as Belgium, in which a national EUR-ACE accredited agency doesn’t exist.

As for AEQES, upon the signature of a formal agreement respecting certain conditions (i.e. the respect of AEQES’ ten-year plan and compatibility of methods and procedures), the agency has the autonomy to establish collaboration with another quality assurance agency [3].

Overall, the two national legal frameworks posed no major barriers to the collaboration. However, one difficulty detected at this stage was the difference between the two periodic calendars. As explained in section 1, programmes in FCB are assessed every ten years, whereas CTI’s accreditation is performed every six years (the minimum accreditation periodicity allowed by the French law). The coordination of calendars between the two agencies doesn’t seem to be possible for now. This difficulty, which has not been judged to be a major obstacle for this initial collaboration, will have to be addressed in a future stage.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Concerning material issues, after an analysis of the demand, CTI’s board confirmed the interest of the agency in establishing this collaboration. CTI transmitted the estimated costs of the operation, which were accepted by the concerned higher education institutions.

*Compatibility of evaluation/ accreditation methods and procedures put in place by the two agencies.*

In order to test the compatibility of procedures and methods, the working group decided to use the comparison tools and procedures developed by ECA[[5]](#footnote-5) in the TEAM project [[6]](#footnote-6)[2]. A number of work meetings were held in order to perform a comparative analysis of standards and procedures. Additionally, representatives of the two agencies were included as observers in a CTI and an AEQES mission.

As a result of this comparison, the procedures and methods of the two agencies were found to be globally compatible with regard to their principles and conception. However, during the crossed visits, a number of implementation differences were detected, which would need to be carefully addressed along the collaboration.

Indeed, a number of crucial elements, such as the dynamics and objectives of the HEI’s self-evaluation phase, the balance between quantitative and qualitative criteria, the particular role of the panel members during the site-visits or the attitude of the higher education institutions with regard to the assessment exercise are fundamentally influenced by the fact that HEIs undergo an accreditation process (as opposed to going through an evaluation process in which no final yes/no decision is made). Being able to effectively combine the accountability and the quality enhancement approaches comes up as one of the main challenges of this collaboration.

These issues are currently being addressed in the detailed design phase of the collaboration and will definitely have an impact on the structural elements of the mission (composition of the panel, role of the panel members and organization of the site-visits).

*The applicability of CTI’s and EUR-ACE accreditation criteria to engineering programmes in the French community of Belgium.*

CTI’s accreditation criteria, whose first version was released in 1998, is explained in the document “References and Guidelines” [3]. A permanent working group at CTI is in charge of revising and updating this document every three years. CTI’s reference framework is compatible with EUR-ACE accreditation criteria.

Even if all the institutions wishing to deliver the « Diplôme d’ingénieur” must demonstrate a global compliance with CTI’s accreditation criteria, a certain flexibility is allowed for institutions abroad to adapt to specific national legal and regulatory frameworks. Nevertheless, a number of criteria have been identified as “mandatory”; that is to say, they need to be respected by the totality of the accredited institutions. Fulfillment of these criteria is a condition for good employability in engineering activities.

* A strong and broad basis in fundamental sciences in order to guarantee analytical competences and the capacity for adjusting in the long term the demanding evolutions of the engineering and management activities.
* The engineering sciences provide a guarantee of efficiency and short term adaptation to a professional activity (experience and innovation).
* Business culture and economic, social, human, environmental ethics awareness (partnerships of the higher education institutions with the profession, involvement of professionals in training, internships in industry, entrepreneurship, ...).
* Communication skills and international awareness (international partnerships, intercultural experiences, language skills, joint diploma, ...).

CTI’s accreditation criteria pay more attention to “what” than to “how”. In this sense, some of the strict quantitative requirements imposed by CTI in the case of French engineering programmes, such as a minimum of 28 weeks of internships, are not directly transposable to foreign degrees. This requirement is in fact related to the second mandatory requirement (short term adaptation to a professional activity). CTI accepts that the organization of internships is frequently difficulted by legal and material barriers and accepts that there could be other methods in order to develop this outcome.

These mandatory requirements were transmitted to the concerned deans. Without anticipating the results of the accreditation, no prior incompatibilities have been detected which could put the accreditation at risk.

CTI’s accreditation criteria are currently being adapted in order to accommodate to Belgium’s French community specificities[[7]](#footnote-7).

* 1. *Collaboration agreement between AEQES and CTI*

As a result of the preparatory phase, the feasibility, as well as the will of all parties to participate in the project, was confirmed. The main outcome of this phase has been the establishment of a formal agreement signed between the presidents of the two agencies [6], covering the different organizational aspects.

1. **Main outcomes of the detailed design phase**

During this phase, the main organizational aspects have been clarified by the CTI-AEQES working group:

* *The general organization of the project.* As a general principle, all stages of the joint mission (composition of the expert panel, site visits, production of reports) are jointly managed by AEQES and CTI. AEQES will ensure the logistic coordination during the execution phase. Costs will be equally shared by the two agencies.
* *The organization of the site-visits*

An evaluation visit of 5 to 7 days, covering all engineering programmes involved, has been organized in each of the higher education institutions. This configuration permits to ensure the evaluation and accreditation coherence at the institutional level.

* *The composition of the expert panel*

A mixed team of experts has been appointed jointly by the two agencies. The composition of the panel has respected the minimum criteria imposed by the two agencies: the academic/professional balance and the presence of a student (CTI); an expertise in science of education and in quality management by at least one panel members (AEQES).

The expert panel is led by three coordinators: a president in charge of coordinating the evaluation process and two CTI members who will ensure the link with the accreditation phase.

A fixed team has been designated covering all missions and which will be present during the entire duration of the visit. This fixed team is composed by:

* The three coordinators
* A science of education expert
* A professional expert
* Two students

Apart from this fixed team, a number of additional experts covering the different engineering domains under evaluation will participate in the missions. These experts will be present during the evaluation of the specific programmes related to their expertise field. These experts will also carry out specific tasks, such as the consultation of documents related to the assessment of the outcomes of the programme (final theses, exams, syllabus, etc.).

* *The main outcomes of the mission*

The following reports will be produced by the expert panel:  
- A draft report, addressed to the HEIs in order to incorporate possible

correction of any factual errors and/or content observations.

* The final review report, published at full length on the AEQES website.
* The system-wide analysis, published on the AEQES website. This analysis consists of a contextualised presentation of the programmes and their prospects in the French community, within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). This report also contains a SWOT analysis of all reviewed programmes, along with a list of recommendations for improving overall quality.

The final review report will be addressed to CTI’s general assembly.

A final executive report will be produced stating the accreditation decision and some final recommendations. The accreditation report will be published on CTI’s website.

1. **Conclusions and questions for the audience**

Since the beginning of the collaboration in December 2009, a preliminary phase has been completed, which has permitted to agree on a certain set of basic principles and to set a basic work framework.

The collaboration between an evaluation agency (AEQES) and an accreditation agency (CTI) in order to perform a joint mission has revealed to be an illustrative and interesting exercise for both parties. The comparison exercise has permitted to confront the procedures and methods of the two organizations; underlying principles behind two apparently similar procedures have been brought to surface

This step by step, practical and detailed comparative analysis has built a space of trust and confidence between the two organizations as it has raised the following issues:

* What are the fundamental differences between an evaluation and an accreditation approach?
* How do these differences impact on the organizational culture of the agency?
* What is the impact of this aspect over the structural elements of an external evaluation:
  + The HEI’s self-evaluation phase
  + the role, behavior and mission of the different panel members
  + the overall attitude of HEI towards the process
  + the organization and course of assessment visits
* To what extent can the agencies conciliate the sometimes confronted objectives of accountability and quality enhancement in this single exercise?

The AEQES-CTI working group would welcome any inputs from the audience of this conference concerning these fundamental issues which will be addressed during the implementation phase.
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