

EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LUXEMBOURG

**FOLLOW-UP REPORT**

by the Committee for the Evaluation of the  
University of Luxembourg

**March 2015**

## 1. Introduction

---

- 1.1 With this report, the Committee for the Evaluation of the University of Luxembourg presents to the University of Luxembourg and to the Luxembourgish Ministry for Higher Education its **findings regarding the follow-up** on the Committee's second full Evaluation Report, published in March 2013. This follow-up is part of an ongoing 4 yearly evaluation cycle that started with the first full evaluation in 2008-2009 and a consecutive follow-up exercise in 2011. This external evaluation cycle has been established in close consultation with the Ministry and the University, and explicitly aims at continuously supporting the ongoing development of the University.
- 1.2 **The follow-up procedure** is designed as a process of stocktaking which is limited in scope and focuses only on the University's achievements since the last evaluation in 2012. It did not involve a new full evaluation with extensive interviews and associated rigorous fact checking. The Committee took the outcomes of the Second Evaluation Report as its starting point and explored if and how the issues addressed in that report have been taken forward. To that purpose, the University was invited to present recent evolutions, developments and initiatives in a progress report. The Committee received this progress report in September 2014 and organized a site visit to the University on 23 and 24 October 2014, during which it met with all relevant stakeholders.<sup>1</sup> This follow-up report presents an overview of the main issues raised in the progress report and subsequently discussed during the site visit. It also collects the most important impressions and considerations of the Committee regarding recent developments within the University. The aim of the present report is to inform stakeholders and to set the stage for the next full evaluation. The report should be considered as an extension of the Second Evaluation Report from 2013 rather than a stand-alone document. In order to provide a report that is a useful resource in the next evaluation round, the Committee has provided a concise report, in which findings and considerations are summarized in short and numbered paragraphs.
- 1.3 The **outline of this report** is as follows: Following this introduction, section 2 focuses on the chief contextual changes the University encountered since the second review in 2012. Section 3 gives an overview of what the Committee considers to be the most significant strengths and signs of improvement since 2012. Section 4 highlights the principal remaining challenges in the Committee's view. Section 5 attempts to draw a general conclusion and ends with a final envoi from the Committee, which ends its mandate with the present follow up.
- 1.4 The Committee explicitly wishes to thank the University for the open and constructive dialogue during the preparation for this follow up and during our interviews. In particular, the **quality of the University's progress report is commendable**. The report clearly is the result of a coordinated process and shows clear evidence of preparatory joint discussions and common efforts. The Committee considers this an important observation in the light of its former recommendations, in which it repeatedly stressed the necessity of strengthening the functioning of the University as a single coherent institution. All parties interviewed confirmed that, notwithstanding this more coherent approach, individual units were still free to raise their own views and priorities.
- 1.5 Both progress report and interviews testified that the Second Evaluation Report has been well received within the University and the Committee was convinced that a **majority of recommendations have been acted upon** and have (as this follow up report will show) in many

---

<sup>1</sup> The aims, general approach and procedural and practical arrangements for the follow up are explained more fully in a Memo presented to the University in April 2014. This Memo can be found in Annex.

cases been translated into sound plans and initiatives, and in some cases even in structural change.

## 2. Contextual changes

---

*As any living organism, a university undergoes continuous changes that affect, in various degrees, its internal functioning and operations. This section attempts to outline the most influential external and internal changes the University of Luxembourg faced since the last review in 2012. This should give the reader the necessary context for the subsequent sections.*

- 2.1 In 2013 Luxembourg faced a **political crisis leading to changes in Government**. Advanced elections were organized and a new Government formed. The Committee was informed that in less than two years' time, three different Ministers or State Secretaries for Higher Education had been in office. Important changes have also occurred in the Ministry's senior administrative offices. These events coincided with the debates on a new law concerning the University. The consequential law is, to date, still not officially in place. These factors of instability have understandably created a feeling of uncertainty within the University community and its leadership towards the plans (and priorities) of the new government.
- 2.2 In most of the interviews, reference was made to the **financial situation** the University had recently been confronted with. The Committee was informed that the Four Year Plan, including a budget of 670M€, was approved on 16<sup>th</sup> of November 2013 by the Board of Governors on the basis of the best information then available to it. The Committee was further informed that subsequent events led the University to adjust their planning downwards from 670M€ to 565M€ in the revised March 2014 version of the Four Year Plan. According to the University, the budget awarded for 2014 represented the same allocation as in 2013, following the merger of two formerly separated budget lines. Additionally, and as a consequence of the political instability, the budget was only approved in May 2014, resulting in an austerity approach in the first months of 2014 based upon monthly allowances of 1/12 of the budget of the previous year. A number of interlocutors testified that this has created a new environment for the University ending the fast rate of growth that had characterized its previous years. In the 11<sup>th</sup> year of its existence, as one interlocutor has put it, "the machine stopped for a certain time and now needs to be re-launched". It was made clear to the Committee that the new financial situation has had different effects on different units within the institution, but has globally affected the whole of the University, most visibly so in a university-wide measure of temporally freezing all recruitment.
- 2.3 A major internal alteration has been the recent **change in the Presidency of the University** with a new rector in office since January 2015. The interviews made clear that great expectations are directed towards the new rector. And while this change in leadership is sure to open new possibilities, it was also conceded to the Committee that in the period leading up to the change, decision-making processes had slowed down, and the necessary discussions (and choices) on strategic issues advocated in the Second Evaluation Report and especially with regard to the new Four Year Plan had, to a certain extent, been hampered.
- 2.4 Finally, and perhaps less a new contextual change than a continuous source of (partly externally attributable) uncertainty, there is the move to **Belval**. The Committee understands that internal communication about Belval has been significantly improved with the creation of a 'Belval office' in January 2014, and the appointment of a special change facilitator. Senior staff members from different departments reported improved involvement in the process, and it was agreed by most interlocutors that there is now a better understanding of the complexities and implications of the

move. However, the Committee also learned of the sometimes difficult communication with Fonds Belval (the Belval development company) and the fact that Belval as an academic and joint project is still not easily discussed with the Government. In the interviews the Committee encountered remaining uncertainty, unrest, and, indeed, worries on the consequences of splitting up premises, staff and students.

### 3. Strengths and signs of improvement

---

*In the present section, the Committee highlights some of the most apparent signs of improvement it has encountered as reflected in the University's progress report and during the interviews. Given the limited scope of the follow-up exercise, this section does not attempt to be exhaustive, but presents what the Committee considers to be the major issues. The Committee also wishes to emphasize that the reader should not interpret the use of conditional wording in this section as an expression of the Committee's doubt or distrust, but rather relate it to the methodological set up of a follow-up exercise: the findings presented in this report are mainly based upon discussions and impressions and are not the result of a thorough independent investigation of facts. The aim of this follow-up report is not to offer judgments, but to indicate the overall direction in which the Committee thinks the University is moving.*

3.1 First and foremost, the Committee recognizes that, in spite of the uncertainties mentioned above (and especially given the sudden changes in financial situation), the management of the University has succeeded in steering the University further forward. As far as the Committee could ascertain, the University has taken the necessary measures to address the difficult circumstances it faced. Operations have kept running and also, as this section highlights, important improvements have occurred. This in itself can be considered as a sign of a certain **organizational solidity**.

3.2 The Committee was particularly pleased to see many signs pointing to better **internal communication** and a shared sense of responsibility within and between the different units of the University.

Reference has already been made above to the quality of the progress report and the improved internal communication regarding Belval. Since the previous evaluation, a university-wide Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system has been introduced that allows for better and more clearly structured planning of all administrative processes. Several working groups within and between Faculties appear to have been formally installed, and Deans now organize regular round tables in which common challenges are discussed and good practices are shared.

Deans and staff delegations explicitly mentioned to the Committee improved communication with the Rectorate. In some instances members of the Rectorate now participate in Faculty meetings.

Most interlocutors also pointed to the process leading up to the new Four Year Plan (2014-2017) as illustrating clearly the increased opportunities for broad debate and dialogue across the University. Encouraging developments have also occurred within the University Council. A set of clear Terms of Reference and by-laws for this body have been developed and implemented. Council members reported an improved efficiency of the meetings. They evidenced more open and active discussion, and also highlighted that Council members were, in general, better prepared for meetings. In the same vein, the Committee was pleased to learn that there are regular debriefings from the Board of Governance meetings where representatives of the University Council are invited.

3.3 Some progress has also been made regarding the development of **university-wide approaches to QA-procedures and tools**, mostly in the area of Teaching and Learning. The Committee learned about regular university wide student evaluations, and was also informed about plans for a common approach to tutoring. There also appears now to be a uniform procedure for new programs, and the program leaders and the Vice President of academic affairs are said now to meet regularly in order to evaluate and discuss developments within programs. The Committee was also very pleased to learn of the University plans for a new Planning and Analytics Office, attached to the Rector's office, dedicated to collection, collation and distribution of information to support more effective quality management and improved common processes and decision-making.

3.4 **Administrative departments** have further professionalized and extended their internal quality assurance systems. The Committee learned that quality working groups had been established by the heads of administration and quality officers from the three faculties. The 'Quality Circles', involving students in all aspects of administration, were also said to be operational. Many interlocutors explicitly pointed to the new ERP system that has increased transparency and efficiency of operations.

The Committee was also pleased to learn that aspects of student life and involvement had evolved positively with a Student Life Bureau dedicated to building a more tangible student community. SEVE, the student service office of the University had developed a new Quality Handbook which was presented to the Committee. The library was reported to have strengthened its services, despite the difficult funding situation. In the area of human resources policy, a job description project for all functions within the University was introduced, based on best practices within other European universities.

3.5 The Committee was pleased to be informed by all three **Faculties** that the 2012 evaluation had been a significant driver in enhancing operations. Interlocutors reported that the evaluation had fostered increased internal discussion, motivated working groups, and informed strategic decision-making. In the individual Faculty reports, the Committee found many instances of active follow-up of recommendations and was delighted to note a genuine appetite for continuous improvement. Well-defined action lines accompanied most improvement plans. Some particularly telling examples included:

- FLSHASE had initiated and completed a highly complex phase of restructuring its organization and governance with the objective of overcoming structural heterogeneity in the field of education and harmonizing the internal structure of its research units. The Faculty had also developed and recently launched two new doctoral schools.
- FDEF planned to install an external advisory board at Faculty level, and was introducing a new T&L strategy. It was also preparing for accreditation of two clusters of masters programs. In addition, the Faculty had also recently renewed its ISO certified quality management system.
- FSTC had nominated a vice dean for teaching and learning and recruited a high profile quality and process officer. In July 2014, the Faculty officially announced its "TLA (Teaching, Learning and Assessment) strategy for quality assurance and enhancement" as a direct response to the recommendations given in the 2012 report. The Faculty also encompassed its research units within a common research priority 'computational sciences' to enhance the visibility of all units.

As mentioned above, the Committee was further pleased to learn that internal cohesion and dialogue between Faculties had improved with the frequent Deans' round table where the Deans exchange information, reflect collectively on common issues and challenges and develop common positions.

3.6 Last, but certainly not least, important improvements were equally apparent within the **Research Priorities**. All five priority reports addressed the recommendations from the 2013 Evaluation Report directly and gave good evidence of well-considered follow-up. The Committee noted promising efforts to intensify interdisciplinary cooperation and to enhance QA in research. The Committee was also impressed by the steady growth of LCSB and SnT; both Interdisciplinary Centres having realized a steady increase in external funding and international visibility. The Committee also noted with pleasure the structural and very promising changes in management and organization of the Research priority Education and Learning in Multilingual and Multicultural Contexts, and also the enhanced visibility and further professionalization of the doctoral schools in LSF and the Law Priority. The Law Department had established an international Advisory Board and initiated a constructive cooperation with the newly created Max Planck Institute for International, European and regulatory procedural law. It was clear to the Committee that all priorities aspired to create relevant added value for Luxembourg's society.

## 4. Remaining challenges

---

*Less than 2 years have elapsed between the publication of the Committee's most recent full Evaluation Report (March 2013) and the Committee's related follow-up site visit (October 2014). Many of the more substantial recommendations in the Second Evaluation Report related to changes in culture and to possible structural change. The Committee is very pleased to note that, as discussed above, these are clearly now being addressed, notwithstanding the considerable amount of effort and time involved. The previous sections have illustrated that the University has been steadily moving forward in a difficult context, but it is evident to the Committee and, from our discussions, also to the University that important challenges still remain. This section summarizes some of the issues which, in the view of the Committee, merit a relatively high priority and which might usefully form a focus in the next full review.*

4.1 The Committee was informed by a significant number of interviewees that they perceived the **Board of Governors** to be somewhat remote from the general functioning and day-to-day realities of the University. There appeared to be a concern amongst these interviewees related to an alleged lack of background information and perceived elements of micro-management. Some interviewees exemplified this by citing individual cases of internal promotions and recruitments that were unexpectedly blocked at the level of the Board. On the other hand, in other discussions the Committee was informed of the robustness of the Board's decision-making processes and the evidence-base on which decisions are based. The Committee noted that, by definition, and indeed by design, the Board must operate at 'arm's length' from the rest of the University and that, in Luxembourg, as elsewhere in the Committee's experience, there is always a danger of confused messages in these circumstances. The Committee was pleased to be informed about steps being taken to improve the flow of information between the Board and the rest of the University community, and would encourage all concerned to sustain their efforts in this admittedly complex environment.

The Committee was pleased to learn that the Board is continuing to seek improvement in the quality of Board papers and also the quality of management information routinely available to the Board in relation to both depth and breadth of coverage. Overall, in the general context of the quality of material available to support the work of the Governing Board, the Committee was pleased to learn that the Board was in the process of strengthening its Secretariat with clear remits in this area.

- 4.2 Related to the matter of inputs to support the work of the Board is the largely still unresolved matter of the under-performance of the University Council which, in the view of the Board, was yet to fully take up its strategic and operational advisory role. Further reinforcing this point, it was very clear to the Committee, both from the Progress Report and interviews, that the full potential of the **University Council**, in terms of quality of debate and impact on decision-making, had yet to be realized. Council members indicated to the Committee the need to further develop a culture of meaningful and open discussion in order to lead a more general culture in the institution of open academic discourse. The scope of the follow-up review did not allow for any further analysis of this matter, but it appeared to the Committee that further discussion between the Board, University Council and Rectorate to further explore this issue would be advantageous. Many interviewees emphasized the importance of strategic leadership, especially within the context of the new Four Year Plan, the recent budget constraints and the changes in Government policy regarding higher education and research.
- 4.3 Although **internal communication and dialogue** appeared to have improved, it remained evident through the interviews that this could and should be taken much further. There are clear pockets of significant improvement, but, in general, effective communication (and decision-making) loops, from top to bottom and back, appeared to many interviewees to be still largely deficient. An example frequently quoted was the decision to freeze all recruitment. Several key interviewees maintained that the boundaries of the decision in relation to the exact scope or timeframe of the ruling were unclear.
- 4.4 The Committee is very conscious of the fact that improvement of communication and dialogue is especially important to bridge the many cultures and professional backgrounds present at this multilingual and international university. This is a view shared by many staff within the University. While this international environment brings much strength, it also creates the challenge of developing a common culture in the University of Luxembourg including shared **understanding of key concepts and strategic challenges**. The Committee found little tangible evidence of a university-wide dialogue or clear position being established in relation to fundamental questions such as: the exact meaning of a research oriented university and its implications for teaching and learning; the opportunities and risks associated with establishing a medical school; or, the impact of digitalization and ‘massification’ or technical novelties such as MOOC’s. These issues appeared to be debated, but only within isolated pockets. The Committee again encountered a wide variation in (indeed, sometimes incompatible) interpretation of key concepts such as ‘multilingual university’, ‘interdisciplinary research’, ‘research priority’, ‘tutoring’, ‘learning outcomes’, and ‘quality assurance’. All these concepts affect the entire university community, but do not appear to be widely discussed, let alone broadly agreed upon. The infrastructure to support such discourse seems to be largely in place, but both a deliberative culture and a drive to successfully utilize such a culture appear to be lacking as yet.
- 4.5 Consideration of these matters which are related to the long-term development of the University is not encouraged by the fact that there would appear to be uncertainties in relation to **Government thinking regarding the future directions of the University**. The Committee viewed increased external clarity almost as a prerequisite for creating the internal environment for meaningful strategic debate and decision-making. The Committee therefore feels there is an urgent need for enhanced and informed dialogue between the University and the Government.
- 4.6 As a consequence of the lack of shared strategic goals and conceptual concurrence, the Committee feels that the danger of **fragmentation, although lessened** is, nonetheless still a present threat. This risk might well be further amplified by the partial move to Belval, with parts of Faculties and Interdisciplinary Centers remaining in Luxembourg city. Within all units of the

University (Faculties and administrative departments included), the Committee repeatedly encountered *ad hoc* solutions to structural problems. Again, the development of common frameworks and a widespread effort to tackle issues collectively will require clear strategic leadership and commitment of all stakeholders.

4.7 Finally, there were three areas which the Committee was unable to follow through fully, but which are important to mention given the commentary in our previous report:

- The **Scientific Advisory Committee** continues to be largely unknown both in Faculties and in Research Priorities.
- Student life has improved as indicated above, but **student representation**, both formally and in the wider sense that the student body is seen as an integral part of the university community, still appears to be poorly organized.
- **Administrative processes** have been streamlined with ERP, but are still said to be slow and sometimes opaque. During the interviews, several references were made to problems with internal budget allocations and also, complaints of administrative understaffing were still prevalent.

## 5. Conclusion and final envoi from the Committee

---

5.1 The University of Luxembourg, now entering its second decade, clearly finds itself in a **period of transition**, in which the initial rapid growth is slowing down and challenging problems are looming in a changing environment. What has been accomplished is remarkable. Luxembourg now has an ambitious multilingual University of national, European and international renown. The University can boast many important achievements. It has created sufficient depth of foundations and organizational solidity to face external and internal challenges. Continuous progress is evident in many areas and the present follow-up review has revealed to the Committee that the University has largely acquired the capacity to maintain momentum.

5.2 After two full evaluations and almost 10 years of ongoing dialogue with the colleagues within the University, the present Committee is now ending its mandate. As a final envoi, the Committee encourages the University to **keep battling actively against the danger of fragmentation and to keep investing in internal communication, university wide dialogue and internal quality assurance**, involving the Board of Governors and the University Council. This should explicitly not be seen as creating needless bureaucracies but rather be viewed as the means of developing and fostering a culture of open academic discourse and collective critical self-reflection. The Committee concludes that this is a necessary prerequisite to:

- further enhancing the quality of research output, the quality of the students' learning experiences, and to safeguarding the standards of the degrees awarded;
- creating an information rich environment;
- fostering intercollegiate learning;
- producing well-informed, well-balanced and well-supported strategic decision-making; and,
- building public trust and thus bring the University into a position in which it can defend robustly its governance and autonomy.

The Committee would also encourage the Government to invest in an informed and constructive dialogue with the Institution on its further development and to provide the **necessary support, confidence and leeway (both in terms of autonomy and budget)** to allow it to build still further on the very solid foundations it has established of an internationally respected research-based University.



5.3 Finally, the Committee wishes to convey **a word of thanks** to all colleagues within the University and the Ministry for the long and hopefully fruitful cooperation. We also wish the new rector and his team much success. It has been an honor, pleasure, and indeed, great privilege to be part of the adventure of creating a new University and watching it grow and mature. We hope that we have always been a supportive partner in this enterprise and have contributed to it in a meaningful way.

We all will, individually and probably in other capacities and from a greater distance, keep following the developments within the University with great interest, and indeed, great pride. We thank all involved for allowing us to share in the first ten years of this remarkable institution.

\*\*\*

## ANNEX

---

# MEMO

## from the Committee of External Evaluation of the University of Luxembourg on the FOLLOW UP PROCEDURE

[15 April 2014]

### INTRODUCTION

In this memo the Committee sets down the procedures and practical arrangements for the follow up phase within the second evaluation of the University of Luxembourg. The content of this memo was explained and discussed with all parties involved in the evaluation during an information meeting at the University of Luxembourg on 8<sup>th</sup> April 2014. This memo complements an earlier letter from the Committee (sent on September 4<sup>th</sup> 2013) in which the general arrangements for the follow up were explained.

### APPROACH AND MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE FOLLOW UP

#### ***Approach***

The follow up procedure is designed as a process of stocktaking which is limited in scope and which focuses on what has been achieved since the last evaluation in 2012. It does not involve a new full evaluation.

The procedure entails an internal and an external phase (self-evaluation by units / site visit by Committee), both focussing mainly on the outcomes of the second evaluation report published in March 2013. The recommendations that were formulated in this report act as the primary guidelines for the follow up. The follow up will explore how the issues addressed in the 2012 report have been taken up. Special attention will be given to the development of internal quality assurance.

The Committee shall produce a short report on its findings which will be presented to the University and the Ministry early 2015.

#### ***Main objectives***

For the University the follow up should be:

- an occasion for systematic discussion on and stock-taking of what has been achieved since the last evaluation;
- an opportunity to systematically consider changes in context and future challenges;

- an input for further action planning and a first preparation for the next full evaluation in 2016.

For the Committee the follow up should provide:

- a procedure by which it can meet its obligations to the Ministry,
- feedback through which it can prepare for and improve the procedure for the next full evaluation in 2016.

## PROCEDURES AND PRACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS

### Internal phase: Progress Statements

In order to provide the Committee with the necessary information on the recent developments within each of the units evaluated in 2012, the individual units are asked to produce short written progress statements.

Following the emphasis in the second evaluation report on the need of developing a stronger communality within the University, and on the importance of the role of the University Council, the Committee furthermore asks the University Council to prepare a more general overview of progress.

#### Individual progress statements by units:

Each progress statement should contain the following three parts:

1. An **introductory part**, explaining any significant changes in the unit's context compared to the situation in 2012. (*max. 1 page*)
2. An **analytical part**, containing the unit's reflections on each recommendation formulated in the Committee's report of 2013. (*max. 4 pages*)

It should be made clear how the unit has responded to the individual recommendations, e.g. which actions were (or are about to be) taken, or why a recommendation was or is considered not to be (or not longer to be) relevant.

It is important to note that the aim of the analysis is not to establish 'full compliance' with all individual recommendations. Rather, the intention is to inform the Committee about how the recommendations have been considered and dealt with by the unit. The focus should be on the actions the unit itself has taken. All recommendations should be considered, but always taken in the broad context of the core analysis of the report from 2013.

As it was a central topic in the Committee's report, special attention should be given to the current state of development of internal quality assurance provisions.

3. A **concluding part** in which a description is given of what the unit sees as the main challenges and priorities for the future. (*max. 1 page*)

Progress statements should be the result of a **close cooperation** of all the parties involved within a unit, should be written in English and should reach the Committee **by September 15<sup>th</sup> 2014**. The Committee expects to receive 9 individual progress statements:

Unit	List of recommendations in 2013 Report
1. Rectorate	pp. 25-26 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> As stated in the 2013 report, the recommendations on pp. 25-26 in the section on Central Management do not only address the Rectorate but are directed to all decision making bodies and functions on the central level. In its individual progress statement the Rectorate is asked to consider these general recommendations from its particular perspective as the main executive body of the University and to focus on actions it has initiated or taken itself.

2. Faculty of Science, Technology and Communication (FSTC)	p. 36
3. Faculty of Law, Economics and Finance (FDEF)	p. 41
4. Faculty of Language, Humanities, Arts and Education (FLSHASE)	p. 48
5. Education and Learning in multilingual and multicultural contexts	p. 56
6. International Finance (The Luxembourg School of Finance)	pp. 62-63
7. European and Business Law	p. 72
8. Systems Biomedicine (The Luxembourg Centre for Systems Biomedicine)	p. 79
9. Security, Reliability and Trust (The Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust)	p. 86

**Progress Statement by University Council:**

The **aim** of the progress statement of the University Council is to establish a general overview of progress, based upon a consideration of the individual progress statements and upon a reflection within the Council of how the University community as a whole has responded to the findings in the second evaluation report.

The progress statement should **contain** a critical analysis of the main evolutions since 2012 and describe which of the recommendations are reflected in actions, strategic decisions and documents and which recommendations need further consideration. All recommendations on pages 25-26 in the 2013 report should be considered, but always taken in the broad context of the core analysis of the report. The focus should not lie on a consideration or evaluation of the individual units but on identifying University-wide discussions, actions and initiatives. It should reflect the perspective of the University community as a whole.

The **format** of the statement is to be decided by the University Council itself. It should be written in English, not exceed 5 pages, and should reach the Committee **by September 15<sup>th</sup> 2014**.

The progress statement from the University Council should be considered by the Board of Governors. The Committee asks to receive a **short statement from the Board of Governors** (e.g. in the form of the minutes from the Board meeting) after the Board meeting of September 2014.

**External phase: Site visit**

In order to gain a good understanding of the progress statements and to discuss their content with the authors, the Committee will visit the University from **Thursday 23<sup>th</sup> till Friday 24<sup>th</sup> of October 2014**. The Committee will meet with the Board, the University Council, the management of the individual units, the heads of administrative offices, and student and staff delegations.

A detailed visit schedule will be drawn up in cooperation with the University along the lines of the following **draft**:

WEDNESDAY 22 <sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER	THURSDAY 23 <sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER		FRIDAY 24 <sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER	
<p><i>This is a first draft. A definitive time schedule will be drawn up in cooperation with the University.</i></p>	08h15 - 09h00	Research unit 1	08h15 - 09h00	Heads of admin. offices
	09h00 - 09h15	break	09h00 - 09h15	break
	09h15 - 10h00	Research unit 2	09h15 - 10h00	Staff delegation
	10h00 - 10h15	break	10h00 - 10h15	break
	10h15 - 11h00	Research unit 3	10h15 - 11h00	Student delegation
	11h00 - 11h15	break	11h00 - 11h15	break
	11h15 - 12h00	Research unit 4	11h15 - 12h15	University Council
	12h00 - 12h15	break		

		12h15 - 13h00	Research unit 5	12h15 - 14h00	Lunch with Board	
		13h00 - 14h30	Lunch & internal C'ttee meeting			
	15h30 - 19h30	Internal C'ttee meeting	14h30 - 15h15	Faculty 1	14h00 – 17h00	Internal C'ttee meeting
			15h15 - 15h30	break		
15h30 - 16h15			Faculty 2			
16h15 - 16h30			break			
			16h30 - 17h15	Faculty 3		
			17h15 - 18h15	Internal C'ttee meeting		
			18h15-19h15	Rectorate		
19h30	Dinner	19h30	Dinner			

**Committee Report**

The Committee will draft a concise follow up report, based upon the progress statements and the discussions during the site visit. The report will contain an overview of the findings of the Committee and a general assessment of how the recommendations formulated in the first evaluation report have been taken into account.

The report will be between 10 and 15 pages. The University will be asked to check it for factual errors or misunderstandings. A final version of the report will be produced early 2015.

The follow up report is considered to be an extension of the evaluation report from 2013 rather than a stand-alone document. The follow up report will be sent to all parties concerned within the University and also to the Ministry.

\*\*\*