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Abbreviations

**ESG** European Standards and Guidelines

**IWR** Institution-wide review

**IAQA** Icelandic Agency for Quality Assurance

**SER** Self-evaluation report

**[Abbreviation** Full phrasing]

Summary

Review Outcome

The review panel commissioned by the Icelandic Agency for Quality Assurance concludes that the [name of University] has **passed** the Institution-wide Review.

**OR**

The review panel commissioned by the Icelandic Agency for Quality Assurance concludes that the [name of University] is required to undergo a **follow-up review**.

Key Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations

1. [xxx]
2. [xxx]
3. [xxx]

Recommendations

1. [xxx]
2. [xxx]
3. [xxx]

If applicable:

Areas of improvement

1. [xxx]
2. [xxx]
3. [xxx]

Samantekt (Icelandic summary)

Niðurstaða úttektar

Úttektarteymið, sem starfar í umboði Gæðamats háskóla, kemst að þeirri niðurstöðu að [nafn háskóla] hafi **staðist** stofnunarúttekt.

**EÐA**

Úttektarteymið, sem starfar í umboði Gæðamats háskóla, kemst að þeirri niðurstöðu að [nafn háskóla] skuli undirgangast **eftirfylgniúttekt.**

Góðir starfshættir og tillögur að umbótum

Góðir starfshættir

1. [xxx]
2. [xxx]
3. [xxx]

Tillögur að umbótum

1. [xxx]
2. [xxx]
3. [xxx]

Nauðsynlegar úrbætur

1. [xxx]
2. [xxx]
3. [xxx]
4. Introduction
	1. Overview of the Review Process

The institution-wide review (IWR) of the [Name of University] (hereafter the University) was performed as part of the third cycle of the Quality Enhancement Framework (QEF3), and the process followed the guidelines given in the Handbook for the Icelandic Quality Enhancement Framework 2024–2029.

In the previous QEF cycle (QEF2), the University took part in an IWR in [Year].

The University submitted its self-evaluation report (SER) on [Date]. In addition, the review panel (hereafter the Panel) received access to supporting documentation, including the Institution-wide Review report in QEF2 from [Year], Year-on report from [Year], midterm progress report from [Year] and Subject-Level Review reports for all faculties undertaken during QEF2.

The review visit took place on [Date]. The full programme of the visit can be found in Annex 1.

* 1. Premise of the Evaluation

The main objective of the IWR is to provide independent external assurance that Icelandic universities are equipped to ensure the quality of their activities. The IWR is designed to support institutions in reflecting on their specific approach to the management of quality and enhancement. The IWR considers the effectiveness of the institution’s internal quality assurance processes and evidence of enhancement, based on an evaluation of three themes:

1. Learning and Teaching
2. Research and Innovation
3. The Quality System and Strategic Management

The University also receives formative feedback from the Panel on a chosen enhancement topic. This feedback does not contribute to the formal review outcome.

The formal review outcome is based on the University’s ability to demonstrate evidence of:

1. a quality management system that is operationally effective and fit for purpose as reflected in the evaluation themes;
2. ongoing enhancement of the quality of its activities; and
3. consideration of and follow-up on recommendations from previous IWRs.
	1. About the University

Please describe the University briefly. Include key characteristics, size, subject fields/schools/faculties, location, mode of delivery, mission, etc. (max. 500 words).

* 1. The Self-Evaluation Report

Please provide feedback on the University’s SER and its self-evaluation process (max. 300 words).

1. Learning from Prior Reviews
	1. Learning from Previous IWR

[Description of the Panel’s findings on the University’s follow-up and response to recommendations from the last IWR].

Please note good examples of enhancement the University has evidenced as follow-up to the last IWR, and also particular areas where the University has faced challenges in follow-up on recommendations (if any).

* 1. Learning from Internal Reviews

[Feedback on the University’s analysis of issues arising from internal reviews and evidence provided about the response to these].

1. Evaluation Themes

The evaluation themes underpin the framework within which the institution-wide review is conducted, as set out in the Handbook for the Icelandic Quality Enhancement Framework 2024–2029. Each theme provides a set of statements collectively describing an institution that is considered operationally effective.

Based on the material submitted by the University and conversations with staff, students, alumni and stakeholders during the review visit, the Panel has evaluated the evidence presented, e.g. of policies, rules or procedures, against the evaluation themes. This section of the report sets out the Panel’s evaluation of the effectiveness of the University’s quality management system in relation to each evaluation theme. The Panel also presents its considerations on the examples of enhancement provided by the University, as well as its use of external reference points and benchmarks, including part 1 of the *The Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG)and the *Icelandic Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*.

* 1. Evaluation Theme I – Learning and Teaching

*This theme addresses the procedures used to manage and enhance the quality of study programmes and other educational provision. This includes the development, monitoring and delivery of education, the management of student progression and awarding of degrees or other formal qualifications, as well as academic support and other forms of support directed at student health and wellbeing.*

[Short introduction on evidence provided by the University in relation to Theme I].

Please note here whether the University was able to present successful examples of enhancement initiatives and concrete actions relating to this theme.

1. New and existing programmes are based on defined planning and review procedures. These procedures are documented, effectively managed and widely understood by teaching staff and academic managers (ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.9).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Procedures for the development and delivery of education make appropriate reference to external reference points, including the Icelandic Qualifications Framework for Higher Education and the expectations of professional or other accreditation bodies where relevant. Students and external stakeholders actively participate in the planning and enhancement of education (ESG 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Planning and enhancement of education includes appropriate consideration of elements such as teaching and assessment methods, learning environments, student and staff support, graduate attributes and employability, learner progression and continuing education, research–teaching linkages, academic integrity and internationalisation (ESG 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.9).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. The needs of diverse learners are taken into consideration, including arrangements for flexible study patterns and for identified physical or learning support needs. Wellbeing and equality are promoted for all student groups, and support or counselling arrangements are in place where necessary (ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Policies and regulations concerning student admission, recognition of prior learning (where appropriate), student progression, and awarding of degrees and other formal qualifications are applied in a consistent and transparent way (ESG 1.4).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Information for students about their programmes are clear and readily available. Learning outcomes and workload (mapped to ECTS) are well defined, with clear protocols for the production and dissemination of handbooks and other support materials in a variety of formats. Achievement of learning outcomes is supported by teaching and assessment approaches. Students are encouraged to take an active role in their learning and receive feedback on their work to help them reach the learning outcomes (ESG 1.3, 1.8).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Procedures are in place to ensure the accuracy and currency of public information, e.g., about admissions, RPL arrangements, courses, student support and academic rules (ESG 1.8).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Educational provision is linked to the institution’s overall societal engagement. Procedures are in place to support this, and these are embedded in the institution’s management system (ESG 1.1, 1.5).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Development of educational provision is promoted through collaboration with partners, academic networks, professional bodies, alumni, and/or other collaborators nationally and internationally (ESG 1.2, 1.9).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

Summary

[Brief summary of the Panel’s conclusion on its findings for Evaluation Theme I].

In the summary of Evaluation Theme I, please consider: Are there good practices to highlight? Are there any areas where the Panel would like to recommend enhancement, or point out necessary areas of improvement (in case of an outcome of *follow-up review required*)?

* 1. Evaluation Theme II – Research and Innovation

*This theme addresses the procedures used to manage and enhance the quality of research and innovation of all types and across all subjects. This includes collaboration, societal impact, stakeholder relationships and support for academic staff and research students.*

[Short introduction on evidence provided by the University in relation to Theme II].

Please note here whether the University was able to present successful examples of enhancement initiatives and concrete actions relating to this theme.

1. The HEI seeks to strengthen the conditions for a stimulating atmosphere in relation to research and innovation, and it encourages activities with partners and collaborators both within and outside academia.

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Documented procedures are in place to ensure the responsible conduct of research, research integrity and adherence to research ethics. The HEI engages with, and encourages, open science and the use of repositories for open data.

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Documented procedures are in place to promote and support staff in the production of discipline-appropriate research and innovation outputs and in the pursuit of external research funding. The procedures should include support for the needs of early career researchers.

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. The HEI sets its direction for future development of research and innovation activities based on analysis of its own operational capacity and strengths as well as the needs of external partners.

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Research and innovation activities contribute to the betterment of society. The HEI collects relevant information regarding the societal impact of research and innovation, and this information is used in the further enhancement of these activities.

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. The HEI seeks to enhance the societal impact and reach of its research and innovation. It has defined goals for such enhancement and strategies for achieving them, supported by its management system.

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Documented procedures are in place for managing, developing and updating stakeholder relations and collaboration networks in relation to research and innovation.

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Documented procedures are in place to manage the recruitment, monitoring and support of postgraduate research students and the awarding of postgraduate research degrees. Student representation arrangements for postgraduate research students are in place.

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

Summary

[Brief summary of the Panel’s conclusion on its findings for Evaluation Theme II].

In the summary of Evaluation Theme II, please consider: Are there good practices to highlight? Are there any areas where the Panel would like to recommend enhancement, or point out necessary areas of improvement (in case of an outcome of *follow-up review required*)?

* 1. Evaluation Theme III – The Quality System and Strategic Management

*This theme addresses the development and effectiveness of the quality management. This includes the functionality of the quality management system, the use of data and student feedback, and links to strategic planning and management, across all institutional activities.*

[Short introduction on evidence provided by the University in relation to Theme III].

Please note here whether the University was able to present successful examples of enhancement initiatives and concrete actions relating to this theme.

1. The HEI maintains an effective quality management system that forms a cycle for continuous improvement of all operations. The quality management system builds on the quality policy, which is made public and forms a part of its strategic management (ESG 1.1).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. The HEI maintains documented procedures with respect to planning, delivery and enhancement of activities that relate to education, research and innovation, and societal engagement. These procedures are designed to be fit for purpose, run in a cyclical manner and address relevant support services and facilities for staff and students ESG 1.1, 1.6).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. There is evidence of clear linkages between the quality management system, strategic management and evidence-based decision-making (ESG 1.1, 1.7).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Effective management structures and committees, with clear roles and responsibilities, are in place to oversee procedures. This includes the monitoring and communication of actions arising from these procedures (ESG 1.1).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. The quality management system, including policies, regulations, procedures and instructions, is maintained and periodically reviewed (ESG 1.1).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Through its quality management system, the HEI utilises appropriate metrics and data, which are systematically collected and addressed. This includes data on student performance, progression, and student or staff concerns and complaints, as well as student representation and feedback on the needs and learning experiences of students (ESG 1.3, 1.5, 1.7).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. The HEI makes meaningful and appropriate use of external expertise in its quality assurance as and when required.

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Quality culture is participatory and inclusive, and there are opportunities for staff, students and external stakeholders to participate in the enhancement of activities in a purposeful manner. Documentation of and guidance on quality assurance is made accessible to all staff and, wherever appropriate, to students. Staff are kept aware of their individual responsibilities in relation to the quality management system (ESG 1.1).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Public information regarding the quality management system and actions arising from quality reviews is available, transparent and up to date (ESG 1.1).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Documented procedures are in place for the recruitment of full-time, part-time and sessional staff (ESG 1.5).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Documented procedures are in place to support the wellbeing, equality and non-discrimination of all staff, regardless of contract or job type (ESG 1.5).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

1. Documented procedures are in place to identify any development needs relating to staff skills and expertise and to support the required development of all staff (ESG 1.5).

[Panel’s feedback and reflection with regard to statement above].

Summary

[Brief summary of the Panel’s conclusion on its findings for Evaluation Theme III].

In the summary of Evaluation Theme III, please consider: Are there good practices to highlight? Are there any areas where the Panel would like to recommend enhancement, or point out necessary areas of improvement (in case of an outcome of *follow-up review required*)?

1. Enhancement Topic

The University has chosen an enhancement topic to explore through the self-evaluation process and site visit. The aim is to give the University an opportunity to receive formative feedback from the Panel on a topic central to the University’s profile or strategy and relevant to its quality enhancement goals. Findings for this topic do not contribute to the final review outcome, but they are intended to add value to the review process by providing the University with an opportunity for discussion and critical reflection with peers on a topic of significance.

[A brief description of the University‘s chosen enhancement topic].

[Formative feedback from the Panel on the enhancement topic].

1. Review Outcome

The review outcome is based on evidence drawn from the content of the SER and supporting documentation, as well as from the Panel’s records of formal meetings with staff, students and stakeholders. The evidence base has been assessed against the evaluation themes, whose effectiveness statements describe an operationally effective institution.

Use the following text in case of an outcome of ***passed***:

The [name of University] has, through its SER and the review visit, been able to demonstrate evidence of:

1. a quality management system that is operationally effective and fit for purpose as described in the evaluation themes;
2. ongoing enhancement of the quality of its activities; and
3. consideration of and follow-up on recommendations from previous IWRs.

The review panel commissioned by the Icelandic Agency for Quality Assurance concludes that the [name of University] has ***passed*** the Institution-wide Review.

Use the following text in case of an outcome of ***follow-up review required.*** Please note that absence of evidence of any one of the three points means the institution must undergo a follow-up review:

The [name of University] has, through its SER and the review visit, been **able** to demonstrate evidence of:

Choose point 1, 2 and/or 3 as applicable

1. a quality management system that is operationally effective and fit for purpose as described in the evaluation themes. This will be evident as a considerable absence of, or major shortcomings in, systematic procedures for key areas of operation;
2. ongoing enhancement of the quality of its activities;
3. consideration of and follow-up on recommendations from previous IWRs.

The [name of University] has, through its SER and the review visit, been **unable** to demonstrate evidence of:

Choose point 1, 2 and/or 3 as applicable

1. a quality management system that is operationally effective and fit for purpose as described in the evaluation themes. This will be evident as a considerable absence of, or major shortcomings in, systematic procedures for key areas of operation;
2. ongoing enhancement of the quality of its activities;
3. consideration of and follow-up on recommendations from previous IWRs.

The review panel commissioned by the Icelandic Agency for Quality Assurance concludes that the [name of University] is required to undergo a ***follow-up review***. The follow-up review is to take place within two years after the publication of this report, following the process set out in the Handbook for the Icelandic Quality Enhancement Framework 2024–2029.

Clarification on the necessary areas of improvement to be considered in the follow-up review are found in Section 5.3.

* 1. Commendations

The review panel commends the University on the following good practices discovered during the review process:

1. [xxx]
2. [xxx]
3. [xxx]

The Panel should strive to keep the points concise and to limit the number of points (for example, up to two per evaluation theme). The Panel is also advised to keep a relative balance between the number of points in this section and the next on recommendations.

* 1. Recommendations

The review panel recommends that the University consider the following areas for further enhancement:

1. [xxx]
2. [xxx]
3. [xxx]

The Panel should strive to keep the points concise and to limit the number of points (for example, up to two per evaluation theme). The Panel is also advised to keep a relative balance between the number of points in this section and the previous one on commendations.

(Only if applicable in case of outcome of *follow-up review required*):

* 1. Necessary Areas of Improvement

Following the Panel’s conclusion of an outcome of ***follow-up review required***, the University will undergo a follow-up review to consider progress made on the following necessary areas of improvement:

1. With regard to Evaluation Theme [No.], Statement [No.]: [xxx]
2. With regard to Evaluation Theme [No.], Statement [No.]: [xxx]
3. With regard to Evaluation Theme [No.], Statement [No.]: [xxx]

Annex 1 – Review Visit Schedule

Day 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Time | Meeting | Attendees |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Day 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Time | Meeting | Attendees |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Day 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Time | Meeting | Attendees |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |