

Institutional Assessment
Institut Supérieur de
l'Economie Luxembourg –
Akademie der Wirtschaft

Programme Assessments
BBA, MBA, MMIQ & BMC

5 June 2018

Transmitted to the Ministry of Higher Education and Research of
Luxembourg on 28 June 2018

Index

1	Executive Summary	4
2	Introduction	8
	2.1 Procedure	8
	2.2 Panel report	9
3	Description of the institution and the programmes	10
	3.1 Overview	10
	3.2 Profile of the institution	10
	3.3 Profile of the programmes	11
4	Institutional assessment	13
	4.1 Criterion A – Strategic objectives	13
	4.2 Criterion B – Origin of financial resources	15
	4.3 Criterion C – regular academic programmes	15
	4.4 Criterion D – staff recruitment	16
	4.5 Criterion E – qualified staff	16
	4.6 Criterion F - infrastructure	18
	4.7 Criterion G – collaboration with other institutions	19
	4.8 Criterion H – participation in international exchange	19
	4.9 Overall conclusion	20
	4.10 Overview of the assessments	21
5	Programme assessment Bachelor Business Administration	22
	5.1 Standard 1 – intended learning outcomes	22
	5.2 Standard 2 - teaching learning environment	24
	5.3 Standard 3 – assessment	27
	5.4 Standard 4 – internal quality assurance	28
	5.5 Standard 5 – research	30
	5.6 Overall conclusion	31
	5.7 Overview of the assessments	32
6	Programme assessment Master Business Administration	33
	6.1 Standard 1 – intended learning outcomes	33
	6.2 Standard 2 - teaching learning environment	35
	6.3 Standard 3 – assessment	38
	6.4 Standard 4 – internal quality assurance	39
	6.5 Standard 5 – research	41
	6.6 Overall conclusion	42
	6.7 Overview of the assessments	43
7	Programme assessment Master Management de l'Innovation, parcours type Management de Qualité	44
	7.1 Standard 1 – intended learning outcomes	44
	7.2 Standard 2 - teaching learning environment	46
	7.3 Standard 3 – assessment	48
	7.4 Standard 4 – internal quality assurance	49

7.5	Standard 5 – research	50
7.6	Overall conclusion	51
7.7	Overview of the assessments	51
8	Programme assessment Bachelor Manager du Chantier	52
8.1	Standard 1 – intended learning outcomes	52
8.2	Standard 2 - teaching learning environment	54
8.3	Standard 3 – assessment	56
8.4	Standard 4 – internal quality assurance	56
8.5	Standard 5 – research	58
8.6	Overall conclusion	58
8.7	Overview of the assessments	59
	Annexes	60
	Annex 1 – Composition of the panel	60
	Annex 2 – Schedule of the site visit	61
	Annex 3 – Documents reviewed	64
	Annex 4 – Abbreviations used	66

1 Executive Summary

This document reports on the institutional assessment of the Luxembourg-based Institut Supérieur de l'Economie – Akademie der Wirtschaft (ISEC-AdW) as well as on the assessment of four bachelor and master programmes ISEC-AdW is already delivering or intends to offer soon. The assessments are carried out by an international expert panel convened by the Accreditation Organisation of The Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) on behalf of the Ministry of Higher Education and Research of Luxembourg.

The panel studied the information materials put at disposition by ISEC-AdW and discussed the state of play of both the institution and the programmes with a variety of stakeholders in Luxembourg on 16-18 April 2018. ISEC-AdW is a private initiative, established in 2015 by the Chambers of Commerce and Crafts in Luxembourg, and aims to provide continuous vocational education for working professionals or for people reorienting their career. ISEC-AdW has been accredited in 2016 as a higher education institute by the Ministry for Higher Education and Research in Luxembourg and is currently offering a few programmes.

The panel noticed that the assessment framework and its criteria are particularly suited for mature institutions but more difficult to apply strictly for start-ups. For that reason, the panel has applied the criteria not only to the institution and its programmes in their present state, but also considered ISEC-AdW's strategic plans for the future, when the institution and the programmes proposed for accreditation reach sufficient maturity.

Having judged six criteria as “met” and two criteria as “partially met”, the panel's overall judgement of the *institutional assessment* criteria is positive. The rationale for ISEC is relevant and the way ISEC wants to realise its mission is feasible. It adheres to the legal and financial regulations in Luxembourg, has set up adequate internal policies and procedures and keeps good track of its decisions. Moreover, the panel thinks highly of the facilities and the student support services including the ISEC Online system. The governance of ISEC is well organised with a clear division of tasks between stakeholders and management. If anything, ISEC could make better use of the contacts of its founding Chambers to identify, design and market its programmes and eventually recruit students among the companies that are member of the Chambers. The positioning of ISEC as provider of higher education programmes for the Luxembourg workforce is strong; nonetheless, this particular stance should not refrain the institute from designing programmes that include a study period abroad and from undertaking (applied) research involving students. Finally, the current administrative and academic staff is of good quality but not sufficient in numbers to turn strategic plans into reality: according to the panel, the existing team needs to be complemented with permanent staff demonstrating academic leadership, educational expertise and communications / business development know-how.

The Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration (BBA) was originally created by the German Fachhochschule für Oekonomie & Management (FOM) and offered in Luxembourg by its branch EUFOM. In 2016, ISEC signed an agreement with FOM and EUFOM to take over the delivery of this German language 180 ECTS BBA programme in Luxembourg as of the academic year 2016-2017. Having judged three criteria as “satisfactory” and two criteria as “unsatisfactory”, the panel's appreciation of the BBA programme is mixed and its ultimate

judgement of the *BBA programme assessment* negative. On the positive side, ISEC is doing rather well in setting up regulations and policies that have direct implications on the BBA programme, and in ensuring a paper trail on its decisions. Moreover, the individual modules and their assessment are described in good detail. The academic and administrative staff on the programme are suited for their tasks: students think highly of the knowledge they gain in class and the support they receive from ISEC. Students particularly appreciate the small scale of both ISEC and the BBA programme. While provisions on assessment and quality assurance are basic but sufficient at this stage of development, they need considerable enhancement in the near future. The same goes for the research activities of ISEC in general and within the BBA programme in particular. On the negative side, the major weaknesses of the BBA are related to two fundamental components of the programme. First, the absence of (intended) learning outcomes at programme level does not allow to link the learning goals of individual modules to the overall programme framework and thus prevents from establishing whether students are eventually educated to a level that is commensurate with what one can expect of a bachelor's programme in business administration. Second, the effective study load of individual modules appears to be too light in so far as acquisition of competencies through self-study is concerned. In this respect, the panel also wonders to what extent the current set-up of the BBA as an almost full-time programme is feasible when the reported study load would indeed reflect reality. It seems almost impossible for students to spend on top of their professional and family commitments the equivalent of 180 ECTS (between 4500 and 5000 hours spread over seven semesters) on their study. ISEC may therefore consider redesigning the BBA as a genuine dual education programme, targeting students who are at work and in a position to apply the acquired know-how and skills on their job in a meaningful way.

The Master Business Administration (MBA) was originally created by the German Fachhochschule für Oekonomie & Management (FOM) and offered in Luxembourg by its branch EUFOM. In 2016, ISEC signed an agreement with FOM and EUFOM to take over the delivery of the German language 120 ECTS MBA programme in Luxembourg as of the academic year 2016/2017. Having judged two criteria as "satisfactory" and three criteria as "unsatisfactory", the panel's appreciation of the MBA programme is mixed and its ultimate judgement of the *MBA programme assessment* negative. On the positive side, ISEC is doing rather well in setting up regulations and policies that have direct implications on the MBA programme, and in ensuring a paper trail on its decisions. Moreover, most individual modules are described in good detail. The academic and administrative staff on the programme are suited for their tasks: students think highly of the knowledge they gain in class and the support they receive from ISEC. Students particularly appreciate the small scale of both ISEC and the MBA programme. While provisions on quality assurance are basic but sufficient at this stage of development, they need considerable enhancement in the near future. The same goes for the research activities of ISEC in general and within the MBA programme in particular. On the negative side, the major weaknesses of the MBA are related to three fundamental components of the programme. First, the absence of (intended) learning outcomes at programme level does not allow to link the learning goals of individual modules to the overall programme framework and thus prevents from establishing whether students are eventually educated to a level that is commensurate with what one can expect of a MBA programme. Second, the focus of the programme on assessment through assignments does not allow to establish whether students have acquired the various learning goals and, upon graduation, have reached the final qualifications that are usually connected to an MBA programme. Finally, the effective study load of individual modules appears to be too light in so far as acquisition of competencies through self-study is

concerned. This is particularly the case for the transfer assessment and the MBA thesis, which require input from students that according to the panel is way below the workload that is usually associated to modules of 25 credits. In this respect, the panel also wonders to what extent the current set-up of the MBA as an almost full-time programme is feasible when the reported study load would indeed reflect reality. ISEC may therefore consider redesigning the MBA as a genuine dual education programme, targeting students who are at work and engage in a contract with both ISEC and their employer certifying that the student has an appropriate job and that the employer facilitates the student in applying the acquired competencies in a meaningful way.

The Master programme Management de l'Innovation, parcours type management de la Qualité (MMIQ, management of innovation and quality) was set up by the Université de Lorraine ten years ago. In 2017, ISEC signed an agreement with the university to offer this 60 ECTS part-time programme in Luxembourg as of September 2018. Students will obtain a double degree from both Université de Lorraine and ISEC. Having judged each criterion as "satisfactory", the panel's appreciation of the *MMIQ programme assessment* is positive. The MMIQ programme in France has been accredited by the competent authorities (HCERES) and the version of the programme that is now up for accreditation in Luxembourg only differs marginally from this French programme. The written materials and the discussions on site have demonstrated that the MMIQ programme is well structured, featuring both learning outcomes at programme level and learning goals per module. Moreover, it is well developed in terms of module contents, didactical approach, staff, admission and workload. As the MMIQ programme will be offered in Luxembourg under the responsibility of ISEC, the panel strongly encourages ISEC to strengthen its involvement in, and supervision of, the MMIQ programme and to turn it into a genuine ISEC programme. This requires on the one hand additional staff to give academic and educational guidance to the programme; on the other hand, the programme needs further integration and embedding in the culture, policies and regulations of ISEC, such as the student-centred education approach, the teaching and examination regulations, and the provisions for quality assurance.

The Bachelor programme Manager de Chantier (BMC, construction site manager) is entirely new and has been developed on specific demand of the construction sector in Luxembourg. The three-year 180 ECTS curriculum is offered in French, organised as a dual education programme and delivered jointly by ISEC and the Institut de Formation Sectoriel du Bâtiment (IFSB, training institute of the construction sector). Having judged each criterion as "satisfactory", the panel's appreciation of the *BMC programme assessment* is positive. The BMC programme has been developed with great care ensuring that the demands of the construction sector are translated properly in a purposeful programme. The panel is particularly impressed by the degree of professional and academic involvement in the programme set-up and considers that their active role in implementing the BMC programme is a strong guarantee for quality. Moreover, the written materials and the discussions on site have convinced the panel that the programme is "ready for take-off" in September 2018. Nonetheless, there are a number of issues that require further clarification and development: the panel strongly encourages ISEC to clarify the relationship and the division of tasks with IFSB, and to assume ownership of the BMC programme. While there is a detailed partnership agreement between the two institutes, the panel is concerned that the ownership of the BMC programme lays mainly with IFSB, with ISEC serving as degree awarding body. In this respect, the panel suggests that ISEC should strengthen its involvement in, and supervision of, the BMC programme. This requires on the one hand additional staff to give academic and educational guidance to the programme; on the other

hand, the BMC programme needs further integration and embedding in the culture, policies and regulations of ISEC, such as the student-centred education approach, the teaching and examination regulations, and the provisions for quality assurance. Finally, the panel urges the programme to make explicit which competencies make up the (intended) learning outcomes at programme level as this would further enhance the consistency of the programme, guarantee that programme outcomes are set at the proper bachelor level and enable outcome monitoring by the quality assurance system.

In sum, based on the findings and considerations that are summarised above and presented in detail in the report, **the panel issues a positive recommendation on the institutional accreditation of the Institut Supérieur de l'Economie – Akademie der Wirtschaft.** With regard to the programmes, the panel concludes that both **the Master Management of Innovation and Quality (MMIQ) and the Bachelor Manager du Chantier (BMC) fulfil the requirements for programme accreditation.** However, **the panel advises negatively on the Bachelor Business Administration (BBA) and the Master Business Administration (MBA) programmes** as these are not up to standard in their current form.

The Hague, 5 June 2018

On behalf of the international expert panel charged with the institutional assessment of ISEC-AdW Luxembourg and the programme assessment of ISEC-AdW's programmes BBA, MBA, MMIQ and BMC.

Prof. Dr. Walter Nonneman
(chair)

Mark Delmartino, MA
(secretary)

2 Introduction

2.1 Procedure

The Ministry of Higher Education and Research of Luxembourg requested NVAO to carry out an institutional assessment of the Institut Supérieur de l'Economie – Akademie der Wirtschaft (ISEC- AdW, further ISEC) in Luxembourg as well as an assessment of four programmes ISEC is currently delivering or planning to offer soon. ISEC is a private initiative, established in 2015 by the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Crafts in Luxembourg, and aims to provide continuous vocational education for working professionals or for people reorienting their career. ISEC has been accredited in 2016 as a higher education institute by the Ministry for Higher Education and Research in Luxembourg and currently offers several programmes – including the Bachelor Business Administration and the Master Business Administration - that comply with the legal regulations in Luxembourg.

Given the particular features of this request, the NVAO convened an international panel of experts consisting of:

- Prof. dr. Walter Nonneman, Belgium, chair
- Prof. dr. Christian Koenig, France, member
- Prof. dr. Jacques Lanarès, Switzerland, member
- Mr. Adrien Buteneers MSc, Belgium, member
- Ms. Jade Brouns BSc, Belgium, student member

The composition of the panel reflects the expertise deemed necessary by NVAO for this double accreditation exercise. Short CV's of the panel members are provided in annex 1. On behalf of NVAO, Dr. Mark Frederiks was responsible for the coordination of the assessment process. The external secretary certified by NVAO, Mr. Mark Delmartino MA, drafted this report in close cooperation with the panel members and in agreement with the chair. All panel members and the secretary signed a statement of independence and confidentiality.

The panel is carrying out the assessments after which the Board of NVAO will make a recommendation to the Ministry of Higher Education and Research of Luxembourg. It is up to the Ministry to make the final decision on the accreditation of the institution and the four programmes. The frameworks for assessment comprise the criteria under article 4 of the Grand Ducal Regulation of 24 August 2016 on accreditation of institutions and programmes of higher education, as well as the Flemish standards for programme assessment.

Having studied the documentation provided by ISEC before the visit, the panel asked ISEC to produce some further clarifications and to make available programme-related materials for consultation on site. The site visit took place on 16-18 April 2018. After an internal meeting to discuss its preliminary finding and study the additional materials, the panel talked to representatives of the Ministry of Higher Education and Research, the management of the institution and the programmes, as well as to lecturers, students and the supervisory board. The schedule of the visit is presented in annex 2. Annex 3 lists the materials made available by the ISEC either before or during the site visit.

Immediately after the discussions, the panel formulated its considerations and preliminary conclusions. These are based on the findings of the site visit and build on the assessment of the documents. The external secretary then drafted the advisory report and circulated it to all panel members for review and feedback. The comments of the members were incorporated in a second version, which was validated by the chair and submitted to ISEC for comments on factual errors. Following this review, a final draft was prepared and submitted on behalf of the panel to NVAO, which in turn will send the report to the Ministry in Luxembourg.

2.2 Panel report

The first chapter of this report is the executive summary, while the current chapter is the introduction. The third chapter describes the institution, the programmes and their position within the higher education system of Luxembourg. The fourth chapter describes the quality of the institution (ISEC), according to the standards and criteria for institutional accreditation, while chapters five to eight report on the quality of the respective programmes. For each standard/criterion the panel describes its findings and considerations and issues a judgement. Findings are the objective facts as found by the panel in the programme documents, in the complementary materials and during the site visit. Considerations are the panel's interpretation of these findings and their respective importance. The considerations of the panel logically lead to a concluding assessment per standard/criterion. The panel concludes each chapter with an overall judgement on the quality of the institution / programme and a table containing an overview of its assessments.

3 Description of the institution and the programmes

3.1 Overview

Country: Luxembourg
Institution: Institut Supérieur de l'Economie – Akademie der Wirtschaft
Programme : Bachelor Business Administration (BBA)
Degree: Bachelor of Arts
Location : city of Luxembourg
Study Load : 180 ECTS

Country: Luxembourg
Institution: Institut Supérieur de l'Economie – Akademie der Wirtschaft
Programme : Master Business Administration (MBA)
Degree: MBA
Location : city of Luxembourg
Study Load : 120 ECTS

Country: Luxembourg
Institution: Institut Supérieur de l'Economie – Akademie der Wirtschaft
Programme : Management de l'Innovation, parcours type management Qualité (MMIQ)
Degree: Master of Science
Location : city of Luxembourg
Study Load : 60 ECTS

Country: Luxembourg
Institution: Institut Supérieur de l'Economie – Akademie der Wirtschaft
Programme : Bachelor Manager de Chantier (BMC)
Degree: Bachelor of Arts
Location : Bettembourg (L)
Study Load : 180 ECTS

3.2 Profile of the institution

The Institut Supérieur de l'Economie – Akademie der Wirtschaft Luxembourg was founded in September 2015 as a "Société Anonyme". Its founders are the Chamber of Commerce (representing 75% of the shares) and the Chamber of Trade/Crafts (25% of the shares). According to its statutes, ISEC is a private education body offering continued vocational training programmes at tertiary education level for people who are at work or wish to reorient their professional career. ISEC is located in the premises of the Chamber of Commerce in the city of Luxembourg and students use the in-house facilities of the House of Training, a certified provider of training programmes set-up by the Chamber of Commerce and the Luxembourg Bankers' Association.

ISEC is currently offering a few generalist entrepreneurial management programmes and intends to expand its portfolio in the future, notably but not exclusively with sector-specific programmes. Through existing and new programmes ISEC wants to meet the needs of the

Luxembourg economy and Luxembourg companies (represented in the founding Chambers) for properly qualified workers in jobs that require a higher education degree. By focusing its programmes explicitly on people who are already at work, ISEC's lifelong learning offer is complementary to the initial education programmes taught at the University of Luxembourg.

Since the start of its educational activities in the academic year 2016-2017, ISEC is recognised by the Luxembourg Ministry of Higher Education and Research as a higher education institution; this accreditation is valid until 2021. At the time of the site visit, ISEC has a dozen academic and administrative staff on the payroll (together representing about 6 full-time equivalents) who ensure the management of ISEC and are key to delivering the education programmes. Furthermore, there are agreements with several visiting lecturers who teach individual modules. Similar contracts will be signed with other lecturers in case the new programmes are accredited.

3.3 Profile of the programmes

ISEC is currently offering several programmes and intends to expand this offer in the near future. Following consultations with the Luxembourg Ministry of Higher Education and Research, ISEC decided to submit four programmes for accreditation. These programmes are indicative for the portfolio ISEC currently holds and wants to develop.

The *Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration* (BBA) is an existing programme. Originally created by German FOM Hochschule für Oekonomie & Management (FOM) for the German (speaking) market, it was delivered in several places. In Luxembourg it was initially the FOM branch EUFOM who provided the programme. The programme is accredited both in Germany (through FIBAA) and in Luxembourg (by the Ministry). In 2016, ISEC signed an agreement with FOM and EUFOM to take over the delivery of the BBA in Luxembourg. The accreditation by the ministry in Luxembourg, which expires in September 2018, has allowed ISEC to deliver this programme since 2016/17. The BBA is offered in German and consists of modules that are spread over seven semesters for a total of 180 ECTS. It is open for students with a completed secondary school degree and targets explicitly people who are at work, as courses are scheduled either during the evening or on Saturdays. Currently, 72 students are enrolled in the BBA: 43 students who were already in the programme when ISEC took over in September 2016 and 29 who joined since.

The *Master Business Administration* (MBA) has an identical history (FOM – EUFOM – ISEC) and a similar profile and accreditation track as the BBA. The MBA is offered in German with some courses being taught in English. It consists of modules that are spread over four semesters for a total of 120 ECTS. It is open for students with a completed bachelor degree (not necessarily in business or economics) and some professional experience. Courses are scheduled in the evenings and on Saturdays. Currently, 21 students are enrolled in the MBA: 11 students who were already in the programme when ISEC took over in September 2016 and 10 who joined since.

The *Master programme Management de l'Innovation, parcours type management de la Qualité* (MMIQ, management of innovation and quality) was set up by the Université de Lorraine ten years ago and has been accredited since by the French agency AERES, currently HCERES. In 2017, ISEC signed an agreement with the Université de Lorraine to offer this programme in Luxembourg as of September 2018. The MMIQ programme at ISEC

features the same modules and to a large extent the same lecturers as the French version, while some contents are adjusted to reflect the Luxembourg situation and will be taught by local professors. The MMIQ is offered mainly in French; about a quarter of the programme is taught in English. Modules are spread over four semesters for a total study load of 60 ECTS. The master programme targets working professionals; courses are scheduled on Friday evenings and Saturdays. If the programme is accredited, students will obtain a double degree from both Université de Lorraine and ISEC.

The *Bachelor programme Manager de Chantier* (BMC, construction site manager) is entirely new and has been developed on specific demand of the construction sector in Luxembourg. The three-year curriculum is organised as a dual programme: for each module students spend a comparable amount of time in acquiring competencies in class and on the job. The programme is offered in French, amounts to 180 ECTS and is delivered jointly by ISEC and the Institut de Formation Sectoriel du Bâtiment (IFSB, training institute of the construction sector). Courses will be held in the IFSB premises in the city of Bettembourg. If accredited, students will obtain a bachelor degree awarded by ISEC.

4 Institutional assessment

The panel has studied the information materials and has held several discussions with different stakeholders internal and external to the institution and its programmes. When comparing the findings from the materials and the discussions with the assessment criteria, the panel noticed that these criteria are designed for larger institutions that have reached a certain maturity and are operating as a going concern. According to the panel it is very difficult to apply these criteria strictly to a start-up educational institution such as ISEC when one is focusing exclusively on the present scope and size of its activities and programmes.

During the site visit, the panel discussed the position of ISEC within the higher education landscape of Luxembourg with representatives of the Luxembourg Ministry of Higher Education and Research. The authorities provided useful clarifications on the criteria for institutional and programme assessment. Furthermore, the panel received on site an internal ISEC document, “Notes for discussion”, which provides a summary of ISEC’s current stance and its intentions in the short run.

Several interviewees emphasised that there is a need for continuous vocational education and training in Luxembourg targeting both local professionals from Luxembourg and (frontier) workers from neighbouring regions who (intend to) work for/with Luxembourg-based companies. Given the demographic forecasts and the increasing demand for (local) professionals who are educated to bachelor/master level, this need is likely to become even larger in the future. As ISEC’s “raison d’être” is to address these needs and challenges, the panel decided to not only look at the current situation but to assess the criteria for institutional accreditation considering also the strategic plans of ISEC for the near future.

4.1 Criterion A – Strategic objectives

The higher education institution bases its activity on the guidelines and strategic objectives that it makes public. It publishes clear, accurate and updated information on its activities, including its academic programmes, admission requirements, achieved learning outcomes and qualifications achieved at the end of these programmes.

Findings

The Institut Supérieur de l’Economie – Akademie der Wirtschaft Luxembourg was established in September 2015 as a “Société Anonyme”. Its founders are the Chamber of Commerce (representing 75% of the shares) and the Chamber of Trade/Crafts (25% of the shares). The panel read in the statutes of the institute, which are published in the Official Journal of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg, that ISEC is set up as a private education body offering continued vocational training programmes at tertiary education level for people who are at work or wish to reorient their professional career.

ISEC’s strategic objective is to offer programmes that meet the current and future needs of the Luxembourg economy. The companies that are member of ISEC’s two founding Chambers are reportedly in need of ever growing numbers of properly qualified workers, i.e. new and existing staff with a relevant higher education degree. In its offer and in the educational design of its programmes, ISEC targets specifically people who are already at

work. By doing so it contributes to the lifelong learning opportunities for the local workforce. The panel gathered moreover that because of this focus, ISEC's offer is complementary - not competitive - to the initial education programmes taught at the University of Luxembourg.

The Luxembourg economy is very international and multilingual, and so are many of the Luxembourg-based companies. As a result, the programmes ISEC offers and intends to offer are focusing on professionals that operate in this environment but may not necessarily hold Luxembourg citizenship. In fact, the panel observed that many of the students in the current programmes are German, while potential demand is more likely to come from students from the Greater Region (Luxembourg, Wallonia, Lorraine, Trier region) and from foreign professionals working in Luxembourg, provided programmes are offered in French, German, English or in multiple languages.

Information on the institute and its programmes is available publicly and in three languages (English, French and German) on www.isec.lu. The panel visited the website and noticed that, apart from a general introduction on ISEC, there is information on four programmes: BBA, MBA, MMIQ and MIAGE (the latter programme is not part of this assessment). While the basic information is available, there is room for more detailed and comprehensive materials, for instance on the unique selling propositions of the institution and its respective programmes, on the didactical concept underlying the programmes and on the criteria for admission.

Considerations

The panel gathered from the written materials and the various discussions on site that ISEC takes up a unique position within the higher education landscape in Luxembourg. According to the panel, ISEC's focus on vocational education and training for working professionals in a Luxembourg context and leading to higher education degrees is clear, consistent and relevant. This strategic objective is also described prominently in the statutes and clearly mentioned on the website.

The current stance of ISEC and its plans for the near future are described in an informative discussion note, which sets out a clear but generally formulated development strategy. According to the panel, ISEC knows very well in which direction it wants to head and this direction is adequate because it addresses a need and because it is fully in line with ISEC's "raison d'être". The strategy now needs to be operationalised and then executed. The panel considers – and noticed that ISEC is aware – that a successful implementation of the strategy requires first and foremost an additional investment in staff at institutional level. The new staff should bring additional capacity, complementary competencies and the necessary capacity of execution to ISEC in order to develop the envisaged programmes and to market these among the target audiences.

The panel also suggests that, as part of a broader marketing effort, ISEC increases the information that is currently available on the website turning it from a basic information tool into a means of recruitment.

Conclusion

The panel judges that ISEC **meets** criterion A.

4.2 Criterion B – Origin of financial resources

The origin of the financial resources available to the institution is transparent and organised in compliance with the rules of scientific neutrality.

Findings

ISEC is financed by the Luxembourg Chamber of Commerce. This financing is based on an annual budget process. As a private company ISEC is obliged to publish its annual financial statements centrally and electronically. This information is accessible to the public. The panel has seen several financial statements: the 'comptes annuels' of 31 December 2016, the 2015 and 2016 financial statements that were introduced electronically to the central "Registre de Commerce et des Sociétés", and the ISEC budget for 2017 and 2018.

The panel, moreover, observed that the necessary resources for teaching are ensured by the guarantee of the ISEC shareholders: the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Crafts have signed a "déclaration de garantie de fonds suffisants". ISEC indicated in its application documents and during the discussions that both the institute and its founding Chambers are aware that its plans cannot be financed solely by student tuition and fees and require an ongoing investment. Because there is no public funding available or foreseen – the Ministry confirmed that the accreditation of a private institution such as ISEC does not entail funding - the necessary financial means for the development of ISEC are budgeted and voted by the Annual General Member meetings of the constituent Chambers.

The panel gathered from the written materials (notably the "Règlement d'Ordre Intérieur Année 2017-2018") and the discussions on site that the governance of ISEC is organised in a transparent way: there is a clear division between the shareholders of ISEC who sit on the supervisory board and the management (Directoire) of ISEC, which consists of an academic, administrative and financial director.

Considerations

The panel considers that the financial situation of ISEC is organised adequately: ISEC's financial sources are clear, it fulfils all statutory obligations in terms of yearly financial statements and there is a 'Chinese Wall' between the shareholders and the management of the institute securing academic neutrality.

According to the panel, there is a common understanding among shareholders and management about the way forward for ISEC. The financial situation of the founding Chambers is such that, if needed and deemed appropriate, it can allow ISEC to do the necessary investments with a view to realising its strategy.

Conclusion

The panel judges that ISEC **meets** criterion B.

4.3 Criterion C – regular academic programmes

The institution provides regular academic programmes as defined under article 28bis, paragraph 3 of the law.

Findings

As ISEC is accredited by the Ministry since 2016, it is only offering programmes that comply with the legal regulations. In line with these legal provisions, ISEC is offering and intends to offer academic programmes that lead to either a bachelor or a master degree, two types of programmes that are explicitly foreseen by article 28 bis.

The panel gathered from the discussions on site that until now, ISEC has been offering programmes it took over from other education providers which had been accredited in their own right. The representatives of the Ministry indicated that offering such academic programmes also entails an expectation with regard to research, in order to ensure that the education provided is informed by the research of the academic staff. Currently, three professors are on the payroll of ISEC; within their contracts, time is allocated for research. ISEC indicated that also in the future, the contracts for academic staff will feature not only time for teaching (preparation, delivery and assessment) but also for research.

Considerations

The panel considers that as a specialised higher education institution, ISEC is providing regular academic programmes leading to bachelor and master degrees. The professors employed by ISEC are allotted time to conduct research.

Conclusion

The panel judges that the ISEC **meets** criterion C.

4.4 Criterion D – staff recruitment

The recruitment of staff members follows clearly defined procedures.

Findings

The panel noticed that professors and lecturers are hired following a standardised appointment process, which is described in detail in the “Règlement Procédure de Recrutement et de Nomination de professeurs et chargés de cours vacataires”. The academic and administrative directors identify the need for recruitment, while the supervisory board decides whether it will put at disposition the necessary financial resources. The academic director publishes the vacancy and leads the recruitment procedure. A committee of five members selects the candidate, while lecturers and students are also represented in the recruitment committee. During the visit, the panel consulted the files that are available for each recruitment: the paper trail indicates that the recruitment practice is in line with the procedures.

Considerations

The panel considers that staff recruitment at ISEC is organised properly.

Conclusion

The panel judges that the ISEC **meets** criterion D.

4.5 Criterion E – qualified staff

In the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the institution employs staff with the necessary scientific and professional qualifications to provide training within the frame of the academic

programmes offered by the institutions under the provisions of the law (art. 28ter, paragraphs 1-2).

Findings

According to the information materials, lecturers at ISEC have a degree that is at least one level higher than the level they teach. Although this statement is not entirely correct – not all lecturers in the MBA programme have a PhD – the panel did gather from the numerous CV's that were made available that both the current lecturers and those envisaged to teach in the new programmes are properly qualified. Students moreover indicated that they are satisfied with the content expertise, the didactical quality and the professional know-how of their lecturers.

The Luxembourg law stipulates that a specialised higher education institution such as ISEC can be accredited if it employs at least 15 full-time equivalent employees with a professional qualification at least equivalent to the level of studies for which the final diploma is awarded and of which the courses are built on recent results of scientific research. The panel observed that ISEC does not fulfil the quantitative component of this requirement: at the time of the site visit and based on the most recent update, ISEC employs 8 non-academic staff (3.1 FTE) in charge of the management and administration of the institute and 7 academic staff (2.85 FTE) with academic and/or key professorial responsibilities. Moreover, it has issued short-term contracts with about 35 professors and lecturers who hold teaching positions at ISEC.

ISEC is aware of its non-compliance with the legal provision and included in the application materials a multi-year plan of activities with the envisaged evolution of its academic and administrative staff. According to this document, the threshold of 15 FTE would be reached when ISEC is offering eight programmes. The discussion with the Ministry of Higher Education and Research representatives showed that to be accredited, any institution should have sufficient human resources to develop and execute programmes: there should not only be enough staff to coordinate the programmes but the institution should also have a sufficient number of in-house lecturers to teach the modules and develop research. In this respect, the panel observed that the most recent staff update features a good mixture of staff categories.

Considerations

The panel considers that the managerial, administrative and academic staff that is currently on the payroll of ISEC has the necessary expertise to organise and deliver higher education programmes.

According to article 28ter of the law on the organisation of higher education, ISEC can be accredited as a specialised higher education institution if it employs at least 15 full-time equivalent employees. Based on a strict interpretation of the legal requirement, the panel cannot endorse that this criterion is fully met at present.

The panel considers that the current size of the faculty and staff is commensurate with the development phase of the institute and the number of programmes ISEC currently delivers. If ISEC is to offer a broader portfolio of programmes, as it intends to do given its request for programme accreditations, then it needs to increase the number of staff operating centrally and the number of professors assuming key positions within individual programmes. Given the envisaged growth, ISEC could benefit from strengthening the team with academic and

educational leadership, and with a business developer (to identify programme opportunities with companies and to recruit potential students). Moreover, and in view of the requirement of the authorities that programmes are built around in-house academic staff, ISEC should recruit some more professors with their own niches of education and research expertise.

According to the panel, it is important that ISEC shows commitment to enlarge its faculty in the very short run. By first having more and competent staff at central level, ISEC will be able to better develop and implement programmes afterwards.

Conclusion

The panel judges that ISEC **partially meets** criterion E.

4.6 Criterion F - infrastructure

On the territory of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg the institution has adequate infrastructure for the various academic programmes and allowing students to complete the required work to achieve the educational objectives.

Findings

ISEC is located in the building of the Chamber of Commerce. In addition to offices for the administration, ISEC can make use of in-house course rooms and a conference centre. The panel visited the facilities that belong to the Chamber of Commerce Luxembourg and feature state-of-the-art educational equipment.

ISEC has developed an internal online system to facilitate the education process. During the visit, the panel was introduced to ISEC Online, a digital learning environment that manages all tasks related to the lifecycle of the programmes and the students (admission, course organisation, exams). It is also a portal offering opportunities for information and communication with and among students and staff.

ISEC has an electronic library which is available for students and professors. By special arrangement they have access to the online library of the University of Luxembourg. According to the panel, these opportunities can be promoted more because not all students seemed aware of it.

Considerations

The panel considers that the material facilities at ISEC are excellent and that its online portal is a strong tool for administrators, staff and students. Moreover, the panel was satisfied to hear that students appreciate the personalised tutoring and support from lecturers and in particular from the student administrator. Given the absence of a proper library, the institute could organise in-house sessions on how to use the electronic library service and how to collect data for assignments and thesis work.

Conclusion

The panel judges that ISEC **meets** criterion F.

4.7 Criterion G – collaboration with other institutions

The institution regularly collaborates with other institutions on the national and international levels as well as with economic and social actors of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

Findings

ISEC has been established by two entities, the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Crafts, which are very well networked within the Luxembourg economy. As a result, ISEC has direct access to and is in regular contact with various social and economic actors in the Grand-Duchy.

Since its establishment, ISEC has been setting up partnership agreements with higher education institutions in the Greater Region, such as FOM, Université de Lorraine and Université de Liège. These agreements have been instrumental in increasing the programme portfolio of ISEC.

Considerations

The panel considers that ISEC has access to an extensive network within Luxembourg and a growing network of academic institutions in the surrounding regions. Nonetheless, the panel thinks that there is room for enhancing the contacts ISEC can access through the Chambers. In view of the programme portfolio ISEC envisages to offer, it could make better use of the Chambers' contacts with companies and economic and social sector actors. Moreover, while applauding ISEC's efforts to sign cooperation agreements with academic partners, the panel suggests that ISEC sharpens the strategy that underlies these agreements and makes them more explicit.

Conclusion

The panel judges that ISEC **meets** criterion G.

4.8 Criterion H – participation in international exchange

The institution actively participates in international exchange programmes for students and teachers.

Findings

Most students at ISEC combine their studies with a full-time job and often have family commitments. Until now, students in ISEC programmes have had no opportunity to include a study period abroad. The professors who are currently on the payroll of ISEC have no time in their contract to undertake international exchange.

According to the Ministry of Higher Education and Research representatives, it is foreseen by law that all bachelor students at the University of Luxembourg go abroad for one semester as part of their curriculum to avoid that they are exposed exclusively to the Luxembourg system of education before entering the labour market. While ISEC students have work experience by the time they graduate, it would be beneficial if they could also have an international study experience.

The panel gathered from the discussions on site that ISEC is considering the possibilities of organising such study period abroad in cooperation with its international academic partners. According to the panel, an international study experience is very well possible if ISEC

programmes would be effectively organised according to the principles of dual education as students could spend short study periods abroad and get these recognised as an integral part of their study load. Furthermore, ISEC could use the international contacts and networks of its professors to enhance not only student exchange but also include a staff mobility component.

Considerations

At the time of the site visit, ISEC is not meeting the requirement of this standard. However, the panel is confident that ISEC has sufficient contacts at institutional level and through its professors to develop opportunities for a study period abroad.

Moreover, as several academic staff have teaching assignments outside Luxembourg and several students are employed by international companies in Luxembourg, ISEC does offer an international academic environment to its students and could increase the international dimension of its education.

Conclusion

The panel judges that ISEC **partially meets** criterion H.

4.9 Overall conclusion

Having judged six criteria as “met” and two criteria as “partially met”, the panel’s overall judgement of the institutional assessment criteria is **positive**.

According to the panel, the rationale for ISEC is relevant and the way ISEC wants to realise its plans is feasible. ISEC adheres to the legal and financial regulations in Luxembourg, has set up adequate internal policies and procedures and keeps good track of its decisions. Moreover, the panel thinks highly of the facilities and the student support services including the ISEC Online system.

The panel considers that the governance of ISEC is well organised with a clear division of tasks between stakeholders and management, securing academic neutrality. If anything, ISEC may want to make better use of the contacts of its founding Chambers to identify, design and market its programmes and eventually to recruit students among the companies that are member of the Chambers.

The positioning of ISEC as provider of higher education programmes for the Luxembourg workforce is strong; nonetheless, this particular stance should not refrain the institute from designing programmes that include a study period abroad or challenging research-based thesis assignments.

Finally, the panel has found that the current administrative and academic staff is of good quality but not sufficient in numbers to turn strategic plans into reality. The discussions on site have made the panel realise that ISEC needs first to invest in more staff at central level with more extensive contracts if it wants to implement programmes successfully afterwards. According to the panel, complementing the existing team with academic leadership, educational expertise and communications / business development know-how will allow ISEC to identify, design, market and implement good quality programmes in the future. Enhancing this academic and educational leadership is all the more necessary according to

the panel if ISEC wants to increase ownership of the programmes that were initially set up by other partners but now form the object of this programme accreditation.

4.10 Overview of the assessments

	Criterion	Judgement
A	The higher education institution bases its activity on the guidelines and strategic objectives that it makes public. It publishes clear, accurate and updated information on its activities, including its academic programmes, admission requirements, achieved learning outcomes and qualifications achieved at the end of these programmes.	meets
B	The origin of the financial resources available to the institution is transparent and organised in compliance with the rules of scientific neutrality.	meets
C	The institution provides regular academic programmes as defined under article 28bis, para 3 of the law.	meets
D	The recruitment of staff members follows clearly defined procedures.	meets
E	In the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the institution employs staff with the necessary scientific and professional qualifications to provide training within the frame of the academic programmes offered by the institutions under the provisions of the law (art. 28ter, para 1-2).	partially meets
F	On the territory of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg the institution has adequate infrastructure for the various academic programmes and allowing students to complete the required work to achieve the educational objectives.	meets
G	The institution regularly collaborates with other institutions on the national and international levels as well as with economic and social actors of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.	meets
H	The institution actively participates in international exchange programmes for students and teachers.	partially meets
	Overall judgement	positive

5 Programme assessment Bachelor Business Administration

5.1 Standard 1 – intended learning outcomes

With respect to level, orientation and content, the intended exit level reflects the current requirements that have been set for the programme by the professional field and/or discipline from an international perspective.

Reference criteria

- *The academic programme has a structured curriculum, which reflects the objectives of the programme. It includes knowledge, specific skills and transversal skills.*
- *The academic programme is defined in line with the European standards and the Bologna process. It is defined in terms of ECTS credits and designed based on student-centred learning and in particular in support of the student's success, active participation in the studies and the development of skills, knowledge and know-how.*
- *The academic programme is divided into modules each of which is assigned a certain number of ECTS credits. The objectives and the learning outcomes of each module are clearly defined.*

Findings

The Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration (BBA) was originally created by the German Fachhochschule für Oekonomie & Management (FOM) and offered in Luxembourg by its branch EUFOM. In 2016, ISEC signed an agreement with FOM and EUFOM to take over the delivery of the BBA in Luxembourg. The accreditation by the Ministry of Higher Education and Research in Luxembourg, which expires in September 2018, has allowed ISEC to deliver this programme since the academic year 2016-2017. Currently, 72 students are enrolled in the BBA: 43 students who were already in the programme when ISEC took over in September 2016 and 29 who joined since.

The BBA is offered in German and consists of modules that are spread over seven semesters for a total of 180 ECTS. The first six semesters consist each of four or five courses while the final semester is dedicated to one course and the bachelor thesis. The programme is open for students with a completed secondary school degree and targets explicitly people who are at work. Hence, courses are scheduled during the evening and on Saturdays.

Based on the programme materials and the discussions on site, the panel observed that the curriculum is structured properly with each module being allocated a certain amount of ECTS study credits. Moreover, the individual modules are described in sufficient detail and contain learning goals. The panel gathered that, in addition to facilitating working students by organising courses outside office hours, the programme is delivered in a student-centred way. Students were very positive about the 'short lines' with lecturers and the coordinator and about the individual attention they get in class.

While the aims and learning goals of individual modules are specified, there is no such information available on the (intended) learning outcomes at programme level. As a result, it is not possible for the panel to verify whether the programme – through the delivery of

individual modules - is working towards knowledge, skills and attitudes that each student should have acquired by the end of the programme. Similarly, it is not possible to establish whether these competencies will be developed to a commonly accepted bachelor's level and if the combination of modules eventually leads to a degree that meets the requirements of the academic and professional field.

Furthermore, the panel observed in the information materials that the BBA is presented as a dual education programme. According to the panel, this is not correct: students are working during their study but there is no direct link between their activities on the job and their studies. Although some students indicated that what they learn in the BBA is directly useful for their job, other students saw no direct impact while still others indicated that they even did not want their employer to know that they were studying.

Considerations

The panel considers that the overall objective of the BBA programme is clear: ISEC offers a German-language bachelor of business administration to students who are already at work. Moreover, the curriculum of the programme is structured in modules featuring learning goals and a given number of credits, eventually adding up to a regular overall study load of 180 ECTS. Furthermore, courses are delivered in a student-centred way in terms of both scheduling and individualised attention to students in class.

However, the panel is surprised to notice that there is hardly any information on the specific aim of this BBA: what is the rationale for organising the programme in the way it is being delivered, how does it reflect the strategic objectives of ISEC, and how does it stand out compared to other BBA programmes? Given the rationale of ISEC and its focus on attracting a specific audience of working students, the panel would expect that the specific ISEC 'flavour' is reflected explicitly in the programme documents and features prominently as a unique selling proposition setting this particular BBA programme apart from other initial education BBA's.

Furthermore, the panel has found little connection between individual modules and the overall programme. Because there are no (intended) learning outcomes formulated at programme level, it is not possible for the panel to verify whether the individual modules contribute to a set of competencies - knowledge, skills and attitudes - that each student should have acquired by the end of the programme. The panel therefore strongly recommends the programme to develop such intended learning outcomes and to indicate clearly the link – for instance through a detailed matrix - between the overall outcomes at programme level, the individual learning goals of the modules and the assessment of both learning goals and learning outcomes.

According to the panel, the elaboration of such intended learning outcomes is all the more important because it allows to establish whether these competencies are set at a commonly accepted bachelor's level. It will also ensure students and the institute that upon graduation, the awarded degree is meeting the requirements of the academic and the professional field.

Finally, the panel considers that the current set-up of the programme as a full-time 180 ECTS endeavour with no connection to the student's work place is not sustainable. The panel, therefore, recommends ISEC to consider transforming the programme into a real dual education curriculum with a clear commitment of both employers and students and with

modules featuring both theory (taught in class) and application of theory (acquired on the job).

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **unsatisfactory**.

5.2 Standard 2 - teaching learning environment

The teaching-learning environment enables the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Reference criteria

- *The workload is appropriate and distributed in a balanced way between semesters.*
- *The relationship between theoretical and practical courses is in line with the programme objectives. Based on the objectives of the programme, internships are planned.*
- *Within the frame of the academic programme leading to the Bachelor's degree, with the exception of alternating courses, a compulsory training period with a university or a higher education institution abroad is included in the programme which is subject to the validation of studies followed outside the home institution.*
- *The admission requirements to the academic programme are clearly defined and published. The admission criteria provide validation of prior experience.*
- *The academic programme has sufficient resources in terms of teachers as well as financial and material resources to cover its specific needs and achieve its objectives. Such resources are available for the entire duration of the academic programme.*
- *Courses are provided by competent staff on the teaching and pedagogical level, capable of linking subject matters to professional practice in the relevant field and current research. Teaching is based on student-centred learning, promoting active participation by the students.*
- *The proportion between permanent teachers and external speakers is adapted to the objectives of the academic programme.*
- *Continuing education programmes are provided to teachers.*
- *Adequate supervision and comprehensive information for students are provided. Students are offered tutoring or mentoring programmes.*

Findings

The BBA programme amounts to 180 ECTS and is spread over seven semesters. Each semester consists of a number of modules with the study load per semester varying from 22 to 29 ECTS. The modules during the first four semesters are common to all, while students have some options to choose from in semester 5 and select a specialisation for 24 ECTS in semester 4: finance, management, operations research, Immaterielle Wirtschaftsgüter (patents, licences, intellectual property, etc.). The bachelor thesis of 11 ECTS completes the programme in semester 7.

As mentioned under standard 1, the structure of the curriculum and its individual modules is clear. The panel observed moreover in the materials that the curriculum covers the topics one would expect in any BBA programme. While most modules seem to be scheduled in a logical order, the panel did wonder why Human Resources was offered already in semester 1 and students take the Propädeuticum in statistics after the modules on quantitative methods. Moreover, the panel noticed that the programme features three introductory

courses (so-called Propädeuticum) that require a considerable workload (250 study load hours in total, to be performed both in class and through self-study) but are not counted as modules and do not entitle students to earn credits.

According to ISEC, students can follow an internship as part of their programme but most students do not use this opportunity as they are at work and see no opportunity to integrate this with their professional commitments. Similarly, and as mentioned already in the section on the institutional assessment, there are no opportunities yet for students to spend a study period abroad. However, the panel gathered from the discussions on site that some kind of international component is required by the Luxembourg authorities and that ISEC is looking into the possibilities of such international exchange through its academic partners and the networks of its professors.

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that the didactical approach of the programme as a whole and of the individual modules is student-centred: lecturers teach in an activating way encouraging students to participate in class and, where possible, to connect theory to the reality of their work situation. Students from their side confirmed – and appreciated – the efforts of the lecturers in this regard.

The admission requirements are clearly stipulated in the programme documents and the information brochure: students need a secondary school degree to start the BBA. Students are informed during the advisory process prior to enrolment about the conditions for admission. If they did not graduate secondary school and have no entitlement to access higher education ('Hochschulzugangsberechtigung'), then students can apply to get their previously acquired professional experiences validated through the so-called VAE (validation des acquis de l'expérience) procedure. A similar procedure is available if students want to get waivers for modules based on previously acquired qualifications. The panel observed in the additional materials on site that this VAE procedure is well developed in ISEC and that the institute is making adequate use of it granting admission or waivers only when students present a well-motivated case.

Looking at the curriculum overview, reviewing the programme materials and talking to students, the panel observed that there is some inconsistency in the study load of the modules. Each module is allocated a certain number of study credits and the study load of the individual modules is broken down in time spent in class and time spent on self-study. Adding up the two components, one arrives at a study load which is on the lower end of the continuum: on average one ECTS amounts to 25 hours of study load. Compared to international practices (usually between 25 and 30 hours), this is on the lower end but just acceptable. BBA students at ISEC reportedly spend about 1100 hours in class, almost one quarter of the total study load, which is again not much but acceptable. The remaining time (at least 3400 hours) should be dedicated to self-study and to preparing for exams. However, students indicated during the site visit that outside class, they spend on average another 5 to 10 hours per week on their study. This is far too little when the programme relies also on students acquiring competencies through self-study.

Moreover, based on the description of the individual modules, the panel did not always see the connection between the requirements of an individual module, the awarded ECTS and the breakdown of the workload for this module between college hours and self-study. For instance, the first two semesters feature four modules with 9 EC each, while teaching units (i.e. contact hours) in the respective modules range from 56 to 96.

The above findings cast doubt on the feasibility of the BBA programme in its current set-up. According to the panel, it seems this programme falls in between stools: although it caters for students who are at work (and often have family commitments), it does offer a curriculum that should be completed as if it were almost a full-time study. Full-time higher education programmes of 180 ECTS usually consist of six semesters of about 20 weeks each, with an average workload of 40 hours per week. Even with semesters at ISEC lasting somewhat longer, it seems almost impossible for students to work, possibly have a family, and then to spend on top of these commitments the equivalent of an almost full-time activity by attending classes and doing extensive self-study during seven semesters.

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that the staff is adequate to deliver the programme. The panel consulted the CV's of all professors and lecturers and noticed that they have the necessary qualifications to teach on the BBA programme. Moreover, the recruitment of staff is organised properly with key professors with a considerable appointment getting time to do research in addition to their core tasks of teaching and examining. Students mentioned that they are highly satisfied with the expertise and availability of the teaching staff. Most lecturers also have good didactical skills and in addition to their academic know-how, they all share their professional expertise with the students in class. The panel noticed moreover during the visit that the student administrator is highly professional and very committed to the wellbeing of each individual student, two characteristics that were entirely confirmed by the students. Although still a start-up, ISEC also pays attention to the professionalization of its staff. According to the panel this is an area which is likely to become even more important in the near future when more staff will be recruited.

Further to what was already mentioned in the section on the institutional assessment, the facilities at ISEC are very good: state-of-the-art classrooms, an electronic learning environment (ISEC Online) that is fit for purpose for students, lecturers and staff, and tutoring and support services that are tailored to the individual needs of the student. Given that ISEC has no library of its own, the panel suggests informing students more extensively about the library opportunities in Luxembourg and to include in the programme a training session on online data gathering.

Considerations

The panel's appreciation of the teaching and learning environment at ISEC is very mixed in so far as the BBA programme is concerned: ISEC has very good facilities and takes care of its BBA students in a personalised way. Moreover, the modules are taught and administered by committed staff with adequate know-how, didactical skills and good exposure to the professional world. Admission is organised properly.

However, the panel is not comfortable with several aspects of the current programme set-up. While the individual modules seem adequate in their own right and constitute elements that one would expect in any BBA programme, there is little indication as to how these individual modules contribute to a coherent overall programme. On the contrary, the panel has doubts about the position of certain modules in the programme, about the position and organisation of the propaedeutic courses and about the absence of an internship and a study period abroad. Some of these flaws can be linked to the absence of explicit programme objectives and intended learning outcomes, as mentioned already under standard 1.

The panel, moreover, considers that the study load of the BBA modules is not adequate for a full-time programme. If students successfully pass courses after a relatively modest number of contact hours and very little self-study, then the course requirements seem too light. One wonders, then, to what extent students graduating from the programme can obtain the final qualifications that are expected of a bachelor in business administration.

Finally, and relating to the previous point, the panel wonders to what extent the current set-up of the programme is feasible when the reported study load would indeed reflect reality. It seems almost impossible for students to spend on top of their professional and family commitments the equivalent of an almost full-time activity by attending classes and doing extensive self-study during seven semesters. Students who are at work and study usually follow the programme in a part-time mode, with each semester accounting on average for 15 ECTS. Alternatively, the programme could be offered in a dual variant, with students applying the acquired know-how and skills on the job in a meaningful way.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **unsatisfactory**.

5.3 Standard 3 – assessment

The programme has an adequate assessment, testing and examination system in place to ascertain whether the intended learning outcomes are being achieved.

Reference criteria

- *The evaluation methods are defined on the basis of the educational objectives.*
- *The evaluation methods applied in the various modules are clearly communicated to the students.*
- *Diplomas and degrees issued by the higher education institution provide information on the acquired qualifications. They are accompanied by a diploma supplement describing the knowledge and skills acquired by the holder.*

Findings

The panel read in the curriculum overview and in the description of the individual modules how students are assessed for each course. During the first four semesters students have a written exam at the end of each module, while two courses also expect students to write and present a short seminar paper. Although written exams are still part of several modules in later semesters, courses can also be assessed through an extensive seminar paper or a presentation. The bachelor thesis consists of both a report and an oral exam; it should be written in three months and will be scored by two assessors.

The panel consulted a sample of completed exams and noticed that the quality of these exams was adequate. Students indicated that they get proper information on the type of exams and on the expectations of the lecturer. They also indicated that there is no systematic feedback on the exams but that, upon individual request, students can consult their corrected exam afterwards.

The panel noticed moreover that there is an extensive teaching and examination regulation both at the level of ISEC ('Rahmenprüfungsordnung für die Bachelor-Studengänge') and for

the BBA programme specifically (Prüfungsordnung für den Bachelor-Studiengang Business Administration). In addition to specific assessment provisions, they cover relevant aspects of the programme including admission, length and structure, ECTS arrangements, etc.

According to the general regulation, ISEC will establish a testing committee ('Prüfungsausschuss') that will guarantee the correct execution of the exams. The panel also noticed that the regulation arranges for reasonable accommodations for students with a functional disability.

Upon graduation, students receive a diploma with a detailed overview of the notes acquired in the modules and a diploma supplement in English.

Considerations

The panel considers that ISEC has elaborated an adequate assessment system and that this system, in so far as the BBA is concerned, is described extensively and properly in the teaching and examination regulation.

Based on input from students and on its own sample review, the panel considers that the exams are valid, reliable and transparent. If anything, the panel encourages the programme in general and the individual examiners in particular to provide feedback to exams and to operationalise the grading table (as described in art. 21 (6) of the regulation) for the specific purpose of thesis assessment.

The panel supports the envisaged establishment of an examination committee and encourages ISEC to extend the mandate of this committee to include the quality of the exams (not only the exam procedure), e.g. by creating peer review of exams prior to the examination.

Notwithstanding the small size of the institution and the direct links between students and staff, the programme may also benefit from a complaints procedure (as envisaged in the examination committee) that spells out the opportunities for appeal before an appeals body in case informal mediation is effective.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

5.4 Standard 4 – internal quality assurance

The set-up and organisation of the internal quality assurance are aimed at systematically improving the programme with the involvement of the relevant stakeholders.

Reference criteria

- *The higher education institution ensures to collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management and the continuous improvement of its academic programmes and research activities.*
- *The higher education institution has an internal and external quality assurance system that it makes public and that forms an integral part of its strategic management. The internal and external measures for the quality assurance of the institution are in*

compliance with the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).

- *The academic programmes are regularly subject to an internal review to ensure they reflect the latest results of research and teaching in the relevant field, that they fulfil the targeted objectives and meet the continuously changing needs of students and society.*
- *Responsibilities, competencies and the decision-making process within the higher education institution are clearly and transparently defined.*
- *Teachers and students have sufficient means to make known their position and to participate in the decision-making process.*
- *The defined institution has a person or a committee dealing with issues relating to equal opportunities policy.*

Findings

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that ISEC has several governance bodies that follow-up the quality of education: the supervisory council, the management board (directoire), the pedagogical committee and the scientific committee. Moreover, quality issues at institutional level are described in the Charte Management de la Qualité, which is publicly available on the website.

The quality of individual modules is monitored systematically through online course evaluations completed by the students. The outcomes of these evaluations are followed up by the management and the student administrator. Moreover, students appoint a representative among their cohort who functions as liaison between students on the one hand and lecturers, student administrator and management on the other hand.

The pedagogical committee collects inputs from lecturers on the quality of the courses and the course materials. Lecturers with a fixed appointment have yearly performance interviews with the academic director.

Students and staff indicated to the panel that they are satisfied with the current system of quality assurance. However, they understand that the small-scale of both institute and programme contributes strongly to the adequacy of the current system, in which many issues are settled through informal channels and direct face-to-face contacts. This system will no longer suffice when more programmes are offered involving more students and more staff.

The panel observed that while there is a systematic evaluation at course level, there are no provisions for block evaluations per semester or for the entire programme. Moreover, the panel noticed that students are heard through the year representatives, but are not (yet) represented in any of the governance bodies. The ISEC management indicated to the panel that they will consider this in the near future as they understand that students should be represented formally when discussing education-related issues in the pedagogical committee.

Finally, the panel read in the statutes that ISEC will set up a Conseil d'Orientation Stratégique (strategic orientation body). Given that the founding Chambers are very well connected throughout Luxembourg, this body could feature representatives from industry and take up an advisory role on the relevance of new education programmes and on the quality of existing programmes for the labour market.

Considerations

The panel considers that ISEC has several written provisions on quality assurance that are adequate at this stage of their development. Moreover, the rationale for, and the task division among, the different bodies is fine. The quality of the education at this moment is ensured through informal face-to-face contacts on the one hand and written provisions and course evaluations on the other hand. Moreover, the panel considers that the current system is effective as the management is willing to act in case of reported problems.

While this system forms a good basis, according to the panel it does need considerable enhancement in the near future. Elements that need to be included both at institutional level and at the level of the BBA programme are the involvement of students in the governance of the programme, evaluations at levels beyond individual modules, feedback to students on measures taken to address evaluation results, a systematic involvement of lectures in evaluating educational quality, and a clear role for alumni and employers in monitoring the quality of existing programmes and in establishing the relevance of new programmes.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

5.5 Standard 5 – research

Reference criteria

- *The higher education institution performs, in the relevant areas, basic oriented research activities or applied research activities as defined in article 1 of the law of 3 December 2014 on the organisation of public research centres. These research activities will lead to publications in the institution's name in international scientific and peer-reviewed journals.*
- *The institution incorporates the results of its research in the education it is providing.*

Findings

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that research and research publications are currently limited to the individual research activities of the key lecturers, and in particular one lecturer who is currently quite proliferate because of his research sabbatical. ISEC informed the panel that it is working together with the lecturers on a detailed research plan for the future. Moreover, current and future employment contracts with professors (will) contain provisions for research in addition to delivering and assessing courses.

The panel noticed that where possible lecturers do integrate current research in their teaching on the BBA programme. Students moreover appreciate this exposure to academic performance. The importance of the research component is likely to grow considerably when students are expected to apply the know-how they acquired at ISEC in their own working environments. In this regard, the panel agrees with both the representatives of the Ministry of Higher Education and Research and with ISEC that there are plenty of opportunities for lecturers to develop – together with students – applied research.

Considerations

While it acknowledges that ISEC has not yet much to show in terms of research, the panel is confident that ISEC is taking the issue seriously – as is demonstrated by the employment

contracts - and has good opportunities to develop (applied) research and integrate this in its BBA programme.

The panel considers that if ISEC wants to offer higher education programmes such as this BBA, it will have to step up its efforts in terms of research. ISEC is fully aware of this requirement. The panel therefore encourages ISEC to promote applied research involving students and to stimulate its professors to get in contacts with and obtain contracts from local companies for research-based consultancy assignments.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

5.6 Overall conclusion

Based on the above-mentioned findings and considerations, the panel is very uncomfortable in recommending the BBA programme for accreditation.

On the positive side, ISEC is doing rather well in setting up regulations and policies that have direct implications on the BBA programme, and in ensuring a paper trail on its decisions. Moreover, the individual modules and their assessment are described in sufficient detail. The panel also considers that the academic and administrative staff on the programme are suited for their tasks; in this respect, the panel perfectly understands why students think highly of the knowledge they gain in class and the support they receive from ISEC.

Part of these positive appreciations are based on the small scale of both ISEC and the BBA programme. While provisions on assessment and on quality assurance are basic but sufficient at this stage of development, they need considerable enhancement in the near future. The same goes – to even a larger extent – for the research activities of ISEC in general and within the BBA programme in particular.

The major weaknesses of the BBA are related to two very fundamental components of the programme: first of all, the absence of (intended) learning outcomes at programme level does not allow to link the learning goals of individual modules to the overall programme framework and thus prevents (the panel) from establishing whether students are eventually educated to a level that is commensurate with what one can expect of a bachelor's programme in business administration.

Secondly, the panel has serious doubts about the effective study load of individual modules, which appears to be too light in so far as acquisition of competencies through self-study is concerned. In this respect, the panel also wonders to what extent the current set-up of the BBA as an almost full-time programme is feasible when the study load (in class and self-study) reported in the documents would indeed reflect reality. It seems almost impossible for students to spend on top of their professional and family commitments the equivalent of 180 ECTS (between 4500 and 5000 hours spread over seven semesters) on their study.

Finally, the panel noticed that notwithstanding its existence for some time, the BBA programme attracts a fairly limited number of students. Although it is not in the remit of the panel to assess the financial viability of the programme, the panel does wonder – also in

view of the previous consideration - whether the programme should not be offered in a dual variant, targeting students who are at work and in a position to apply the acquired know-how and skills on their job in a meaningful way.

5.7 Overview of the assessments

Standard		Judgement
1	Intended learning outcomes	unsatisfactory
2	Teaching-learning environment	unsatisfactory
3	Assessment	satisfactory
4	Internal quality assurance	satisfactory
5	Research	satisfactory
Overall judgement		negative

6 Programme assessment Master Business Administration

6.1 Standard 1 – intended learning outcomes

With respect to level, orientation and content, the intended exit level reflects the current requirements that have been set for the programme by the professional field and/or discipline from an international perspective

Reference criteria

- *The academic programme has a structured curriculum, which reflects the objectives of the programme. It includes knowledge, specific skills and transversal skills.*
- *The academic programme is defined in line with the European standards and the Bologna process. It is defined in terms of ECTS credits and designed based on student-centred learning and in particular in support of the student's success, active participation in the studies and the development of skills, knowledge and know-how.*
- *The academic programme is divided into modules each of which is assigned a certain number of ECTS credits. The objectives and the learning outcomes of each module are clearly defined.*

Findings

The Master Business Administration (MBA) was originally created by the German Fachhochschule für Oekonomie & Management (FOM) and offered in Luxembourg by its branch EUFOM. In 2016, ISEC signed an agreement with FOM and EUFOM to take over the delivery of the MBA in Luxembourg. The accreditation by the Ministry of Higher Education and Research in Luxembourg, which expires in September 2018, has allowed ISEC to deliver this programme since the academic year 2016-2017. Currently, 21 students are enrolled in the MBA: 11 students who were already in the programme when ISEC took over in September 2016 and 10 who joined since.

The MBA is offered in German with some courses being taught in English. It consists of modules that are spread over four semesters for a total of 120 ECTS. The first three semesters consist each of four courses while the final semester is dedicated to the MBA thesis. The programme is open for students with a completed bachelor degree and some professional experience. As the MBA explicitly targets people who are at work, courses are scheduled during the evening and on Saturdays.

Based on the programme materials and the discussions on site, the panel observed that the curriculum is structured properly with each module being allocated a certain amount of ECTS study credits. Moreover, most individual modules are described in sufficient detail and contain learning goals. The panel gathered that, in addition to facilitating working students by organising courses outside office hours, the programme is delivered in a student-centred way. Students were very positive about the easy connections with lecturers and the coordinator and about the individual attention they get in class.

While the aims and learning goals of individual modules are specified, there is no such information available on the (intended) learning outcomes at programme level. As a result, it is not possible for the panel to verify whether the programme – through the delivery of

individual modules - is working towards knowledge, skills and attitudes that each student should have acquired by the end of the programme. Similarly, it is not possible to establish whether these competencies will be developed to a level that is commonly expected of an MBA programme and thus whether the students will be awarded an MBA degree that meets the requirements of the academic and professional field.

Furthermore, the panel observed in the information materials that the MBA is presented as a dual education programme. According to the panel, this is not entirely correct: students are working during their study but there is no direct and formal connection between their study and their workplace.

Considerations

The panel considers that the overall objective of the MBA programme is clear: ISEC offers a German-language MBA to students with often limited business or management background and who are at work. Moreover, the curriculum of the programme is structured in modules featuring learning goals and a given number of credits, eventually adding up to a regular overall study load of 120 ECTS. Furthermore, courses are delivered in a student-centred way in terms of both scheduling and individualised attention to students in class.

However, the panel is surprised to notice that there is hardly any information on the specific aim of this particular MBA: although the management indicated that the programme's unique selling propositions are the language, the small scale and the course schedule, the panel found no indication of any content-related strengths. Given the particular rationale of ISEC and its focus on attracting a specific audience of working students, the panel would expect that the particular ISEC 'flavour' is reflected explicitly in the programme contents and in the description of how this particular MBA programme stands apart from other MBA's.

Furthermore, the panel has found little connection between individual modules and the overall programme. Because there are no (intended) learning outcomes formulated at programme level, it is not possible for the panel to verify whether the individual modules contribute to a set of competencies - knowledge, skills and attitudes - that each student should have acquired by the end of the programme. The panel therefore strongly recommends the programme to develop such intended learning outcomes and to indicate clearly the link – for instance through a detailed matrix - between the overall outcomes at programme level, the individual learning goals of the modules and the assessment of both learning goals and learning outcomes.

According to the panel, the elaboration of such intended learning outcomes is even more important because it allows to establish whether these competencies are set at a commonly accepted MBA level. It will also ensure students and the institute that upon graduation, the awarded degree is meeting the requirements of the academic and the professional field.

Finally, the panel considers that the current set-up of the programme as a full-time 120 ECTS endeavour with no formal connection to the student's work place is not workable and sustainable. Instead, the panel recommends ISEC to consider transforming the programme into a real dual education curriculum with a clear commitment of both employers and students and with modules featuring both theory (taught in class) and application of theory (acquired on the job).

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **unsatisfactory**.

6.2 Standard 2 - teaching-learning environment

The teaching-learning environment enables the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Reference criteria

- *The workload is appropriate and distributed in a balanced way between semesters.*
- *The relationship between theoretical and practical courses is in line with the programme objectives. Based on the objectives of the programme, internships are planned.*
- *Within the frame of the academic programme leading to the Bachelor's degree, with the exception of alternating courses, a compulsory training period with a university or a higher education institution abroad is included in the programme which is subject to the validation of studies followed outside the home institution.*
- *The admission requirements to the academic programme are clearly defined and published. The admission criteria provide validation of prior experience.*
- *The academic programme has sufficient resources in terms of teachers as well as financial and material resources to cover its specific needs and achieve its objectives. Such resources are available for the entire duration of the academic programme.*
- *Courses are provided by competent staff on the teaching and pedagogical level, capable of linking subject matters to professional practice in the relevant field and current research. Teaching is based on student-centred learning, promoting active participation by the students.*
- *The proportion between permanent teachers and external speakers is adapted to the objectives of the academic programme.*
- *Continuing education programmes are provided to teachers.*
- *Adequate supervision and comprehensive information for students are provided. Students are offered tutoring or mentoring programmes.*

Findings

The MBA programme amounts to 120 ECTS and is spread over four semesters. As mentioned under standard 1, the structure of the curriculum and its individual modules is clear. The panel observed moreover in the materials that the curriculum covers the topics one would expect in any MBA programme and the topics are scheduled in a logical order. Almost all modules are compulsory and common to all students; in one module students have some options to choose from. Before the start of the programme students can follow crash courses in business administration, law and methodology; each module has a study load of 40 hours but students do not earn credits.

The panel was surprised to notice that the fourth semester of the MBA programme consists of a transfer assessment and a MBA thesis, each accounting for 25 ECTS. While MBA programmes are often completed by a final product such as a thesis, the panel did not understand from the programme materials why so many credits are allocated to an MBA thesis, which according to art. 27 (2) of the education and examination regulation should be produced between two and three months and is to be produced in English (art 25). Moreover, the panel gathered from the discussion on site that the transfer assessment consists of a short reflection paper in which students describe how they were able to apply the knowledge they gained in their professional life to the MBA modules and how three of

these modules have had an impact on their work. Moreover, the format for the paper features a declaration in lieu of oath that students have worked for at least 725 hours in a professional capacity during their MBA studies.

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that the didactical approach of the programme as a whole and of the individual modules is student-centred: lecturers teach in an activating way encouraging students to participate in class and, where possible, to connect theory to the reality of their work situation. Students from their side confirmed – and appreciated - the efforts of the lecturers in this regard.

The admission requirements are clearly stipulated in the programme documents and the information brochure: students need a bachelor degree and at least one year of work experience to start the MBA. Moreover, students should have a relevant job and sufficient English language skills. If students lack some of the admission requirements, they can take an admission test with ISEC or bring in additional work experience. Students who want to get waivers for modules based on previously acquired qualifications, can apply to get these validated through the so-called VAE (validation des acquis de l'expérience) procedure. The panel observed in the additional materials on site that this VAE procedure is well developed in ISEC. The panel did not come across students who were admitted to the MBA programme without a completed bachelor degree.

Looking at the curriculum overview, reviewing the programme materials and talking to students, the panel observed that there is some inconsistency in the study load of the modules. Each module is allocated a certain number of study credits and the study load of the individual modules is broken down in time spent in class and time spent on self-study. Adding up the two components, one arrives at a study load which is on the lower end of the continuum: on average one ECTS amounts to 26 hours of study load. Compared to international practices (usually between 25 and 30 hours), this is on the lower end but acceptable. However, MBA students at ISEC reportedly spend just over 400 hours in class, which is only 13% of the total study load. The remaining time should be dedicated to self-study and to preparing for exams. However, students indicated during the site visit that outside class, they spend on average another 5 to 10 hours per week on their study. This is far too little when the programme relies to such an extent on students acquiring competencies through self-study. Even by recognising some of the time spent on the job and by allocating 25 credits to the transfer assessment, the remaining study load is considerable if the claimed workload outside class is effectively used for self-study, course preparation and exams.

Moreover, based on the description of the individual modules, the panel did not always see the connection between the requirements of an individual module, the awarded ECTS and the breakdown of the workload for this module between college hours and self-study. For instance, there is a 6 EC module with 24 contact hours, while one 5 EC modules consists of 36 contact hours.

The above findings cast doubt on the feasibility of the MBA programme in its current set-up. According to the panel, it seems this programme has an ambiguous positioning: although it caters for students who are at work (and often have family commitments), it does offer a curriculum that should be completed as if it were almost a full-time study. Full-time higher education programmes of 120 ECTS usually consist of four semesters of about 20 weeks each, with an average workload of 40 hours per week. Even with semesters at ISEC lasting

somewhat longer, it seems almost impossible for students to work, possibly have a family, and then to spend on top of these commitments so many hours on their study.

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that the staff is adequate to deliver the programme. The panel consulted the CV's of all professors and lecturers and noticed that they have the necessary qualifications to teach on the MBA programme. Moreover, the recruitment of staff is organised properly with key professors with a considerable appointment getting time to do research in addition to their core tasks of teaching and examining. Students mentioned that they are highly satisfied with the expertise and availability of the teaching staff. Most lecturers also have good didactical skills and in addition to their academic know-how, they all share their professional expertise with the students in class. The panel noticed moreover during the visit that the student administrator is highly professional and very committed to the wellbeing of each individual student, two characteristics that were entirely confirmed by the students. Although still a start-up, ISEC also pays attention to the professionalization of its staff. According to the panel this is an area which is likely to become even more important in the near future when more staff will be recruited.

Further to what was already mentioned in the section on the institutional assessment, the facilities at ISEC are very good: state-of-the-art classrooms, an electronic learning environment (ISEC Online) that is fit for purpose for students, lecturers and staff, and tutoring and support services that are tailored to the individual needs of the student. Given that ISEC has no library of its own, the panel suggests to inform students about the library opportunities in Luxembourg and to include in the programme a training session on online data gathering.

Considerations

The panel's appreciation of the teaching and learning environment at ISEC is very mixed in so far as the MBA programme is concerned: ISEC has very good facilities and takes care of its MBA students in a personalised way. Moreover, the modules are taught and administered by committed staff with adequate know-how, didactical skills and good exposure to the professional world. Admission is organised properly.

However, the panel is not comfortable with several aspects of the current programme set-up. While most individual modules seem adequate in their own right and constitute elements that one would expect in any BBA programme, there is little indication as to how these individual modules contribute to a coherent overall programme. Moreover, the panel has considerable doubts about the added value of the transfer assessment in its current form and about the sheer number of credits that are allocated to the MBA thesis. According to the panel, both components can be part of the curriculum, but not in the way they are currently applied and not for the number of credits they currently represent.

The panel, moreover, considers that the study load of the MBA modules is not adequate for a full-time programme. If students successfully pass courses after a relatively modest number of contact hours and very little self-study, then the course requirements seem too light. One wonders, then, to what extent students graduating from the programme can obtain the final qualifications that are expected of an MBA programme.

Finally, and relating to the previous point, the panel wonders to what extent the current set-up of the programme is feasible when the reported study load would indeed reflect reality. It

seems almost impossible for students to spend on top of their professional and family commitments so many hours attending classes and doing extensive self-study during four semesters. Alternatively, the programme could be offered in a dual variant, with students applying the acquired know-how and skills on the job in a meaningful way, not through a declaration and a small reflection paper.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **unsatisfactory**.

6.3 Standard 3 – assessment

The programme has an adequate assessment, testing and examination system in place to ascertain whether the intended learning outcomes are being achieved.

Reference criteria

- *The evaluation methods are defined on the basis of the educational objectives.*
- *The evaluation methods applied in the various modules are clearly communicated to the students.*
- *Diplomas and degrees issued by the higher education institution provide information on the acquired qualifications. They are accompanied by a diploma supplement describing the knowledge and skills acquired by the holder.*

Findings

The panel read in the curriculum overview and in the description of the individual modules how students are assessed for each course. Almost each module is assessed through an assignment and a presentation while also participation in class is considered. The MBA thesis consists of both a report and an oral exam and is scored by two assessors.

The panel consulted a sample of assignments and noticed that these exams were fine. However, the panel was surprised to note that there is hardly any diversity in the type of exam and that students are not tested on their knowledge of topics such as economics, financial management, HRM, marketing, etc. Students indicated that they get proper information on the expectations of the lecturer about the exam assignment. Some lecturers provide relevant written feedback, while others only give a score. Upon individual request, students can consult their corrected exam afterwards.

The panel noticed moreover that there is an extensive teaching and examination regulation both at the level of ISEC ('Rahmenprüfungsordnung für die Masterstudiengänge') and for the MBA programme specifically (Prüfungsordnung für den Master-Studiengang Business Administration). In addition to specific assessment provisions, they cover relevant aspects of the programme including admission, length and structure, ECTS arrangements, etc.

According to the general regulation, ISEC will establish a testing committee ('Prüfungsausschuss') that will guarantee the correct execution of the exams. The panel also noticed that the regulation arranges for reasonable accommodations for students with a functional disability.

Upon graduation, students receive a diploma with a detailed overview of the notes acquired in the modules and a diploma supplement in English.

Considerations

The panel considers that ISEC has elaborated an adequate assessment system and that this system, in so far as the MBA is concerned, is described extensively and properly in the teaching and examination regulation. If anything, the panel encourages the programme in general and the individual examiners in particular to provide feedback on the assignments and to operationalise the grading table (as described in art. 21 (6) of the regulation) for the specific purpose of the assignment and thesis reviews.

While the sample of assignments it reviewed seems to be fine, the panel is concerned that the strong focus on assessment through assignments will prevent students from acquiring knowledge on the key disciplinary components of business and management. Moreover, the way both the transfer assessment and the evaluation of the MBA thesis are organised is unclear for the panel. As a result, the panel has serious doubts that the assessment – as organised in the MBA programme – will measure effectively whether students have acquired the various learning goals at the level of the modules and if students upon graduation have reached the final qualifications that are usually connected to an MBA programme.

The panel supports the envisaged establishment of an examination committee and encourages ISEC to extend the mandate of this committee to include the quality of the exams (not only the exam procedure), e.g. by creating peer review of exams prior to the examination. Notwithstanding the small size of the institution and the direct links between students and staff, the programme may also benefit from a complaints procedure (as envisaged in the examination committee) that spells out the opportunities for appeal before an appeals body in case informal mediation is effective.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **unsatisfactory**.

6.4 Standard 4 – internal quality assurance

The set-up and the organisation of the internal quality assurance are aimed at systematically improving the programme with the involvement of the relevant stakeholders.

Reference criteria

- *The higher education institution ensures to collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management and the continuous improvement of its academic programmes and research activities.*
- *The higher education institution has an internal and external quality assurance system that it makes public and that forms an integral part of its strategic management. The internal and external measures for the quality assurance of the institution are in compliance with the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).*
- *The academic programmes are regularly subject to an internal review to ensure they reflect the latest results of research and teaching in the relevant field, that they fulfil the targeted objectives and meet the continuously changing needs of students and society.*
- *Responsibilities, competencies and the decision-making process within the higher education institution are clearly and transparently defined.*

- *Teachers and students have sufficient means to make known their position and to participate in the decision-making process.*
- *The defined institution has a person or a committee dealing with issues relating to equal opportunities policy.*

Findings

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that ISEC has several governance bodies that follow-up the quality of education: the supervisory council, the management board (directoire), the pedagogical committee and the scientific committee. Moreover, quality issues at institutional level are described in the Charte Management de la Qualité, which is publicly available on the website.

The quality of individual modules is monitored systematically through online course evaluations completed by the students. The outcomes of these evaluations are followed up by the management and the student administrator. Moreover, students appoint a representative among their cohort who functions as liaison between students on the one hand and lecturers, student administrator and management on the other hand.

The pedagogical committee collects inputs from lecturers on the quality of the courses and the course materials. Lecturers with a fixed appointment have yearly performance interviews with the academic director.

Students and staff indicated to the panel that they are satisfied with the current system of quality assurance. However, they understand that the small-scale of both institute and programme contributes strongly to the adequacy of the current system, in which many issues are settled through informal channels and direct face-to-face contacts. This system will no longer suffice when more programmes are offered involving more students and more staff.

The panel observed that while there is a systematic evaluation at course level, there are no provisions for block evaluations per semester or for the entire programme. Moreover, the panel noticed that students are heard through the year representatives, but are not (yet) represented in any of the governance bodies. The ISEC management indicated to the panel that they will consider this in the near future as they understand that students should be represented formally when discussing education-related issues in the pedagogical committee.

Finally, the panel read in the statutes that ISEC will set up a Conseil d'Orientation Stratégique (strategic orientation body). Given that the founding Chambers are very well connected throughout Luxembourg, this body could feature representatives from industry and take up an advisory role on the relevance of new education programmes and on the quality of existing programmes for the labour market.

Considerations

The panel considers that ISEC has several written provisions on quality assurance that are adequate at this stage of their development. Moreover, the rationale for, and the task division among, the different bodies is fine. The quality of the education at this moment is ensured through informal face-to-face contacts on the one hand and written provisions and course evaluations on the other hand. Moreover, the panel considers that the current system is effective as the management is willing to act in case of reported problems.

While this system forms a good basis, according to the panel it does need considerable enhancement in the near future. Elements that need to be included both at institutional level and at the level of the MBA programme are the involvement of students in the governance of the programme, evaluations at levels beyond individual modules, feedback to students on measures taken to address evaluation results, a systematic involvement of lecturers in evaluating educational quality, and a clear role for alumni and employers in monitoring the quality of existing programmes and in establishing the relevance of new programmes.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

6.5 Standard 5 – research

Reference criteria

- *The higher education institution performs, in the relevant areas, basic oriented research activities or applied research activities as defined in article 1 of the law of 3 December 2014 on the organisation of public research centres. These research activities will lead to publications in the institution's name in international scientific and peer-reviewed journals.*
- *The institution incorporates the results of its research in the education it is providing.*

Findings

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that research and research publications are currently limited to the individual research activities of the key lecturers, and in particular one lecturer who is currently quite proliferate because of his research sabbatical. ISEC informed the panel that it is working together with the lecturers on a detailed research plan for the future. Moreover, current and future employment contracts with professors (will) contain provisions for research in addition to delivering and assessing courses.

The panel noticed that where possible lecturers do integrate current research in their teaching on the MBA programme. Students moreover appreciate this exposure to academic performance. The importance of the research component is likely to grow considerably when students are expected to apply the know-how they acquired at ISEC in their own working environments. In this regard, the panel agrees with both the representatives of the Ministry and with ISEC that there are plenty of opportunities for lecturers to develop – together with students – applied research.

Considerations

While it acknowledges that ISEC has not yet much to show in terms of research, the panel is confident that ISEC is taking the issue seriously – as is demonstrated by the employment contracts - and has good opportunities to develop (applied) research and integrate this in its MBA programme.

The panel considers that if ISEC wants to offer higher education programmes such as this MBA, it will have to step up its efforts in terms of research. ISEC is fully aware of this requirement. The panel therefore encourages ISEC to promote applied research involving

students and to stimulate its professors to get in contacts with and obtain contracts from local companies for research-based consultancy assignments.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

6.6 Overall conclusion

Based on the above-mentioned findings and considerations, the panel is very uncomfortable in recommending the MBA programme for accreditation.

On the positive side, ISEC is doing rather well in setting up regulations and policies that have direct implications on the MBA programme, and in ensuring a paper trail on its decisions. Moreover, most individual modules are described in good detail. The panel also considers that the academic and administrative staff on the programme are suited for their tasks; in this respect, the panel perfectly understands why students think highly of the knowledge they gain in class and the support they receive from ISEC.

Part of these positive appreciations are based on the small scale of both ISEC and the MBA programme. While provisions on quality assurance are basic but sufficient at this stage of development, they need considerable enhancement in the near future. The same goes – to even a bigger extent – for the research activities of ISEC in general and within the MBA programme in particular.

The major weaknesses of the MBA are related to three very fundamental components of the programme: first of all, the absence of (intended) learning outcomes at programme level does not allow to link the learning goals of individual modules to the overall programme framework and thus prevents (the panel) from establishing whether students are eventually educated to a level that is commensurate with what one can expect of a MBA programme.

Secondly, the panel has serious doubts about the effective study load of individual modules, which appears to be too light in so far as acquisition of competencies through self-study is concerned. This is particularly the case for the transfer assessment and the MBA thesis, which require input from students that according to the panel is way below the workload that is usually associated to modules of 25 credits. Moreover, the panel wonders to what extent the current set-up of the MBA as an almost full-time programme is feasible when the study load (in class and self-study) reported in the documents would indeed reflect reality.

Thirdly, the panel is concerned that the focus of the programme on assessment through assignments will not allow to establish whether students have acquired the various learning goals and, upon graduation, have reached the final qualifications that are usually connected to an MBA programme.

Finally, the panel noticed that notwithstanding its existence for some time, the MBA programme attracts a limited number of students. Although it is not in the remit of the panel to assess the financial viability of the programme, the panel does wonder whether the programme should not be offered in a dual variant. In that case the MBA programme would target students who are at work and who are willing to engage in a contract with both ISEC and their employer. This agreement would certify that the student has a proper job and that

the employer facilitates the student in applying the acquired competencies in a meaningful way.

6.7 Overview of the assessments

Standard		Judgement
1	Intended learning outcomes	unsatisfactory
2	Teaching-learning environment	unsatisfactory
3	Assessment	unsatisfactory
4	Internal quality assurance	satisfactory
5	Research	satisfactory
Overall judgement		negative

7 Programme assessment Master Management de l'Innovation, parcours type Management de Qualité

7.1 Standard 1 – intended learning outcomes

With respect to level, orientation and content, the intended exit level reflects the current requirements that have been set for the programme by the professional field and/or discipline from an international perspective

Reference criteria

- *The academic programme has a structured curriculum, which reflects the objectives of the programme. It includes knowledge, specific skills and transversal skills.*
- *The academic programme is defined in line with the European standards and the Bologna process. It is defined in terms of ECTS credits and designed based on student-centred learning and in particular in support of the student's success, active participation in the studies and the development of skills, knowledge and know-how.*
- *The academic programme is divided into modules each of which is assigned a certain number of ECTS credits. The objectives and the learning outcomes of each module are clearly defined.*

Findings

The Master programme Management de l'Innovation, parcours type management de la Qualité (MMIQ, management of innovation and quality) was set up by the Université de Lorraine ten years ago and has been accredited since by the French agency AERES, currently HCERES. In 2017, ISEC signed an agreement with the Université de Lorraine to offer this programme in Luxembourg as of September 2018. If the programme is accredited by the Luxembourg authorities, students will obtain a double degree from both Université de Lorraine and ISEC.

The information materials indicate that the programme aims to train (future) managers in techniques and methodologies focused on the quality of products and services. By doing so, MMIQ is meeting the needs of a growing number of enterprises that want to innovate technologically and at organisational level by developing new products, optimising their production and increasing their performance in a highly competitive market. However, innovation is not only about creating new products, but also questions existing practices, methodologies, production lines and management processes. The programme is likely to attract interest from local companies as more than 70% of enterprises in Luxembourg are reportedly involved in innovation. Moreover, the programme focuses on quality in innovation as enterprises in Luxembourg and the Greater Region want to meet the increasing demand of consumers for good quality products while ensuring that their innovation efforts are sustainable in the long run.

The overall aim of the programme is translated in a programme of 60 ECTS consisting of modules that are spread over four semesters. The panel observed that at programme level (intended) learning outcomes have been formulated. By the end of the programme, students are/should be capable:

- d'entreprendre et de maîtriser une démarche de management de la qualité incluant une certification ISO 9001 et le modèle d'excellence EFQM;
- de s'initier à la norme ISO 26000 sur la responsabilité sociétale, la thématique de la souffrance au travail et l'intégration de la variable écologique dans le management stratégique de l'entreprise;
- de participer à la mise en oeuvre et au développement de la politique qualité dans une entreprise;
- de piloter une démarche d'amélioration continue des processus;
- d'utiliser de manière efficace les outils de résolution des problèmes et les outils innovants de la qualité;
- de manager des équipes projets;
- de maîtriser les outils de la méthodologie Lean Six Sigma;
- de maîtriser les outils des méthodologies CAF et HERMES;
- de mettre en place et diriger un plan d'expérience;
- de mettre en place la gestion des projets de conception et de développement;
- de maîtriser les outils statistiques nécessaires au contrôle statistique par échantillonnage.

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that the MMIQ programme at ISEC features the same modules and to a large extent the same lecturers as the French version, while some contents are adjusted to reflect the Luxembourg situation and will be taught by local professors. Based on the programme materials and the discussions on site, the panel observed that the curriculum is structured properly with each module being allocated a certain amount of ECTS study credits. Moreover, individual modules are described in sufficient detail and contain learning goals ('compétences visées').

The MMIQ is offered mainly in French; about a quarter of the programme is taught in English. The master programme targets working professionals; courses are scheduled on Friday evenings and Saturdays. The panel noticed that, in addition to facilitating working students by organising courses outside office hours, the programme will be delivered in a student-centred way.

Considerations

The panel considers that the overall objective of the MMIQ programme is clear. Moreover, the rationale for offering the programme in Luxembourg is relevant. The programme has been accredited in France and the version that is up for accreditation in Luxembourg only differs in terms of some module contents and some lecturers. The panel considers that the programme is well structured and features both learning outcomes at programme level and learning goals per module.

Without putting in doubt the positive conclusion on this standard, the panel draws attention to the fact that ISEC will be responsible for the delivery of the MMIQ programme in Luxembourg. As MMIQ has already been in existence for a long time in France, the panel encourages ISEC to strengthen its supervision on the programme, add its own flavour and thus ensure there is ownership for this programme among ISEC management, staff and students.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

7.2 Standard 2 - teaching learning environment

The teaching-learning environment enables the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Reference criteria

- *The workload is appropriate and distributed in a balanced way between semesters.*
- *The relationship between theoretical and practical courses is in line with the programme objectives. Based on the objectives of the programme, internships are planned.*
- *Within the frame of the academic programme leading to the Bachelor's degree, with the exception of alternating courses, a compulsory training period with a university or a higher education institution abroad is included in the programme which is subject to the validation of studies followed outside the home institution.*
- *The admission requirements to the academic programme are clearly defined and published. The admission criteria provide validation of prior experience.*
- *The academic programme has sufficient resources in terms of teachers as well as financial and material resources to cover its specific needs and achieve its objectives. Such resources are available for the entire duration of the academic programme.*
- *Courses are provided by competent staff on the teaching and pedagogical level, capable of linking subject matters to professional practice in the relevant field and current research. Teaching is based on student-centred learning, promoting active participation by the students.*
- *The proportion between permanent teachers and external speakers is adapted to the objectives of the academic programme.*
- *Continuing education programmes are provided to teachers.*
- *Adequate supervision and comprehensive information for students are provided. Students are offered tutoring or mentoring programmes.*

Findings

The MMIQ programme amounts to 60 ECTS and is spread over four semesters. As mentioned under standard 1, the structure of the curriculum and its individual modules is clear. All modules are compulsory and there are no specialisation tracks. Five courses in three modules are taught in English, including the one preparing students for the TOEIC certificate (Test of English for International Communication). The programme does not feature a master thesis, but students attend a research workshop and do a small research project. Big part of the third semester is dedicated to an innovation project during a company placement (12 ECTS).

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that particular attention is paid to the didactical approach of the programme. The MMIQ programme prepares students for the knowledge, skills and attitudes they will need when dealing with innovation and quality in their company. Hence the attention in the curriculum to issues and practices such as client involvement, leadership, benchmarking, employee involvement or continuous improvement. Throughout the different modes of training and education, students will have the opportunity to develop their competencies to work in teams, enhance their social attitudes and improve their communication skills. Courses invariably pay attention to both knowledge acquisition and the operationalisation and application of this know-how. This approach seems to match very well with the principle of student-centred education that is key to ISEC; lecturers teach in an activating way encouraging students to

participate in class and, where possible, to connect theory to the reality of their work situation.

The admission requirements are clearly stipulated in the programme documents and the information brochure: students need a completed (bachelor or bachelor + 1) degree of 240 ECTS bachelor degree and hold a professional position that is relevant for the programme or a potential lever for promotion upon graduation. The panel gathered from the discussion that the admission process is handled with great diligence as potential students from the Greater Region may qualify (or not) for admission bringing very different diplomas and/or experience to the table. All potential applicants are interviewed. Students also need sufficient English language skills to follow the courses taught in English. Students who want to get waivers for modules based on previously acquired qualifications, can apply to get these validated through the so-called VAE (validation des acquis de l'expérience) procedure.

Looking at the curriculum overview and reviewing the programme materials, the panel observed that the envisaged study load of the modules is adequate. Students follow 360 hours of class and dedicate between three and six months to a placement. The curriculum is delivered as a part-time programme with each semester accounting for about 15 ECTS. This allows students to combine study and work. Although there is no formal link between study and work in the sense that working time is counted as part of the study load, the course contents are such that they allow students to apply on the job what they have learned in class.

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that the staff is adequate to deliver the programme. The panel consulted the CV's of all professors and lecturers and noticed that they have the necessary qualifications to teach on the MMIQ programme. Most staff are already teaching on the MMIQ programme in France and will assume similar tasks in Luxembourg. In addition, new staff with specific knowledge on the local situation in Luxembourg are hired. As mentioned in the section on the institutional assessment, ISEC has an adequate recruitment strategy in place: professors with a considerable appointment get time to do research in addition to their core tasks of teaching and examining. Moreover, the didactical skills of the lecturers are considered during recruitment.

Further to what was already mentioned in the section on the institutional assessment, the facilities at ISEC are very good: state-of-the-art classrooms, an electronic learning environment (ISEC Online) that is fit for purpose for students, lecturers and staff, and tutoring and support services that are tailored to the individual needs of the student. Students enrolled on the MMIQ programme will benefit from these services.

Considerations

The MMIQ programme has been accredited in France. Based on the available materials and the discussions on site, the panel noticed that the curriculum is not much different from what is offered in France and therefore considers that the programme fulfils the requirements for accreditation. Moreover, the information available demonstrates according to the panel that the programme is well developed in terms of module contents, curriculum structure, didactical approach, staff, admission and workload.

In line with its consideration under standard 1, the panel encourages ISEC to assume ownership of the programme and its delivery by recruiting a sufficient number of good quality lecturers who bring in an additional Luxembourg dimension to the programme. Moreover, ISEC could add its own flavour to the programme by making MMIQ students benefit from its student-centred teaching approach, its individual attention and support, and the excellent material facilities and tutoring services.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

7.3 Standard 3 – assessment

The programme has an adequate assessment, testing and examination system in place to ascertain whether the intended learning outcomes are being achieved.

Reference criteria

- *The evaluation methods are defined on the basis of the educational objectives.*
- *The evaluation methods applied in the various modules are clearly communicated to the students.*
- *Diplomas and degrees issued by the higher education institution provide information on the acquired qualifications. They are accompanied by a diploma supplement describing the knowledge and skills acquired by the holder.*

Findings

As ISEC is likely to offer the MMIQ programme as of September 2018, there was not yet much information available on the assessment of the programme. In France, MMIQ students complete written exams at the end of each module; in case they fail the exam there is a resit. According to the accreditation report from HCERES, the assessment of students is organised adequately (“tout à fait standard”).

When assessing the quality of the BBA and MBA programmes, the panel noticed that ISEC has developed extensive teaching and examination regulations for programmes at both bachelor and master level. These documents and the principles and approaches described form an adequate basis for the assessment of the MMIQ programme and its modules. One of its provisions is to establish a testing committee that will guarantee the correct execution of the exams. The panel also noticed that the regulation arranges for reasonable accommodations for students with a functional disability.

Considerations

While it received very little information on the assessment of the MMIQ programme in Luxembourg, the panel is confident that the organisation of the assessment will not differ much from the approach in France, which has been approved by the accreditation body.

Nonetheless, the panel encourages ISEC to bring the envisaged assessment of the MMIQ programme in line with the provisions that are applicable to all master programmes at ISEC and to describe the assessment system in a separate teaching and examination regulation. The panel also supports the envisaged establishment of an examination committee and encourages ISEC to extend the mandate of this committee to include the quality of the assessment (not only the exam procedure), e.g. by creating peer review of exams prior to

the examination. The programme may also benefit from a complaints procedure that spells out the opportunities for appeal before an appeals body in case informal mediation is effective.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

7.4 Standard 4 – internal quality assurance

The set-up and organisation of the internal quality assurance are aimed at systematically improving the programme with the involvement of the relevant stakeholders.

Reference criteria

- *The higher education institution ensures to collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management and the continuous improvement of its academic programmes and research activities.*
- *The higher education institution has an internal and external quality assurance system that it makes public and that forms an integral part of its strategic management. The internal and external measures for the quality assurance of the institution are in compliance with the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).*
- *The academic programmes are regularly subject to an internal review to ensure they reflect the latest results of research and teaching in the relevant field, that they fulfil the targeted objectives and meet the continuously changing needs of students and society.*
- *Responsibilities, competencies and the decision-making process within the higher education institution are clearly and transparently defined.*
- *Teachers and students have sufficient means to make known their position and to participate in the decision-making process.*
- *The defined institution has a person or a committee dealing with issues relating to equal opportunities policy.*

Findings

In line with its findings on assessment, the panel did not get much specific information on the organisation of the internal quality assurance of MMIQ in Luxembourg. In France, the quality of the programme and its modules are monitored by a 'Conseil de Perfectionnement' which gathers twice per year and includes staff, professionals and alumni. Students from their side assess each course, while student representatives meet after each semester with the programme management to discuss the overall organisation of the programme. According to the accreditation report from HCERES, internal quality assurance functions well ("de manière tout à fait régulière et efficace").

When assessing the quality of both ISEC and its BBA and MBA programmes, the panel noticed that ISEC has several governance bodies that follow-up the quality of education: the supervisory council, the management board (Directoire), the pedagogical committee and the scientific committee. Moreover, quality issues at institutional level are described in the Charte Management de la Qualité, which is publicly available on the website. The provisions for course evaluations that is adopted for the BBA and MBA programmes look very similar to the system that is in place at the Université de Lorraine.

The discussions on site revealed that students – both in France and in Luxembourg - are heard through the year representatives, but are not (yet) represented in any of the governance bodies or the Conseil de Perfectionnement. Both the MMIQ programme director and the ISEC management indicated to the panel that they will look into this in the near future as they understand that students should be represented formally when discussing education-related issues.

Considerations

While it received very little information on specific quality assurance provisions for the MMIQ programme in Luxembourg, the panel is confident that these will not differ much from the approach in France, which has been approved by the accreditation body.

Nonetheless, the panel encourages ISEC to bring the envisaged quality assurance of the MMIQ programme in line with the provisions that are currently applicable to all programmes at ISEC. The panel considers that these arrangements are sufficient at this stage of ISEC's development but require considerable enhancement in the near future. Elements that need to be included at the level of the MMIQ programme are the involvement of students in the governance of the programme, student evaluations at levels beyond individual modules, feedback to students on measures taken to address evaluation results, a systematic involvement of lecturers in evaluating educational quality, and a clear role for alumni and employers in monitoring the quality and relevance of the programme.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

7.5 Standard 5 – research

Reference criteria

- *The higher education institution performs, in the relevant areas, basic oriented research activities or applied research activities as defined in article 1 of the law of 3 December 2014 on the organisation of public research centres. These research activities will lead to publications in the institution's name in international scientific and peer-reviewed journals.*
- *The institution incorporates the results of its research in the education it is providing.*

Findings

The panel gathered from the written materials that the MMIQ programme in France is embedded in a research centre (CEREFIGE, Centre européen de recherche en économie financière et gestion des entreprises) of the Université de Lorraine. The centre and its researchers – including lecturers on the MMIQ programme in Luxembourg - operate in a scientific network with other institutions in the Greater Region.

Considerations

The panel considers that through the Université de Lorraine, lecturers on the MMIQ programme in Luxembourg will bring in sufficient research know-how and capacity. While it acknowledges that ISEC has not yet much to show in terms of research, the panel is confident that ISEC is taking the issue seriously and will step up its research efforts in due course, while hiring additional lecturers.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

7.6 Overall conclusion

Having come to a satisfactory conclusion on each criterion, the panel's overall judgement on the assessment of the MMIQ programme is **positive**.

The MMIQ programme in France has been accredited by the competent authorities and the version of the programme that is now up for accreditation in Luxembourg only differs marginally from the French programme.

The written materials and the discussions on site have demonstrated that the MMIQ programme is well structured, featuring both learning outcomes at programme level and learning goals per module. Moreover, the master programme is well developed in terms of module contents, didactical approach, staff, admission and workload.

As of September 2018, the MMIQ programme will be offered in Luxembourg under the responsibility of ISEC. The panel strongly encourages ISEC to strengthen its involvement in, and supervision of, the MMIQ programme and to turn it into a genuine ISEC programme. According to the panel, this requires on the one hand additional staff to give academic and educational guidance to the programme; on the other hand, the programme needs further integration and embedding in the culture, policies and regulations of ISEC, such as the student-centred education approach, the teaching and examination regulations, and the provisions for quality assurance.

7.7 Overview of the assessments

Standard		Judgement
1	Intended learning outcomes	satisfactory
2	Teaching-learning environment	satisfactory
3	Assessment	satisfactory
4	Internal quality assurance	satisfactory
5	Research	satisfactory
Overall judgement		positive

8 Programme assessment Bachelor Manager de Chantier

8.1 Standard 1 – intended learning outcomes

With respect to level, orientation and content, the intended exit level reflects the current requirements that have been set for the programme by the professional field and/or discipline from an international perspective

Reference criteria

- *The academic programme has a structured curriculum, which reflects the objectives of the programme. It includes knowledge, specific skills and transversal skills.*
- *The academic programme is defined in line with the European standards and the Bologna process. It is defined in terms of ECTS credits and designed based on student-centred learning and in particular in support of the student's success, active participation in the studies and the development of skills, knowledge and know-how.*
- *The academic programme is divided into modules each of which is assigned a certain number of ECTS credits. The objectives and the learning outcomes of each module are clearly defined.*

Findings

The *Bachelor programme Manager de Chantier* (BMC, construction site manager) has been developed on specific demand of the construction sector in Luxembourg and is scheduled to start for the first time in September 2018. The programme will be delivered jointly by ISEC and the Institut de Formation Sectoriel du Bâtiment (IFSB, training institute of the construction sector). If accredited, students will obtain a bachelor degree awarded by ISEC.

The panel gathered from the discussions and the written materials that the programme fills an important gap in the existing training offer and responds to an urgent need as the construction sector is confronted with major technological changes and has few qualified professionals to address these changes. Moreover, the panel noticed that a lot of development work has been done so far to turn the needs of the construction sector into a fully-fledged higher education programme.

The bachelor programme aims to provide students with a multi-purpose training to prepare them for a broad variety of management tasks in the construction sector. Construction site managers are the liaison between the production team on site and the technical management of the company and should be able to supervise and manage construction sites, supervise the quality of execution, monitor the financial aspects of the work on site and participate in the set-up of construction projects.

The overall aim of the BMC programme is translated in a three-year curriculum of 180 ECTS that pays attention to different issues such as knowledge of new materials, digitalisation, legal frameworks, safety regulations and construction techniques. Students are enrolled in a dual education programme, which means that they follow courses in the IFSB premises in the city of Bettembourg and practice the acquired competencies on the job.

The panel observed that the curriculum is structured properly with each module being allocated a certain amount of ECTS study credits. Moreover, the individual modules are described in good detail and contain course contents, learning goals, literature sources and forms of assessment.

Although the programme information package contains several indications on the competencies a BMC student should have acquired by the time of graduation, the panel did not find a precise list of (intended) learning outcomes at programme level. The evaluation form for the placement tutor lists a whole range of professional competencies clustered around eight skills, while the programme description mentions about a dozen transversal competencies and refers in the section 'organisation of the programme' to eighteen competencies that should be acquired during the programme.

Considerations

The panel considers that there is a very strong link between on the one hand the well-motivated demand expressed by the construction sector and on the other hand the answer to this demand by the IFSB training institute through the detailed BMC programme. This has resulted in a structured curriculum that fulfils all reference criteria set by the Luxembourg accreditation authorities in terms of programme objectives.

Without wanting to jeopardise the start of the BMC programme in September 2018, the panel draws attention to a few issues that require further clarification in due course: first of all, the panel is surprised to read that the programme is responding to an urgent and extensive need of the construction sector, while only about 15-20 students are expected to enrol.

Secondly, the panel urges the programme to make explicit which of the competencies that are currently mentioned in the materials constitute the (intended) learning outcomes at programme level. Such clarification would further enhance the consistency of the BMC and its development logic which the panel already established through this initial accreditation exercise: intended learning outcomes (standard 1) – learning goals (standard 2) – assessment (standard 3) – achieved learning outcomes (standard 4). Moreover, this explicit formulation of intended learning outcomes allows to verify that these outcomes are set at the proper bachelor level (i.e. level 6 of the European / national qualification framework) and not at the level of an upgraded Brévet Technicien Supérieur (BTS). Notwithstanding its panel's request to set clear learning outcomes, the panel considers that the amount of professional and academic involvement in programme preparation and implementation bears a strong guarantee that the BMC programme is consistent and set at a proper level.

Thirdly, the panel suggests clarifying and fine-tuning the relationship and the division of tasks between ISEC and IFSB. While there is a detailed partnership agreement between the two institutes, the panel is somewhat concerned after the discussion on site that the ownership of the BMC programme lays mainly with IFSB, with ISEC serving as degree awarding body.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

8.2 Standard 2 - teaching learning environment

The teaching-learning environment enables the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Reference criteria

- *The workload is appropriate and distributed in a balanced way between semesters.*
- *The relationship between theoretical and practical courses is in line with the programme objectives. Based on the objectives of the programme, internships are planned.*
- *Within the frame of the academic programme leading to the Bachelor's degree, with the exception of alternating courses, a compulsory training period with a university or a higher education institution abroad is included in the programme which is subject to the validation of studies followed outside the home institution.*
- *The admission requirements to the academic programme are clearly defined and published. The admission criteria provide validation of prior experience.*
- *The academic programme has sufficient resources in terms of teachers as well as financial and material resources to cover its specific needs and achieve its objectives. Such resources are available for the entire duration of the academic programme.*
- *Courses are provided by competent staff on the teaching and pedagogical level, capable of linking subject matters to professional practice in the relevant field and current research. Teaching is based on student-centred learning, promoting active participation by the students.*
- *The proportion between permanent teachers and external speakers is adapted to the objectives of the academic programme.*
- *Continuing education programmes are provided to teachers.*
- *Adequate supervision and comprehensive information for students are provided. Students are offered tutoring or mentoring programmes.*

Findings

The BMC programme amounts to 180 ECTS and is spread over six semesters. Each semester consists of three modules and a report on the placement period for a total study load of 30 ECTS. As mentioned under standard 1, the structure of the curriculum and its individual modules is clear. The panel observed moreover in the materials that the curriculum covers indeed a broad range of topics, in line with the expectations of the sector.

The programme is offered as dual education: students spend a total of 1600 hours in class and 4500 hours on the job or preparing for the exams or the placement report. Every year the student produces an extensive case study related to one of the modules and presents it to a jury of employers' tutors and lecturers. The report on the placement period takes up a considerable part of the study credits (30+). At the time of the site visit, this component was not yet elaborated fully and IFSB/ISEC should specify what is expected and how the study load is reflected in the assignment. Furthermore, it is not clear if the programme features a thesis as two overview documents provide contradictory information on this point.

The panel noticed that the programme does not (yet) include a study period abroad, but gathered from the discussions on site that some kind of international component is required by the Luxembourg authorities and that ISEC and IFSB are looking into the possibilities of such international exchange together with its academic partners.

The didactical approach of the programme as a whole and of the individual modules is student-centred: lecturers will teach in an activating way encouraging students to participate in class; moreover, students have plenty of opportunities to connect theory to the reality of their work situation.

The admission requirements are clearly stipulated in the programme documents: students need a secondary school degree (Bac technique or Bac general). Students with a completed post-secondary Brévet Technicien Supérieur can enrol in the programme and finish it earlier. As places are limited, students are selected based on an application file, an interview and an entrance exam. Students who want to get waivers based on previously acquired qualifications or experiences, can apply through the VAE procedure. Once selected, the programme will sign an agreement with the student and the employer to ensure that the student can spend sufficient time on the programme and to arrange for a tutor on the job.

Looking at the curriculum overview and reviewing the programme materials, the panel observed that the study load of individual modules has been calculated in great detail and looks adequate. Although the panel performs an initial assessment of this BMC programme that is yet to start, the programme looks feasible.

The panel gathered from the written materials and the discussions on site that the staff is adequate to deliver the programme. The panel consulted the CV's of all professors and lecturers and noticed that they have the necessary qualifications to teach on the BMC programme. Some professors are linked to partner universities in Belgium and France, while other lecturers have extensive professional expertise in the domain they teach.

The programme is offered in the IFSB premises in the city of Bettembourg. Due to time limitations the panel was not able to visit the IFSB premises. The panel gathered from the presentation and discussion during the site visit that the training facilities of IFSB are particularly suited for this type of programme.

Considerations

The panel considers that the BMC programme is well developed in terms of module contents, curriculum structure, didactical approach, staff, admission and workload. If anything, the programme should reflect and clarify on some aspects of the curriculum, such as the thesis, the placement reports and the opportunity for an exchange period abroad.

In line with its consideration under standard 1, the panel encourages ISEC to assume ownership of the programme as it is ultimately responsible for the delivery of the programme and the award of the bachelor degree. In this respect, ISEC may want to ensure it demonstrates academic and administrative leadership in this programme. Moreover, ISEC could add its own academic vision to the programme by making BMC students benefit from its student-centred teaching approach, its individual attention and support, and the excellent online facilities and tutoring services.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

8.3 Standard 3 – assessment

The programme has an adequate assessment, testing and examination system in place to ascertain whether the intended learning outcomes are being achieved.

Reference criteria

- *The evaluation methods are defined on the basis of the educational objectives.*
- *The evaluation methods applied in the various modules are clearly communicated to the students.*
- *Diplomas and degrees issued by the higher education institution provide information on the acquired qualifications. They are accompanied by a diploma supplement describing the knowledge and skills acquired by the holder.*

Findings

As ISEC is likely to offer the BMC programme as of September 2018, there was not yet much information available on the assessment of the programme in general and its individual modules in particular. The panel noticed however that the placement is monitored carefully and the tutor is asked to complete a comprehensive evaluation of the student.

When assessing the quality of the BBA and MBA programmes, the panel noticed that ISEC has developed extensive teaching and examination regulations for programmes at both bachelor and master level. These documents and the principles and approaches described form an adequate basis for the assessment of the BMC programme and its modules. One of its provisions is to establish a testing committee that will guarantee the correct execution of the exams. The panel also noticed that the regulation arranges for reasonable accommodations for students with a functional disability.

Considerations

While it received very little information on the assessment of the BMC programme, the panel is confident that the organisation of the assessment will be in line with the procedures that are in place both at ISEC and IFSB. Nonetheless, the panel urges the programme to clarify this issue and add more details on assessment to the course descriptions.

Moreover, the panel encourages ISEC to bring the envisaged assessment of the BMC programme in line with the provisions that are applicable to all bachelor programmes at ISEC and to describe the assessment system in a separate teaching and examination regulation. The panel also supports the envisaged establishment of an examination committee and encourages ISEC to extend the mandate of this committee to include the quality of the exams (not only the exam procedure), e.g. by creating peer review of exams prior to the examination. The programme may also benefit from a complaints procedure that spells out the opportunities for appeal before an appeals body in case informal mediation is effective.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

8.4 Standard 4 – internal quality assurance

The set-up and organisation of the internal quality assurance are aimed at systematically improving the programme with the involvement of the relevant stakeholders.

Reference criteria

- *The higher education institution ensures to collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management and the continuous improvement of its academic programmes and research activities.*
- *The higher education institution has an internal and external quality assurance system that it makes public and that forms an integral part of its strategic management. The internal and external measures for the quality assurance of the institution are in compliance with the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).*
- *The academic programmes are regularly subject to an internal review to ensure they reflect the latest results of research and teaching in the relevant field, that they fulfil the targeted objectives and meet the continuously changing needs of students and society.*
- *Responsibilities, competencies and the decision-making process within the higher education institution are clearly and transparently defined.*
- *Teachers and students have sufficient means to make known their position and to participate in the decision-making process.*
- *The defined institution has a person or a committee dealing with issues relating to equal opportunities policy.*

Findings

In line with its findings on assessment, the panel did not get much specific information on the organisation of the internal quality assurance of BMC. The panel gathers from the materials that the rules and regulations that are in place at ISEC will also apply to the new BMC programme. Students are asked to complete an evaluation form after each course, while student representatives meet after each semester with the programme management to discuss the overall organisation of the programme. Moreover, the panel understood from the discussion on site that the programme has been designed involving many different stakeholders, companies and universities which are reportedly also keen to follow-up the implementation of the new programme.

When assessing the quality of both ISEC and its BBA and MBA programmes, the panel noticed that ISEC has several governance bodies that follow-up the quality of education: the supervisory council, the management board (Directoire), the pedagogical committee and the scientific committee. Moreover, quality issues at institutional level are described in the Charte Management de la Qualité, which is publicly available on the website.

The discussions on site revealed that students are heard through the year representatives, but are not (yet) represented in any of the governance bodies. The ISEC management indicated to the panel that they will look into this in the near future as they understand that students should be represented formally when discussing education-related issues.

Considerations

While the panel received very little information on specific quality assurance provisions for the BMC programme, the panel is confident that these will not differ much from the approach that is currently in place at ISEC. The panel considers that these arrangements are sufficient at this stage of ISEC's development but require considerable enhancement already during the start up the programme. Moreover, the panel advises ISEC management to monitor carefully the start-up of each year, particularly during the years of first time teaching. Elements that need to be included at the level of the BMC programme are the

involvement of students in the governance of the programme, student evaluations at levels beyond individual modules, feedback to students on measures taken to address evaluation results, a systematic involvement of lecturers in evaluating educational quality, and a clear role for alumni and employers in monitoring the quality and relevance of the programme. The latter point may very well prove to be a strength of the programme as many stakeholders have been involved in the programme design and are keen to follow-up its implementation.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

8.5 Standard 5 – research

Reference criteria

- *The higher education institution performs, in the relevant areas, basic oriented research activities or applied research activities as defined in article 1 of the law of 3 December 2014 on the organisation of public research centres. These research activities will lead to publications in the institution's name in international scientific and peer-reviewed journals.*
- *The institution incorporates the results of its research in the education it is providing.*

Findings

The panel was informed during the BMC presentation on site that IFSB is working together with Neobuild, the “pôle d’innovation technologique du secteur de la construction durable”. This cooperation allows for applied research projects involving students and lecturers, while there is also a spill-over from Neobuild staff who will teach on the BMC programme. Furthermore, the programme has been developed by involving staff from universities of Liège, Louvain-la-Neuve and Lorraine, who will also be teaching on the programme and bring in their specific research expertise.

Considerations

The panel considers that during the preparation phase of the programme, the BMC developers have consulted and involved several stakeholders with a specific research profile. These contacts have confirmed their interest in the implementation of the programme. Although the research component within the programme can be further developed in a more systematic way, the panel is confident that the partners will bring in sufficient research know-how and capacity.

Conclusion

The panel judges this standard to be **satisfactory**.

8.6 Overall conclusion

Having come to a satisfactory conclusion on each criterion, the panel's overall judgement on the assessment of the BMC programme is **positive**.

The panel considers that the new BMC programme has been developed with great care ensuring that the demands of the construction sector are translated properly in a purposeful programme. The panel is particularly impressed by the degree of professional and academic

involvement in the programme set-up and considers that their active role in implementing the BMC programme is a strong guarantee for quality. Moreover, the written materials and the discussions on site have convinced the panel that the programme is “ready for take-off” in September 2018.

Nonetheless, there are a number of issues that require further clarification and development in due course: first and foremost, the panel strongly encourages ISEC to clarify and fine-tune the relationship and the division of tasks between ISEC and IFSB, and to assume ownership of the BMC programme. While there is a detailed partnership agreement between the two institutes, the panel is concerned that the ownership of the BMC programme lays mainly with IFSB, with ISEC serving as degree awarding body.

In this respect, the panel suggests that ISEC strengthens its involvement in, and supervision of, the BMC programme; this requires on the one hand additional staff to give academic and educational guidance to the programme; on the other hand, the BMC programme needs further integration and embedding in the culture, policies and regulations of ISEC, such as the student-centred education approach, the teaching and examination regulations, and the provisions for quality assurance.

Finally, the panel urges the programme to make explicit which competencies make up the (intended) learning outcomes at programme level as this would further enhance the consistency of the programme, guarantee that programme outcomes are set at the proper bachelor level and enable outcome monitoring by the quality assurance system.

8.7 Overview of the assessments

Standard		Judgement
1	Intended learning outcomes	satisfactory
2	Teaching-learning environment	satisfactory
3	Assessment	satisfactory
4	Internal quality assurance	satisfactory
5	Research	satisfactory
Overall judgement		positive

Annexes

Annex 1 – Composition of the panel

Prof. Dr. Walter Nonneman, panel chair

Emeritus and part-time professor in Economics, University of Antwerp. Visiting scholar at Harvard Business School and Warwick University. Specialised in economic policy, public economics and management in the public and non-profit sector. Member of the board of KBC Group NV, Cera BM NV and Fluxys Belgium NV. Expert/chair in several NVAO assessments.

Prof. Dr. Christian Koenig, expert

Associate Dean, International Affairs, Associate Professor Department of Management, ESSEC Business School. Executive Director, Council on Business and Society. Former member of the Board of University Paris-Descartes. Research areas: Strategic alliances, international development, public sector. PhD in Management, Université Paris IX – Dauphine; MA Business Economics, Harvard University. Expert in a previous NVAO assessment in Luxembourg.

Prof. Dr. Jacques Lanarès, expert

Professor at the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences of the University of Lausanne. His current teaching is in the field of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education and Adult Education. He was Vice Rector at the University of Lausanne, in Charge of Development of Teaching and Quality, and Chairman of the Board of Vice Rectors in charge of quality at all Swiss universities. PhD in Neuropsychology and Genetic Psychology at the University of Geneva. Expert in many quality reviews (AERES, EUA, FINHEEC, IUQB, World Bank).

Mr. Adrien Buteneers MSc, expert

Head of Research of expertise centre Construction and Energy at PXL University College in Hasselt, Belgium. He graduated as Master-Engineer in Civil Engineering Technology and is a Sworn Surveyor-MSOG Expert. He held several management positions, both in Belgium and abroad, after which he became a lecturer in CAD, Topography, Building Materials and Building Techniques. He participated intensively in the start of a new study programme, (Professional) Bachelor of Construction. Expert in a previous NVAO assessment.

Ms Jade Brouns BSc, student expert

Jade Brouns is studying Pedagogical Sciences at KU Leuven and is currently finalising her master's degree in Educational sciences. She also follows a teacher training programme for primary school teachers at Fontys Hogeschool in Tilburg. Jade has been trained for NVAO assessments and participated as student expert in several assessment panels.

The panel is supported by:

- Mark Delmartino MA, secretary trained and certified by NVAO
- Dr. Mark Frederiks, NVAO process coordinator

All panel members and the secretary have signed a declaration of independence.

Annex 2 – Schedule of the site visit

Monday 16 April 2018

09.00 Arrival at ISEC

09.15 Preparatory meeting of the panel and review of materials

12.00 Lunch

12.30 Meeting with institutional management

- Mr Luc Henzig, Financial director
- Ms Muriel Morbé, Administrative director
- Ms Corinne Baylac, Academic director
- Ms Antje Weber, responsible for administration

13.45 Meeting on HRM and staff recruitment

- Ms Muriel Morbé, Administrative director
- Ms Corinne Baylac, Academic director
- Ms Antje Weber, responsible for administration

14.45 Tour of facilities ISEC and presentation online system

- Ms Antje Weber

15.30 Meeting on facilities, student counselling

- Ms Antje Weber
- Mr Thomas Gergen, professor ISEC

16.15 Internal panel meeting

17.15 Round-up of day one with ISEC management

- Mr Luc Henzig, Financial director
- Ms Muriel Morbé, Administrative director
- Ms Corinne Baylac, Academic director

18.00 End of day one

Tuesday 17 April 2018

08.45 Arrival at ISEC

09.00 Meeting with Ministry of Higher Education and Research

- Dr Leon Diederich
- Ms Christiane Huberty
- Ms Andreia Alves
- Ms Corinne Kox

10.00 Meeting with participatory committees of students and staff

- Ms Corinne Baylac, academic director

- Ms Antje Weber, student administrator
- Mr Thomas Gergen, ISEC professor
- Mr Adis Sabanovic, student 2017 BBA

11.00 Internal panel meeting

12.00 Meeting with Management of BBA and MBA

- Mr Franz Peter Lang
- Ms Corinne Baylac
- Ms Antje Weber

12.45 lunch

13.45 Meeting with BBA and MBA students

- Mr Adis Sabanovic, BBA
- Mr David Lux, BBA
- Mr Laurent Dielissen, MBA

14.45 Meeting with BBA and MBA teachers

- Ms Susie Lee
- Mr Thomas Gergen
- Mr Christoph Hartman
- Mr Wolfgang Mousiol

16.00 Meeting with management and teachers of BMC and MMIQ

- Mr Bruno Renders, sectorial representative IFSB
- Mr Marcel Deravet, programme director BMC
- Mr Rémi Fabbri, academic partner BMC
- Mr Julien Husson, academic partner BMC
- Ms Smaïl Benzidia, programme director MMIQ
- Ms Corinne Baylac, academic director ISEC

17.30 Internal panel meeting

18.00 End of day two

Wednesday 18 April 2018

09.00 Arrival at ISEC and internal panel meeting

10.00 Meeting with Supervisory Board ISEC

- Mr Fernand Ernster, president supervisory board
- Mr Christian Thiry, vice-president supervisory board

11.00 Clarification meeting on MBA programme

- Mr Franz Peter Lang
- Mr Christophe Hartmann
- Ms Corinne Baylac
- Ms Antje Weber

11.45 Lunch

12.30 Internal meeting panel

13.30 Feedback on panel findings to ISEC

- Mr Luc Henzig
- Ms Muriel Morbé
- Ms Corinne Baylac
- Ms Antje Weber
- Mr Franz Peter Lang

14.00 End of site visit

Annex 3 – Documents reviewed

ISEC institution - documents studied prior to the site visit

- Summary document: ISEC Accreditation 2018
- ISEC Présentation Générale, 2017
- ISEC Règlement des Examens 2017-2018
- ISEC Solution informatique mise en place pour l'ISEC, 2017
- ISEC Organigram
- Partnership agreements
- Cooperation contract ISEC – Chamber of Commerce
- CV's of teaching staff

ISEC institution - materials put at disposition on site

- Notes for discussion ISEC, April 2018
- Additional Documents ISEC
 - Statutes
 - Minutes Assemblée Générale
 - Minutes Conseil de surveillance
 - Minutes Directoire
 - Minutes commission Pédagogique
 - Minutes Commission Scientifique
 - Annual Accounts 2015 + 2016
 - Budget 2018
 - Forward Budget
 - Students & Programs
 - Student Profiles
 - List of academic, administrative and support staff ISEC, April 2018
 - Evaluations
 - ISEC Online
 - Facilities
 - Minutes + Applications of last recruitment, copies of Certificates + Letters
 - Copies of articles published by ISEC lecturers
 - Handbooks

ISEC programmes BBA and MBA

- Présentation Bachelor et Master en Business Administration
- Programmbeschreibung für die Studiengänge BBA und MBA
- Zulassungsordnung für die Bachelor-Studiengänge der ISEC
- Kompetenzorientierte Zulassungsordnung – Validation des Acquis de l'Experience (VAE) für Studiengänge der ISEC. Examples of VAE-admission
- Curriculumübersicht BBA
- Curriculumübersicht MBA
- Course Materials for BBA and MBA
- Overview of teaching staff BBA and MBA
- Lehrquote im Studiengang BBA
- Lehrquote im Studiengang MBA
- Prüfungsordnung BBA
- Prüfungsordnung MBA
- Examples of written exams BBA
- Examples of MBA assignments

- Leitfaden zur formalen Gestaltung von Seminar- und Abschlussarbeiten an der ISEC
- Partnerschafts- und Übernahmevertrag ISEC – FOM – eufom
- Lizenzvertrag ISEC – FOM – eufom

ISEC programme MMIQ

- Présentation Master Management de l'Innovation, parcours type Management de la Qualité
- Curriculum overview MMIQ
- Equipe pédagogique MMIQ
- Fiches unites d'enseignement MMIQ
- Convention de Partenariat ISEC – IAE Metz Université de Lorraine + Lettre d'intention pour la mise en place d'un programme de formation académique
- Evaluation report HCERES – Master Management de l'Innovation, 2017

ISEC programme BMC

- Présentation Bachelor Manager de Chantier
- Manuel pédagogique BMC
- Curriculum overview + detailed study load BMC
- Equipe pédagogique BMC
- Formulaire d'évaluation (course evaluation form) BMC
- BMC evaluation form placement
- Procédure validation des acquis de l'expérience (VAE)
- Convention de Partenariat IFSB - ISEC
- Powerpoint presentations CDEC. Conseil pour le Développement Economique de la Construction; and IFSB. Institut de Formation Sectoriel du Bâtiment

Annex 4 – Abbreviations used

AdW	Akademie der Wirtschaft
BBA	Bachelor Business Administration
BMC	Bachelor Manager de Chantier
ECTS	European Credit Transfer Scheme
FTE	full-time equivalent
IFSB	Institut de Formation Sectoriel du Bâtiment
ISEC	Institut Supérieur de l'Economie
MBA	Master of Business Administration
MMIQ	Master Management de l'Innovation, parcours management de la Qualité
NVAO	Dutch-Flemish Accreditation Body
S.A.	Société Anonyme