

Guidelines for Institutional Accreditation

Approved by the Higher Education Quality Assessment Council of the Estonian Higher Education Quality Agency on 01.04.2011.

Amended on 13.06.2012; 21.02.2012; 21.02.2013; 04.06.2013; 02.12.2013; 18.06.2015; 11.11.2016.

Amended by the Quality Assessment Council for Higher Education of the Estonian Quality Agency for Education on 02.07.2024.

I. General Provisions

1. On the basis of clause 10 (1) 1), subsection 10 (4) and § 12 of the Universities Act, subsections 21 (1) to (3) and (5) of the Institutions of Professional Higher Education Act, and subsections 14 (1) to (3) and (5) of the Private Schools Act, the Estonian Quality Agency for Education (hereinafter HAKA) shall establish and disclose the conditions and the procedure for institutional accreditation together with an Annex.
2. The institutional accreditation is an external evaluation in the course of which HAKA shall assess the compliance of the management, administration, academic and research activity, and academic and research environment of universities and institutions of professional higher education (hereinafter higher education institutions), with the legislation as well as with the purposes and development plans of institutions of higher education. The purpose of institutional accreditation is to support the development of strategic management and culture of quality in higher education institutions, inform stakeholders of the outcomes of the main activities thereof, and enhance the reliability and competitiveness of Estonian higher education.
3. Higher education institutions have an obligation to undergo the institutional accreditation at least once in seven years.
4. A higher education institution or its organising body shall submit a request for institutional accreditation to HAKA no later than 1.5 years before the expiration date of the existing accreditation.
5. Definitions
In this document, the following definitions are used:
 - 5.1. “Sub-area” means a subdivision of an assessment area containing specific requirements (e.g., 7.1.1, 7.1.2, etc.).
 - 5.2. “Evaluation criterion” means a recommended standard against which compliance with the requirements is evaluated.

- 5.3. "Assessment area" means core or support processes of a higher education institution the functioning of which the expert panel evaluates in the course of institutional accreditation. The assessment areas include the organisational management and performance; teaching and learning; research, development and/or other creative activity; and service to society (e.g., 7.1, 7.2, etc.).
- 5.4. "Indicator" means a quantitative value describing the results or developments of an assessment area.
- 5.5. "Requirement" means an obligation of a higher education institution or expectation of institutional performance arising from legislation, strategies or international agreements (e.g., 7.1.1.1, 7.1.1.2, etc.).
- 5.6. "Component assessment" means separate assessments of four assessment areas by an expert panel: the organisational management and performance; teaching and learning; research, development and/or other creative activity; and service to society.
- 5.7. "Research, development and/or other creative activity" (hereinafter RDC) means research and development (including basic and applied research) as defined in the Organisation of Research and Development Act, and creative and development activities in the field of arts.
- 5.8. "Key results" mean the most important output indicators describing institutional performance on the basis of which higher education institutions assess implementation of their development and action plans.

II. Assessment Areas, Sub-areas and Requirements for Institutional Accreditation

- 6. When defining the assessment areas, sub-areas, and requirements for institutional accreditation; the legislation of the Republic of Estonia regulating higher education, national strategies, the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, and other international agreements, have been taken into account. When accrediting a foreign higher education institution, in addition to ESG, the requirements arising from the legal framework of the respective country are also taken into account, and if necessary, procedures, requirements, standards, criteria and/or indicators are adjusted accordingly.
- 7. HAKA shall assess the compliance of the management, administration, academic and research activity, and academic and research environment of higher education institutions with the requirements by the following areas and sub-areas:

7.1. Organisational management and performance

7.1.1. General management

- 7.1.1.1. A higher education institution has defined its role in the Estonian society.
- 7.1.1.2. The development plan and the related action plans of a higher education institution arise from the concrete purposes that are built on its mission, vision and core values, and that consider the country's priorities and society's expectations.
- 7.1.1.3. Key results of a higher education institution have been defined.
- 7.1.1.4. The leadership of a higher education institution conducts the preparation and implementation of development and action plans and includes the members and other stakeholders in this work.

- 7.1.1.5. Liability at all management levels has been defined and described, and it supports the achievement of institutional purposes and the coherent performance of core processes.
 - 7.1.1.6. Internal and external communications of a higher education institution (including marketing and image building) are purposeful and managed.
- 7.1.2. Personnel management
- 7.1.2.1. The principles and procedures for employee recruitment and development arise from the objectives of the development plan of a higher education institution, and ensure academic sustainability.
 - 7.1.2.2. When selecting, appointing and evaluating members of the academic staff, their past activities (teaching, RDC, student feedback, etc.) are taken into account in a balanced way.
 - 7.1.2.3. The principles of remuneration and motivation of employees are clearly defined, available to all employees, and implemented.
 - 7.1.2.4. Employee satisfaction with the management, working conditions, flow of information, etc., is regularly surveyed and the results used in improvement activities.
 - 7.1.2.5. Employees participate in international mobility programmes, cooperation projects, networks, etc.
 - 7.1.2.6. Employees base their activities on principles of academic ethics.
- 7.1.3. Management of financial resources and infrastructure
- 7.1.3.1. The allocation of financial resources of a higher education institution as well as the administration and development of infrastructure are economically feasible, and are based on the objectives of the development plan of an institution of higher education and national priorities (except private institutions).
 - 7.1.3.2. A higher education institution uses information systems that support its management and the coherent performance of its core processes.
 - 7.1.3.3. The working conditions of the staff, and the learning and RDC conditions of students (library, studios, workshops, laboratories, etc.) meet the needs arising from the specifics of an institution of higher education and the expectations of members.

7.2. Teaching and learning

- 7.2.1. Effectiveness of teaching and learning, and formation of the student body
- 7.2.1.1. A higher education institution has defined its educational objectives and measures their implementation.
 - 7.2.1.2. A higher education institution creates the prerequisites to ensure its graduates national and international competitiveness.
 - 7.2.1.3. The number of student places is planned in accordance with the social need and the potentials and purposes of an institution of higher education.
 - 7.2.1.4. The admission rules are consistent with the mission and purposes of an institution of higher education and support the formation of a motivated student body.

7.2.1.5. Students are provided with opportunities to study at a higher education institution regardless of any special needs.

7.2.2. Study programme development

7.2.2.1. A higher education institution bases its new study programmes on its purposes and the needs of the labour market, and takes into account the strategies of the country and expectations of the society.

7.2.2.2. Development activities related to study programmes are systematic and regular; different stakeholders are involved in the development of study programmes.

7.2.2.3. Graduate satisfaction with the quality of instruction and employer satisfaction with the quality and suitability to the requirements of the labor market of graduates are surveyed and analysed; the results are considered in the development of study programmes.

7.2.3. Student academic progress and student assessment

7.2.3.1. Student academic progress is monitored and supported.

7.2.3.2. Student assessment supports learning and is in line with learning outcomes.

7.2.3.3. A higher education institution has an effective system for taking account of prior learning and work experience.

7.2.4. Support processes for learning

7.2.4.1. The organisation of studies creates an opportunity for students to complete their studies within the standard period.

7.2.4.2. A higher education institution provides students with counselling related to their studies and career.

7.2.4.3. A higher education institution supports student international mobility.

7.2.4.4. Modern technical and educational technology resources are used to organise educational activities.

7.2.4.5. Students are periodically asked for feedback on learning and support processes (the organisation of studies, assessment, counselling, etc.); the results of surveys are taken into account in improvement activities.

7.3. Research, development and/or other creative activity (RDC)

7.3.1. RDC effectiveness

7.3.1.1. A higher education institution has defined its RDC objectives and measures their implementation.

7.3.1.2. A higher education institution monitors the needs of society and the labour market, and considers them in planning its RDC activities.

7.3.2. RDC resources and support processes

7.3.2.1. A higher education institution has an effective RDC support system.

7.3.2.2. A higher education institution has financial resources needed for RDC development and a strategy that supports their acquisition.

7.3.2.3. A higher education institution participates in different RDC networks.

7.3.2.4. RDC infrastructure is being updated and used effectively.

7.3.3. Student research supervision and doctoral studies

- 7.3.3.1. A higher education institution includes students of all academic cycles in research, creative or project activity; and systematically surveys student satisfaction with their supervision.
- 7.3.3.2. Professionalism, effectiveness and the workload of supervisors are reasonably balanced, which ensures the quality of research papers and positive graduation rates.
- 7.3.3.3. Students are guided to recognize plagiarism and to avoid it.
- 7.3.3.4. Conditions have been created for admission of international doctoral students and for studies abroad for doctoral students.
- 7.3.3.5. A higher education institution includes recognised foreign scientists in the provision of doctoral studies and the supervision of doctoral theses.

7.4. Service to society

7.4.1. Popularisation of core activities of a higher education institution and the involvement of an institution of higher education in social development

- 7.4.1.1. A higher education institution has a system for popularising its core activities.
- 7.4.1.2. Employees of an institution of higher education participate in the activities of professional associations, and as experts, in other social supervisory boards and decision-making bodies.

7.4.2. In-service training and other educational activities for the general public

- 7.4.2.1. A higher education institution has defined the objectives regarding in-service training and measures their implementation.
- 7.4.2.2. In-service training is planned in accordance with the needs of target groups as well as with the potentials and purposes of an institution of higher education.
- 7.4.2.3. Participant satisfaction with the quality of in-service training is regularly surveyed and the results are used in planning improvement activities.

7.4.3. Other public-oriented activities

- 7.4.3.1. Public-oriented activities are purposeful, the results of the activities are periodically evaluated, and improvements are introduced based on evaluations.
- 7.4.3.2. A higher education institution contributes to the enhancement of community welfare by sharing its resources (library, museums, sports facilities, etc.) and/or by organising concerts, exhibitions, performances, conferences, fairs and other events.

8. Assessment criteria and indicators for sub-areas shall be defined in the Annex to this document.

III. Formation and Functions of Expert Panels

9. An expert panel (hereinafter panel) shall consist of four to six members. HAKA shall initiate the formation of a panel no later than six months prior to the planned assessment visit (hereinafter visit).
10. Panels shall be formed based on the following principles:
 - 10.1. at least one member of a panel shall be chosen from outside of higher education institutions;
 - 10.2. at least two members of a panel shall be chosen from outside of Estonia;
 - 10.3. at least one member of a panel shall be a student or a person who has graduated from a higher education institution within the previous year;
 - 10.4. at least one member of a panel shall preferably have an experience of managing an institution of higher education similar to the one under evaluation;
 - 10.5. at least one member of a panel shall have past experience in institutional accreditation;
 - 10.6. members of a panel shall not be affiliated with the institution of higher education under evaluation.
11. Requirements for panel members:
 - 11.1. members of a panel shall be independent; they shall not represent the interests of the organisation they belong to;
 - 11.2. members of a panel shall be unbiased in their assessments;
 - 11.3. members of a panel shall know the functioning of the system of higher education and are knowledgeable about trends in higher education and principles of external evaluation;
 - 11.4. members of a panel shall have the teamwork skills necessary for implementing the work;
 - 11.5. members of a panel shall be proficient in both spoken and written English.
12. After coordinating the composition of a preliminary panel with the HAKA Higher Education Quality Assessment Council (Hereinafter Quality Assessment Council), HAKA shall forward the relevant information to the higher education institution, who then has one week to present its position on the composition of a panel and, when justified, to ask for additional members or for the removal of a member within a number limit provided for in clause 9 above.
13. The Director of HAKA shall approve the final composition of a panel by his or her order and appoint a chairperson of the panel and an assessment coordinator.
14. An assessment coordinator (hereinafter coordinator) shall be an HAKA employee who has past experience in external evaluation in the field of higher education. The coordinator is a support person of a panel and an administrator of the accreditation process. The coordinator is not a member of a panel.
15. Members of a panel shall confirm by signature an obligation to maintain the confidentiality of information that has become known to them in the course of evaluation, and a lack of conflicts of interest. In the case of a conflict of interest, panel members shall immediately notify the Director of HAKA of it and remove themselves from the work of the panel. A conflict of interest is presumed to be present in the following cases:

- 15.1. A panel member has an employment or other contractual relationship with the higher education institution under evaluation at the time of evaluation, or he or she has had an employment relationship with that higher education institution within three years prior to the assessment visit.
 - 15.2. A panel member is participating in the work of a decision-making or advisory body of the higher education institution under evaluation at the time of evaluation.
 - 15.3. A panel member is studying at the higher education institution under evaluation, or graduated from it less than three years ago.
 - 15.4. The membership connected with the higher education institution under evaluation includes a person closely related to a panel member (spouse or life partner, child or parent).
16. The working language of a panel shall be English. If the higher education institution wants to use interpretation services, it shall coordinate the selection of an interpreter with the assessment coordinator no later than one month prior to the assessment visit. According to HAKA, an interpreter must meet the following requirements: he or she has necessary preparation for consecutive interpretation in Estonian-English-Estonian (master degree studies in interpreting, in-service training in interpreting, interpreting as an additional specialty, etc.), past experience in consecutive interpretation, and commands the terminology regarding higher education. Costs of interpretation services shall be incurred by the higher education institution under evaluation.
17. With the consent of the chairperson of a panel and by an order of the Director of HAKA, up to two observers from other organisations practicing external evaluation can be appointed. Observers shall confirm by signature an obligation to maintain the confidentiality of information that has become known to them in the course of evaluation. Observers have no right to intervene in the process of evaluation.
18. Duties of members of a panel:
- 18.1. to examine documents regulating institutional accreditation and complete assessment training provided by HAKA;
 - 18.2. to review a self-evaluation report of an institution of higher education, and prepare and submit to a coordinator a list of topics to be focused on in the course of evaluation by assessment areas and sub-areas;
 - 18.3. to participate in the meetings and discussions of the panel;
 - 18.4. to participate in the preparation for a visit;
 - 18.5. to participate in the visit;
 - 18.6. to participate in wording component assessments and preparing the assessment report;
 - 18.7. to examine the comments of the institution of higher education about the assessment report and consider them when coordinating the output of the final assessment report;
 - 18.8. to perform other tasks related to evaluation activities according to the division of tasks among the members of a panel;
 - 18.9. to adhere to the agreed panel deadlines.

19. Duties of a coordinator:
 - 19.1. to ensure smooth functioning of the evaluation process on the basis of the requirements and the timeframe provided in this document;
 - 19.2. on the basis of recommendations by members of a panel, to prepare a summary of topics on which the evaluation should focus;
 - 19.3. to coordinate with the members of a panel the list of people whom the panel would like to interview, and the list of additional materials that the panel needs to prepare for the visit;
 - 19.4. to coordinate with an institution of higher education the schedule of the visit, the names and the titles of positions of the people participating in meetings; and, if necessary, to request additional materials from the institution of higher education;
 - 19.5. to prepare a draft assessment report on the basis of recommendations by members of a panel;
 - 19.6. to perform other one-time tasks related to a specific evaluation assigned by the chairperson of the panel.
20. Duties of the chairperson of a panel:
 - 20.1. to chair the meetings of the panel;
 - 20.2. to divide tasks among the members of the panel;
 - 20.3. to lead the panel during the visit;
 - 20.4. after the visit, to give the overview of provisional conclusions of the panel to the higher education institution;
 - 20.5. to ensure that the component assessments are justified;
 - 20.6. to prepare and confirm the assessment report.
21. Interviews conducted during visits shall be documented.
22. HAKA shall remunerate the members of a panel according to the price list established by a directive of the chairperson of the Management Board of the Archimedes Foundation. HAKA shall also reimburse the members of a panel for costs of transportation (except between the facilities of a higher education institution in a city/settlement) and costs of accommodation.

IV. Preparation of Self-evaluation Report

23. Self-evaluation reports shall contain an evidence-based analysis of the strengths and areas for improvement of higher education institutions by assessment areas and sub-areas.
24. Self-evaluation reports shall be in English. The maximum length of the report, including annexes, is 120,000 characters but not longer than 70 pages (*amendment shall enter into force 01/01/2013*).
25. HAKA shall provide basic training in self-evaluation to higher education institutions at their request. HAKA shall reimburse the costs related to trainers' wages and the development of training materials.
26. In addition to the basic training, HAKA shall arrange trainings in the course of the process according to the dates available in its training calendar or at the request of an institution of higher education. Higher education institutions shall pay for these trainings according to the price list

established by a directive of the chairperson of the Management Board of the Archimedes Foundation.

27. Higher education institutions shall submit their self-evaluation reports in electronic format to HAKA no later than three months prior to an assessment visit coordinated with HAKA.
28. HAKA shall review a self-evaluation report within two weeks after receiving it and, if necessary, return it to the higher education institution for amendments and improvements. The higher education institution shall send the amended report back to HAKA within two weeks.
29. The coordinator shall send the self-evaluation report to the panel no later than two months prior to the visit.

V. Assessment Visits

30. HAKA with the higher education institution shall agree on the week of the assessment visit 9 to 12 months ahead of time. The higher education institution who receives a panel shall, no later than one month before a visit, appoint a person who is responsible for a smooth process of the visit, and ensures appropriate working conditions for members of the panel.
31. No later than one month prior to the visit, the coordinator shall, based on the proposals by members of the panel and in coordination with them, prepare a list of the following items concerning the self-evaluation report:
 - 31.1. questions and/or comments;
 - 31.2. a provisional list of the strengths of the higher education institution and the topics to be focused on in the course of evaluation;
 - 31.3. a list of additional materials to be requested;
 - 31.4. a list of individuals, whom the panel would like to meet during the visit;
 - 31.5. a list of regional facilities or colleges which the panel would like to visit (up to 2 facilities/colleges per institution of higher education).
32. The coordinator shall prepare the schedule for the visit and coordinate it with the higher education institution under evaluation no later than three weeks before the visit.
33. A visit shall last up to three days, in case of a higher education institution with regional facilities or colleges for a longer period as appropriate, but no more than one day per facility or college.
34. In the course of a visit, the higher education institution shall make an appropriately furnished room available to the panel members and allow the panel to:
 - 34.1. access internal normative documents that provide for and govern the activities of the higher education institution;
 - 34.2. interview employees and students of the higher education institution at the choice of panel members;
 - 34.3. access information related to education, research, development and students, and information systems;
 - 34.4. access information related to employees of the higher education institution (their CVs, job descriptions, etc.);
 - 34.5. examine the infrastructure of the higher education institution;

- 34.6. access students' research, development and creative works;
 - 34.7. access information related to financial activities of the higher education institution;
 - 34.8. if necessary, obtain other information related to the management and administration of the higher education institution.
35. Within five days after the visit, HAKA shall ask the higher education institution to give feedback on the apparent preparation of members of the panel, the relevance of their questions and other pertinent issues according to the form established by HAKA. The results of the feedback shall be taken as the basis for choosing members of panels for subsequent accreditations.

VI. Assessment Reports and Formation of Component Assessments

36. Panels shall evaluate institutions of higher education in four separate areas: the organisational management and performance; teaching and learning; research, development and/or other creative activity; and service to society (hereinafter component assessments).
37. Component assessments shall be based on conformity analysis by sub-area. Sub-areas shall be evaluated on a scale with three values: 'conforms with requirements', 'partially conforms with requirements', and 'does not conform with requirements'.
38. Panels shall base their component assessments on the following principles:
- 38.1. If all sub-areas are evaluated as 'conforms with requirements', the component assessment shall be 'conforms with requirements'.
 - 38.2. If one sub-area is evaluated as 'partially conforms with requirements' and all other sub-areas are evaluated as 'conforms with requirements', the component assessment shall be either 'conforms with requirements' or 'partially conforms with requirements', based on the conclusion after weighing the strengths of the area against its weaknesses.
 - 38.3. If more than one sub-area is evaluated as 'partially conforms with requirements', the component assessment shall be 'partially conforms with requirements'.
 - 38.4. If one sub-area is evaluated as 'does not conform with requirements' and all other sub-areas are evaluated as 'conforms with requirements', the component assessment shall be 'partially conforms with requirements'.
 - 38.5. If one sub-area is evaluated as 'does not conform with requirements' and at least one is evaluated as 'partially conforms with requirements', the component assessment shall be either 'partially conforms with requirements' or 'does not conform with requirements', based on the conclusion after weighing the strengths of the area against its weaknesses.
 - 38.6. If at least two sub-areas are evaluated as 'does not conform with requirements', the component assessment shall be 'does not conform with requirements'.
39. Panels' component assessments shall preferably be based on a decision adopted by consensus. If consensus is not reached, a simple majority of members of the panel shall make the decision, and the dissenting view(s) together with the reason(s) shall be included. If the votes are equally divided, the vote of the chairperson shall decide.

40. Sub-areas where a higher education institution has shown outstanding results and/or initiatives, the panel may recognize it with an additional note of 'worthy of recognition'. If the panel estimates that at least two sub-areas of an assessment area deserve recognition, the panel shall recognize the achievements of the university in that assessment area with an additional note of 'worthy of recognition'.
41. HAKA shall submit an assessment report the higher education institution by the end of the fifth week after the visit. Upon a special agreement between HAKA, the panel and the higher education institution, in the case where several higher education institutions are evaluated simultaneously, the deadline for the submission of the assessment report can be extended for up to two weeks.
42. Higher education institutions shall have the opportunity to submit their comments about the assessment report within two weeks after receipt of the report. The panel shall review the comments received and consider them in preparing the final report.
43. The chairperson of a panel shall forward the electronic version of the final assessment report, including the final component assessments, and confirmed by the chairperson of the panel, to HAKA no later than by the end of the eighth week after the visit.
44. HAKA shall forward the panel's assessment report to the HAKA Quality Assessment Council and the higher education institution under evaluation.

VII. Final Decision by HAKA Quality Assessment Council

45. The Quality Assessment Council shall make the final decision on the institutional accreditation at its session within three months after receiving the report. If necessary, the Quality Assessment Council may ask the chairperson of the panel or a member of the panel assigned by the chairperson to attend the session for explanations.
46. The Quality Assessment Council shall base its decision on the self-evaluation report of a higher education institution, the component assessments by a panel, comments by the higher education institution received in a timely manner, and additional materials submitted at the request of the Quality Assessment Council.
47. In case of contradictions in component assessments or inadequate justification, the Quality Assessment Council shall have the right to return the report to the expert panel to be reviewed and clarified. The panel shall re-send the reviewed report to HAKA no later than within two weeks after it was returned to the panel and HAKA shall proceed in accordance with the procedure established by clauses 43 and 44 above.
48. The Quality Assessment Council shall base its decision regarding institutional accreditation on the following principles:
 - 48.1. If all component assessments are provided as 'conforms with requirements', the Quality Assessment Council shall conclude that the management, administration, academic and research activity, and academic and research environment, meet the requirements; and decide to accredit the institution of higher education for seven years.

- 48.2. If one or two component assessments are provided as 'partially conforms with requirements' and all other component assessments are provided as 'conforms with requirements', the Quality Assessment Council shall analyse the strengths and areas for improvement of the higher education institution and conclude that the management, administration, academic and research activity, and academic and research environment, meet the requirements; and decide to accredit the higher education institution for seven years; or shall conclude that there are deficiencies in the management, administration, academic and research activity, or academic and research environment of the higher education institution; give instructions to remove them; and decide to accredit the higher education institution for three years.
- 48.3. If three component assessments are provided as 'partially conforms with requirements' and none of the component assessments are provided as 'does not conform with requirements', the Quality Assessment Council shall conclude that there are deficiencies in the management, administration, academic and research activity, or academic and research environment of the higher education institution; give instructions to remove them; and decide to accredit the institution of higher education for three years.
- 48.4. If all component assessments are provided as 'partially conforms with requirements', the Quality Assessment Council shall analyse the strengths and areas for improvement of the institution of higher education and conclude that there are deficiencies in the management, administration, academic and research activity, or academic and research environment of the higher education institution; give instructions to remove them; and decide to accredit the institution of higher education for three years; or shall conclude that the management, administration, academic and research activity, or academic and research environment of the higher education institution does not meet the requirements; and decide not to accredit the institution of higher education.
- 48.5. If one component assessment is provided as 'does not conform with requirements', the Quality Assessment Council shall analyse the strengths and areas for improvement of the higher education institution, and conclude that the management, administration, academic and research activity, or academic and research environment of the higher education institution does not meet the requirements; and decide not to accredit the institution of higher education; or shall conclude that there are deficiencies in the management, administration, academic and research activity, or academic and research environment of the higher education institution; give instructions to remove them; and decide to accredit the higher education institution for three years. In this case, the accreditation for three years shall be possible only if all other component assessments are 'conforms with requirements'.
- 48.6. If at least two component assessments are provided as 'does not conform with requirements', the Quality Assessment Council shall conclude that the management, administration, academic and research activity, or academic and research environment of the higher education institution does not meet the requirements; and decide not to accredit the institution of higher education.
- 48.7. If the Quality Assessment Council weighs between two accreditation decisions and finds that if the higher education institution were to satisfy certain conditions, a more positive decision would be possible, the Quality Assessment Council may make that decision as a secondary condition as defined by § 53 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

49. If panels have recognized the development of an assessment area with an additional note 'worthy of recognition', the Quality Assessment Council shall cite the recognition(s) in the final decision. The additional note shall not influence the result of the accreditation.
50. HAKA shall electronically forward the final decision by the Quality Assessment Council and the assessment report to the institution of higher education within two weeks after the date of the decision by the Quality Assessment Council.
51. Within one week after the final decision and the assessment report were forwarded to the institution of higher education, HAKA shall publicise on its website the final decision, the assessment report and, in coordination with the higher education institution, the self-evaluation report.

VIII. Contesting of Accreditation Proceedings Conducted by HAKA and Final Decision by Quality Assessment Council

52. A person who finds that his or her rights are violated or his or her freedoms are restricted by assessment procedures conducted by HAKA or by a decision made by the HAKA Quality Assessment Council may file a challenge pursuant to the procedure provided for in the Administrative Procedure Act. The challenge shall be filed with the HAKA Quality Assessment Council within 30 days after the person filing the challenge became or should have become aware of the contested finding.
- 52¹. The Assessment Council shall forward the challenge to the Appeals Committee who provides the Assessment Council with an unbiased opinion regarding the validity of the challenge within 5 days after receiving the challenge. The Assessment Council shall adjudicate the challenge within 10 days after the challenge is delivered to the Council, taking into account the justified opinion of the Appeals Committee. If the challenge needs to be further examined, the Assessment Council may extend a term for review of the challenge by up to 30 days.
53. The final decision by HAKA Quality Assessment Council may be challenged within 30 days after the delivery of the final decision, filing an action with the Tallinn courthouse of the Tallinn Administrative Court pursuant to the procedure provided for in the Code of Administrative Court Procedure.

IX. Follow-up Activities

54. HAKA assumes that the responsibility for resolving the problems pointed out in assessment reports and for continuous improvement activities lies with the higher education institutions. Two years after the adoption of the decision to accredit the higher education institution for seven years, HAKA asks the institution to give the Quality Assessment Council a written review of the planned and implemented activities deriving from the recommendations presented in the assessment report, as well as their results. HAKA shall draw up a summary of the reviews submitted by the higher education institutions that shall be made available on the HAKA website.

55. If at least one assessment area of the institutional accreditation has been provided as 'partially conforms' and the Quality Assessment Council has added a secondary condition to the accreditation decision according to clause 48.7 above, a follow-up activity shall take place where the HAKA Quality Assessment Council shall assess the developments in that area and make recommendations for improvement, as necessary.

X. Involving Competent Evaluation Authorities of Foreign Countries

56. If a higher education institution wishes that a competent foreign assessment authority (hereinafter assessment authority) would conduct an institutional accreditation, the institution of higher education shall submit a well-reasoned request to HAKA to include that assessment authority, no later than two years prior to the expiration date of its current accreditation, and it shall contain the following information:
 - 56.1. the name and contact details of the assessment authority, including its web address;
 - 56.2. the consent of the assessment authority to conduct the accreditation, and an estimated expenditure;
 - 56.3. a description of the procedure (including the schedule) and requirements for a planned accreditation process.
57. Higher education institutions may order accreditation service from internationally recognised assessment authorities that have fulfilled the following conditions:
 - 57.1. the assessment authority has institutional evaluation experience;
 - 57.2. the procedure and requirements for accreditation are transparent and in conformity with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area;
 - 57.3. assessment reports of the assessment authority allow the HAKA Quality Assessment Council to decide whether the management, administration, academic and research activity, and academic and research environment of a higher education institution are consistent with legislation as well as with the purposes and development plans of the higher education institution.
58. Within one month after receipt of the request, the HAKA Quality Assessment Council shall make a reasoned decision on the suitability of the assessment authority to conduct institutional accreditation.
59. If HAKA approves the use of an assessment authority, it shall conclude a tripartite contract with the higher education institution and the assessment authority, providing the rights and responsibilities of the parties and the procedure for reimbursement for expenditures.
60. An assessment authority shall submit its assessment report to HAKA.
61. If it becomes evident that there are significant deficiencies in the assessment report, and it is impossible to evaluate important sub-areas and make a final decision that is consistent with

Estonian legislation, the HAKA Quality Assessment Council shall have the right to return the report to the assessment authority for modification and improvement.

62. If it is possible to make a final decision that is consistent with Estonian legislation, the HAKA Quality Assessment Council shall make one of the following decisions:
 - 62.1. concludes that the management, administration, academic and research activity, and academic and research environment of the higher education institution meet the requirements; and decides to accredit the higher education institution for seven years;
 - 62.2. concludes that there are deficiencies in the management, administration, academic and research activity, or academic and research environment of the higher education institution; gives instructions to remove them, based on the assessment report; and decides to accredit the higher education institution for three years;
 - 62.3. concludes that the management, administration, academic and research activity, and academic and research environment of the higher education institution do not meet the requirements; and decides not to accredit the higher education institution.
63. The proceedings described in this chapter and the final decision by the Quality Assessment Council may be contested following the procedure provided in Chapter VIII.

XI. Implementing Provisions

64. Within three months after approval of this document by the HAKA Quality Assessment Council, HAKA shall prepare a schedule for the first round of institutional accreditations for the years 2012 to 2016 and coordinate it with the higher education institutions.
65. As an exception to the above, HAKA shall coordinate the dates for accreditations in autumn 2011 and spring 2012 with higher education institutions within one month after approval of this document by the HAKA Quality Assessment Council.

ANNEX 1: Evaluation Criteria and Indicators

| 1. ORGANISATIONAL MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE | | |
|---|---|--|
| Requirements | Assessment criteria | Indicators |
| 1.1. General management | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A higher education institution has defined its role in the Estonian society. • The development plan and the related action plans of a higher education institution arise from the concrete purposes that are built on its mission, vision and core values, and that consider the country's priorities and society's expectations. • Key results of a higher education institution have been defined. • The leadership of a higher education institution conducts the preparation and implementation of development and action plans, and involves the members and different stakeholders. • Liability at all management levels has been defined and described, and it supports the achievement of institutional purposes and the coherent | <p>The higher education institution has defined its role in the Estonian society; its mission and vision take into account the operational environment and expectations of stakeholders.</p> <p>Action plans of the higher education institution arise from the concrete purposes built on its mission, vision and core values, that consider the country's priorities and society's expectations; and also from the principle that the higher education institution has an important role in shaping the students into responsible citizens of initiative. The leadership of the higher education institution conducts the preparation and implementation of development and action plans, and involves the members (including students, whose participation in the management of the institution of higher education it supports) and different stakeholders. Key results of the higher education institution have been defined, including target values (numerical indicators describing key results, i.e., the objectives to be reached) and output indicators (numerical indicators describing current situations and trends). The development plan and policies are periodically reviewed; the key results are measured and analysed, and if necessary, development and action plans are amended; the development planning is evidence-based (reasoned).</p> <p>The management, academic and administrative (support) structure of the higher education institution supports the achievement of purposes. Liability at all management levels has been defined and</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the rate of achievement prescribed in development/action plans (key results) • results of employee satisfaction survey: satisfaction with management and information flow • other indicators arising from institutional purposes |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>performance of core processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal and external communications of a higher education institution (including marketing and image building) are purposeful and managed. | <p>described, and it supports the coherent performance of core processes. Employees and students of the higher education institution are aware of institutional purposes and their roles in achieving them. Both the internal and external communications of the higher education institution (including marketing and image building) are managed: they are based on institutional purposes, their functioning is periodically reviewed, and the necessary amendments are made.</p> | |
|---|--|--|

1.2. Personnel management

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The principles and procedures for employee recruitment and development arise from the objectives of the development plan of a higher education institution, and ensure academic sustainability. When selecting, appointing and evaluating members of the academic staff, their past activities (teaching, RDC, student feedback, etc.) are taken into account in a balanced way. The principles of remuneration and motivation of employees are clearly defined, available to all employees, and implemented. | <p>There are clear rules and procedures for employee recruitment and development that arise from objectives of the development plan of the higher education institution. Trends in academic and support staff related to their qualifications, age distribution and competition for positions, indicate sustainability. The principles of remuneration and motivation of employees are clearly defined and available to all employees. They are consistent with trends and potentials of the higher education institution, and indicate the institution's sustainability in terms of recruiting qualified staff. Employee satisfaction and dedication are regularly surveyed and the results used in improvement activities. Workload distribution for members of the academic staff is clearly fixed among teaching, research and development activities and other activities, including management. When selecting, appointing and evaluating members of the academic staff, their past activities, including research, development of teaching techniques, student feedback, etc., are taken into account in a balanced way. Employees (both academic and administrative/support staff) participate in</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the rate of competition for academic positions the number and profile of the staff (academic and administrative/support staff, age distribution, qualifications, including their average age by qualification level) the proportion of foreign teaching staff and research staff indicators of international mobility of academic staff as a proportion of their total number other indicators arising from institutional purposes |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee satisfaction with the management, working conditions, flow of information, etc., is regularly surveyed and the results used in improvement activities. • Employees participate in international mobility programmes, cooperation projects, networks, etc. • Employees base their activities on principles of academic ethics. | <p>international mobility programmes and are active in self-development.</p> <p>Employees base their activities on principles of academic ethics; there are, among other things, clear rules for the conduct of proceedings in plagiarism cases.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

1.3. Management of financial resources and infrastructure

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation of financial resources of a higher education institution, and the administration and development of infrastructure, are economically feasible; and are based on the objectives of the development plan of an institution of higher education and national priorities (except private institutions). • A higher education institution uses information systems that support its management and the coherent performance of core processes. • The working conditions of the staff | <p>The allocation of financial resources of the higher education institution, and the administration and development of infrastructure, are economically feasible; and are based on the objectives of the development plan of the higher education institution and national priorities (except private institutions). Budget funds come from different sources, which helps to manage risks.</p> <p>The higher education institution uses information systems that support its management and the coherent performance of core processes.</p> <p>Both the working conditions of the staff and the learning and RDC conditions of students (library, studios, workshops, laboratories, etc.) meet the needs arising from the specifics of the institution of higher education and expectations of target groups. Students have been provided with opportunities for both independent and team work at the higher education institution.</p> <p>The higher education institution supports the student council (student body) and</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the distribution of the revenue and expenditure • investment dynamics • results of employee satisfaction survey: satisfaction with working conditions • results of student satisfaction survey: satisfaction with learning and RDC conditions • other indicators arising from institutional purposes |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>and the learning and RDC conditions of students (library, studios, workshops, laboratories, etc.) meet the needs arising from the specifics of an institution of higher education and the expectations of members.</p> | <p>other student associations in shaping student life. The higher education institution analyses the use of its assets and considers the results in improvement activities.</p> | |
|---|---|--|

| 2. TEACHING AND LEARNING | | |
|--|--|---|
| Requirements | Assessment criteria | Indicators |
| 2.1. Effectiveness of teaching and learning, and formation of the student body | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A higher education institution has defined its educational objectives and measures their implementation. • A higher education institution creates the prerequisites to ensure its graduates national and international competitiveness. • The number of student places is planned in accordance with the social need and the potentials and purposes of an institution of higher education. • The admission rules are consistent with the mission and purposes of an institution of higher education and support the formation of the motivated student body. • Students are provided with opportunities to study at a higher education institution regardless of any special needs. | <p>The higher education institution has defined its educational objectives and measures their implementation.</p> <p>The higher education institution has developed a system for analysing and evaluating competencies and international competitiveness of its graduates; the results are systematically used in the development of study programmes, teaching and learning.</p> <p>The organisation of work practice is clearly regulated, including the requirements for supervisors.</p> <p>The number of student places is planned in accordance with the social need, the provision of state-commissioned education (RKT), and the potentials and purposes of the higher education institution. The fulfilment of plans (including RKT) is analysed and the plans are modified according to the results of the analyses.</p> <p>The admission rules are transparent, consistent with the mission and purposes of the higher education institution, and support the formation of the motivated student body; the rules are periodically reviewed, and the results are applied to development activities.</p> <p>Students are provided with opportunities to study at the institution of higher education regardless of any special needs (e.g., special admission conditions, physical environment takes into account special needs, special grants, etc.).</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • positive graduation rates, including the fulfilment of RKT • employer satisfaction with preparation of graduates • rates of alumni employment • other indicators arising from institutional purposes that give, among other things, evidence of the international competitiveness of graduates |
| 2.2. Study programme development | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A higher education institution bases its new study programmes on its purposes and the needs of the labour market, and considers the strategies of the country and expectations of the society. • Development activities related to study programmes are systematic and regular, and different stakeholders are involved in the development of study programmes. • Graduate satisfaction with the quality of instruction and employer satisfaction with the quality of graduates are surveyed and analysed; the results are considered in the development of study programmes. | <p>Development activities related to study programmes are systematic and regular, and different stakeholders (including students, graduates, employers, professional associations) are involved in the development of study programmes. Graduate and labour market feedback on the quality of graduates and their compliance with labour market requirements are examined and analysed, and the results used in improvement activities.</p> <p>The higher education institution starts new study programmes (including joint study programmes) taking into account the current and developmental needs of the labour market, and including the best national and/or international practices.</p> <p>Results of the external evaluation of study programmes, teaching and learning, are analysed and taken into account in development activities.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • student satisfaction with the quality of instruction • alumni satisfaction with the quality of instruction • employer satisfaction with preparation of graduates • results of quality assessments of study programme groups • other indicators arising from institutional purposes, e.g., the number of joint study programmes, the number of study programmes in English, etc. |
| 2.3. Student academic progress and student assessment | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student academic progress is monitored and supported. • Student assessment supports learning and is in line with learning outcomes. • A higher education institution has an effective system for taking account of prior learning and work experience. | <p>The progress and study results of students are monitored and supported (including activities for talented students and students at risk of dropout, bridging courses). The establishment of student status (calculating full-time and part-time study, defining minimum student workload, etc.) follows clear rules that ensure fair treatment to all students.</p> <p>The assessment takes place according to a procedure determined by the higher education institution, it supports learning, is consistent with learning outcomes, and considers the particular</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the average duration of study by academic cycles • the proportion of dropouts • other indicators arising from institutional purposes |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>nature of a student contingent; the procedure for assessment is regularly reviewed and improved: the assessment measures the achievement of expected learning outcomes and objectives of a study programme, contains clear and publicized assessment criteria, and considers clear regulations in cases of student absence, illness or other mitigating circumstances. The procedure for assessment (including examination and thesis defence procedures, the time and form of notification of grades) is transparent and ensures fair treatment of students. There is an effective system for challenging assessment results; challenges are analysed and the assessment system is improved. The higher education institution has an effective system for taking account of prior learning and work experience, and it is regularly evaluated and improved.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

2.4. Support processes for learning

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation of studies creates an opportunity for students to complete their studies within the standard period. • A higher education institution provides counselling related to studies and career. • A higher education institution supports student international mobility. • Modern technical and educational technology resources are used to organise educational activities. | <p>The organisation of studies ensures students an opportunity to complete their studies within the standard period. The principles for preparing timetables support the appropriate use of time of students and teaching staff. Student international mobility is supported, including studies in foreign institutions of higher education. The recognition of studies in foreign institutions is based on the Lisbon Convention. Systems have been created to support foreign (guest) students. The higher education institution provides counselling related to studies and career, including for student candidates. Students are periodically asked for feedback on organisation of studies, assessment, counselling, etc.; it is analysed, and the results taken into account in improvement activities. The</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proportion of foreign students and foreign guest students • the number/proportion of students who have studied at foreign institutions of higher education compared to the total number of current students and graduates • the proportion of dropouts • results of feedbacks • other indicators arising from institutional purposes |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are periodically asked for feedback on learning and support processes (the organisation of studies, assessment, counselling, etc.); the results of surveys are taken into account in improvement activities. | <p>teaching staff are asked for feedback on the organisation of studies and support services; it is analysed, and the results used in improvement activities. Modern technical and educational technology resources are used to organise educational activities.</p> | |
|---|--|--|

| 3. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND/OR OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITY (RDC) | | |
|--|---|---|
| Requirements | Assessment criteria | Indicators |
| 3.1. RDC effectiveness | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A higher education institution has defined its RDC objectives and measures their implementation. A higher education institution monitors the needs of society and the labour market, and considers them in planning RDC activities. | <p>The university has defined its RDC objectives and measures their implementation. RDC objectives and activities of the university take into account, among other things, the current and developmental needs of society and the labour market. The university has developed a system for identifying those needs.</p> <p>The university has taken into account the comments made in the course of research evaluation.</p> <p>The institution of professional higher education has defined the RDC objectives and measures their implementation. The professional higher education institution has developed a system for identifying the current and developmental needs of segments of the labour market that relate to its RDC activities, and for starting the relevant research.</p> | <p>Examples of indicators the use of which depends on the particular nature of an institution of higher education and its RDC objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> results of external evaluations (research evaluation, quality assessment of doctoral studies) management and participation in centres of excellence: the number and scope of finances of centres numerical data: (1) total research publications; (2) publications of categories 1.1., 1.2, 2.1, 3.1; monographs on national sciences; (3) public presentations of creative works; recognitions from international competitions; reviews in professional publications, |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>etc.; (4) patent applications, patents; (5) text books, teaching tools for various media; (6) system development solutions, product development solutions, environmental solutions; (7) contracts with enterprises; (8) spin-off firms, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of research publications/creative works per member of the teaching staff and per member of research staff (calculated in full-time positions, by field) • other indicators arising from institutional purposes |
|--|--|--|

3.2. RDC resources and support processes

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A higher education institution has an effective RDC support system. • A higher education institution has financial resources needed for RDC development and a strategy that supports their acquisition. • A higher education institution participates in different RDC networks. • RDC infrastructure is being updated and used effectively. | <p>The university has an effective RDC support system (e.g., counselling related to intellectual property, support for publishing publications, referral to doctoral studies, motivating the cooperation with employers). Financial resources needed for RDC exist, along with a strategy that supports their acquisition. The university participates in different RDC networks. RDC infrastructure of the university is continuously being updated and used effectively.</p> <p>The institution of professional higher education has an effective RDC support system (e.g., counselling related to intellectual property, support for publishing publications, referral to doctoral studies, motivating the cooperation with employers). Financial resources needed for RDC exist, along</p> | <p>Examples of indicators the use of which depends on the particular nature of an institution of higher education and its RDC objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • results of employee satisfaction survey: satisfaction with RDC support services • investments into the RDC infrastructure • the proportion of RDC finances in the total budget, separately including finances received from international contracts, applied R&D contracts, grants for creative activity; trends, |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>with a strategy that supports their acquisition. The professional higher education institution participates in different RDC networks.</p> | <p>comparison with partners (partial overlap with management)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ratio of RDC finances to research staff (calculated in full-time positions) |
|--|---|---|

3.3. Student research supervision and doctoral studies

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A higher education institution involves students of all academic cycles in research, creative or project activity; and systematically surveys student satisfaction with their supervision. Professionalism, effectiveness and the workload of supervisors are reasonably balanced, which ensures the quality of research papers and positive graduation rates. Students are guided to recognize plagiarism and to avoid it. Conditions have been created for admission of international doctoral students and for studies abroad for all doctoral students. A higher education institution involves recognized foreign scientists in the provision of doctoral studies and the | <p>The university has involved students of all academic cycles in research, creative or project activity; and systematically surveys their satisfaction with supervision. The results of feedback are taken into account in improvement activities. Professionalism, effectiveness and the workload of supervisors are reasonably balanced, which ensures the quality of research papers and a positive (university) graduation rate. Students are guided to recognize plagiarism and to avoid it. The effectiveness of doctoral studies at universities (the period of studies, fulfilment of RKT, the percentage of graduates compared to the number entering studies four years prior) is stable or improving. The quality of doctoral theses (publishing, opponents) meets a required standard. Supervisors of doctoral theses publish at least on the level of doctoral theses and qualify for research grants and research themes of targeted financing. The proportion of international doctoral students and doctoral students who have studied abroad for at least one semester is stable or increasing. Improvement activities take account of feedback from doctoral students and graduates of doctoral studies.</p> | <p>Examples of indicators the use of which depends on the particular nature of an institution of higher education and its RDC objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> total number of defences of doctoral theses, their number by field, trends average period of doctoral studies, trends the proportion of international doctoral students the proportion of doctoral students who have studied at foreign universities for at least one semester the proportion of supervisors (including co-supervisors) from outside of the higher education institution, including from foreign countries the proportion of opponents from foreign countries at defences of doctoral theses results of student satisfaction survey: satisfaction with supervision |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>supervision of doctoral theses.</p> | <p>Recognized foreign scientists are involved in the provision of doctoral studies and the supervision of doctoral theses.</p> <p>The institution of professional higher education has involved students of all academic cycles in research, creative or project activity; and systematically surveys their satisfaction with supervision. The results of feedback are taken into account in improvement activities. Professionalism, effectiveness and the workload of supervisors are reasonably balanced, which ensures the quality of research papers and a positive graduation rate (of the institution of higher education). Research topics of students at the professional higher education institution are related to needs of stakeholders from outside of higher education institutions. Students are guided to recognize plagiarism and to avoid it.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • other indicators arising from institutional purposes |
|--|---|--|

| 4. SERVICE TO SOCIETY | | |
|---|--|---|
| Requirements | Assessment criteria | Indicators |
| 4.1. Popularisation of core activities of a higher education institution and its involvement in social development | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A higher education institution has a system for popularising its core activities. • Employees of an institution of higher education participate in the activities of professional associations and, as experts, in social supervisory boards and decision-making bodies. | <p>The higher education institution has a system for popularising its core activities; events for students of basic and upper secondary schools and vocational educational institutions take place and the number of participants is stable or increasing. In media, employees of the institution of higher education publish articles of popular science, introducing specialities and scientific research.</p> | <p>Examples of indicators the use of which depends on the particular nature of an institution of higher education and its objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of people/enterprises (including students, separately) involved in popularisation activities, |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>Employees of the higher education institution participate in the activities of professional associations and, as experts, in social supervisory boards and decision-making bodies.</p> | <p>the number of events by type, trends</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • employee participation in non-university bodies (the number and %) • articles by employees in newspapers (the number of articles per employee), commentaries, interviews, etc. • other indicators arising from institutional purposes |
|--|---|---|

4.2. In-service training and other educational activities for the general public

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A higher education institution has defined its objectives regarding in-service training and measures their implementation. • In-service training is planned in accordance with the needs of target groups as well as with the potentials and purposes of an institution of higher education. • Participant satisfaction with the quality of in-service training is regularly surveyed and the results are used in planning improvement activities. | <p>The higher education institution has strategic objectives and a clear action plan in the field of lifelong learning. The success of activities is periodically evaluated and improved as necessary. The system of development, implementation and evaluation of in-service training ensures its quality, including the quality of documents issued. The number of participants in in-service training and the money earned by providing such training are stable or increasing.</p> | <p>Examples of indicators the use of which depends on the particular nature of an institution of higher education and its objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of participants in in-service training (and in other forms of paid open learning) per hour, or per ECP earned (including participant to full-time academic staff ratios) • the proportion of money acquired from in-service training compared to the total scope of finances for educational activities • other indicators arising from institutional purposes |
|--|--|--|

4.3. Other public-oriented activities

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public-oriented activities are purposeful, the | <p>Public-oriented activities are defined in the development plan of the higher education institution; the results of the</p> | <p>Examples of indicators the use of which depends on the particular nature of an</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>results of the activities are periodically evaluated, and improvements are introduced based on those evaluations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A higher education institution contributes to the enhancement of community welfare by sharing its resources (library, museums, sports facilities, etc.) and/or by organising concerts, exhibitions, performances, conferences, fairs and other events. | <p>activities are periodically evaluated, and improvements introduced based on those evaluations.</p> <p>The higher education institution contributes to the enhancement of regional welfare by sharing its resources (library, museums, sports facilities, etc.) and/or by organising concerts, exhibitions, performances, conferences, fairs and other events.</p> | <p>institution of higher education and its objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of public-oriented events by type, the number of participants (if measurable) • other indicators arising from institutional purposes |
|---|--|--|