

Annex 10 - Institutional Review Judgements

In total, the reviewers make six judgements in Institutional Review. First, they make a judgement about each of the five Evaluation Areas. Secondly, the reviewers reach a summary judgement about the extent to which the HEI meets the State Quality Standards.

The Evaluation Area judgements

The wording of the Evaluation Area judgements is as follows:

- 1 The standards for the Organisation and its management are...
- 2 The standards for Resourcing are...
- 3 The standards for the Curriculum are...
- 4 The standards for Teaching, Learning, Assessment and Research are...
- 5 The standards for Students and their support are...

The judgement for each Evaluation Area has four possible grades: **standards are fully met; standards are substantially met; standards are partly met; or standards are not met.**

At the end of the site visit, the review team concludes with a series of findings and classifies them under the Evaluation Area headings. The reviewers record facts, supported by evidence and their evaluation of them. They note features of good practice, recommendations for action, affirmations of courses of action that the HEI has already identified, and weaknesses.

The criteria that review teams will use to come to these judgements are set out in the table below. These criteria are cumulative, which means that most criteria within a particular section should be fulfilled to support the relevant judgement.

When teams make their judgements, they will take into account whether the Albanian State Quality Standards have been met. Neither the headings nor the Standards are intended as checklists and reviewers will not use them in this way. Reviewers will appreciate that the precise

details of how a Standard is being addressed will vary from HEI to HEI. Not all expectations apply to all providers, which is why the judgement criteria above refer to 'applicable Standards'.

...are fully met	...are substantially met	...are partly met	...are not met
All applicable Standards have been met.	All, or nearly all, applicable Standards have been met.	Most applicable Standards have been met.	Several applicable Standards have not been met or there are major gaps in one or more of the applicable Standards.

	<p>Standards not met do not, individually or collectively, present any serious risks to the management of this area.</p>	<p>Standards not met do not present any serious risks.</p> <p>Some moderate risks may exist which, without action, could lead to serious problems over time with the management of this area.</p>	<p>Standards not met present serious risk(s), individually or collectively, to the management of this area, and limited controls are in place to mitigate the risk. Consequences of inaction in some areas may be severe.</p>
--	--	---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are examples of good practice in this area and no recommendations for improvement. • The provider has plans to enhance this area further. • Student engagement in the management of this area is widespread and supported. • Managing the needs of students is a clear focus of the provider's strategies and policies in this area. 	<p>Any recommendations may relate, for example, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minor omissions or oversights • a need to amend or update details in documentation, where the amendment will not require or result in major structural, operational or procedural change • completion of activity that is already underway in a small number of areas that will allow the provider to meet the Standards more fully. 	<p>Any recommendations may relate, for example, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • weakness in the operation of part of the provider's governance structure (as it relates to quality assurance) or lack of clarity about responsibilities • insufficient emphasis or priority given to assuring standards or quality in the provider's planning processes • quality assurance procedures which, while broadly adequate, have some shortcomings in terms of the rigour with which they are applied • problems which are confined to a small part of the provision. 	<p>Any recommendations may relate, for example, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ineffective operation of parts of the provider's governance structure (as it relates to quality assurance) • significant gaps in policy, structures or procedures relating to the provider's quality assurance • breaches by the provider of its own quality assurance management procedures.
---	--	--	---

...fully met	...are substantially met	...are partly met	...are not met
	<p>The need for action has been acknowledged by the provider in its review documentation or during the review, and it has provided clear evidence of appropriate action being taken within a reasonable timescale.</p> <p>There is evidence that the provider is fully aware of its responsibilities for assuring quality: previous responses to external review activities provide confidence that areas of weakness will be addressed promptly and professionally.</p>	<p>Plans that the provider presents for addressing identified problems before or at the review are under-developed or not fully embedded in the provider's operational planning.</p> <p>The provider's priorities or recent actions suggest that it may not be fully aware of the significance of certain issues. However, previous responses to external review activities suggest that it will take the required actions and provide evidence of action, as requested.</p>	<p>Plans for addressing identified problems that the provider may present before or at the review are not adequate to rectify the problems, or there is very little or no evidence of progress.</p> <p>The provider has not recognised that it has major problems, or has not planned significant action to address problems it has identified.</p> <p>The provider has limited understanding of the responsibilities associated with one or more key areas of the Standards, or may not be fully in control of all parts of the organisation.</p> <p>The provider has repeatedly or persistently failed to take appropriate action in response to external review activities.</p>

The summary judgement

The review team will come to a summary judgement for the whole Institutional Review based on the judgements for the five Evaluation Areas. Reviewers will compare the extent to which the standards have been met for each Evaluation Area and will compare the profile of the five grades with the table below. The summary judgement will be expressed as one of the following:

1. **The State Quality Standards are fully met**
2. **The State Quality Standards are substantially met**
3. **The State Quality Standards are partly met**
4. **The State Quality Standards are not met**

Standards are fully met	Standards are substantially met	Standards are partly	Standards are not met
The HEI meets fully the standards in at least 4 Evaluation Areas and substantially in the fifth	The HEI meets the standards in all 5 Evaluation Areas at least substantially and meets standards fully in 1 to 3 Evaluation Areas	The HEI meets the standards in at least 3 Evaluation Areas fully or substantially and the remaining Evaluation Areas are not met	The HEI meets the standards fully or substantially in 2 or less Evaluation Areas and the remaining Evaluation Areas are not met