

Assessment report

LA SALLE UNIVERSITY



Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation



european consortium for accreditation

Assessment report

La Salle University- Institutional Review

Copyright © 2015 **European Consortium for Accreditation in higher education**

All rights reserved. This information may be used freely and copied for non-commercial purposes, provided that the source is duly acknowledged.
Additional copies of this publication are available via www.ecahe.eu

Table of content

Glossary.....	7
1. Executive summary	8
2. The assessment procedure	9
3. Basic information	12
4. Assessment criteria	12
Standard 1: Intended internationalisation.....	14
Standard 2: Action plans	17
Standard 3: Implementation	20
Standard 4: Enhancement.....	23
Standard 5: Governance.....	25
5. Overview of assessments	30
Annex 1. Composition of the panel	31
Annex 2. Documents reviewed	33
Annex 3. Site visit programme	35

Glossary

CNA	National Accreditation Council
HE	Higher education
HEI	Higher education Institution
QA	Quality assurance
LSU	La Salle University
COLCIENCIAS	Colombian Administrative Department of Science, Technology and Innovation
MEN	Ministry of National Education
SER	Self- Assessment Report
PID	Institutional development Plan
ORII	Office of International and Inter institutional Relations

1. Executive summary

La Salle University was assessed by the National Accreditation Council of Colombia, CNA. This assessment procedure took place within the framework of the [Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation project](#). CNA convened an assessment panel which studied the self-evaluation report and undertook a site visit on 18th y 19th November 2014, in Bogotá, Colombia.

La Salle University bases its internationalisation on a clear vision highly connected to the service to society as common in many Latin American HEIs. Internationalisation is strongly related to its research, its education, and its service to society, and has been formulated as a *humanized internationalisation* which “invites to a permanent reflection about the human being and its role in the knowledge society”. It is recommended to analyse and describe the internal and external context for its intended internationalisation. Based on those contexts the university then needs to present its intended goals for internationalisation for the long term and its objectives for the short term more explicitly, and use these also for evaluation and measures of improvement. This might also lead to a revised SWOT analysis, reflecting these goals and objectives more clearly. The university has done so in its document of March 2015, LINEAMIENTOS ESTRATÉGICOS PARA LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN ACADÉMICA UNIVERSIDAD DE LA SALLE, after the visit of the expert panel. The panel is convinced of the good intentions of the plan, its implementation and review is a process of the years to come.

ULS **action plans for internationalisation** are mainly located in the document *Proyecto J*, where specific internationalisation objectives are listed. Other documents, such as the Institutional Plan 2010- 2015, also contain goals and objectives linked to internationalisations. In general, institution's internationalisation plans warrant the achievement of its internationalisation goals. Since the strategic commitment in the internationalisation field is quite recent, a follow-up over all internationalisation actions plans should be established, in order to guarantee the feasibility of objectives and the use of results.

The **implementation** of the internationalisation goals and activities is supported by ULS information system, particularly by the “internationalisation information system” called NEXUS. This System has been useful for the academic community involved in all internationalisation activities, but also provides information to all institutional information systems.

The Institution has consolidated a **system of self-evaluation** for the continuous enhancement of quality not only at the institutional level but also at the level of academic programs. The experience within the national accreditation framework has been extremely important in order to structure this system which also includes internationalisation elements. It is important to mention that internationalisation is evaluated by the CNA during accreditation processes both for Institutional and programs level. ULS is currently accredited and has already developed two institutional accreditation processes successfully.

In terms of **Governance**, it is clear that the responsibilities regarding the institution's internationalisation activities are defined and allocated in an adequate way. However, it would be important to pay further attention to the development of a comprehensive approach to the

responsibilities for internationalisation as to avoid the danger that too much is dependent on the actions of what is one administrative unit, where it should be part of all academic and administrative units. The head of the international office participates in most of the institutional committees, which shows the increasing importance of internationalisations from a comprehensive approach within the Institution. Nevertheless, the panel recommended the creation of an institutional internationalisation committee with representatives from all academic and administrative units, from the student community and from external organisations relevant to the internationalisation goals of the university. This committee has been established as part of the new policy of the university: LINEAMIENTOS ESTRATÉGICOS PARA LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN ACADÉMICA UNIVERSIDAD DE LA SALLE, March 2015, and although established only after the visit, the expert panel considers this a positive development.

Conclusion

La Salle University demonstrates a strong commitment in building, developing and consolidating clear and consistent internationalisation processes that have had a positive impact recently, which are supported, both by the “lasallista” academic community and external stakeholders. It is important to highlight the strong commitment at the management level, which becomes visible in the availability of resources and institutional arrangement for internationalisation. The vision of *humanized internationalisation* has been key for developing plans, strategies and internationalisation activities; *Proyecto Utopía* is undoubtedly the clearest example upon this issue. As a main suggestion, the ULS needs to make a more explicit definition of its objectives. Although ULS complies with all standards, ULS should pay special attention to the recommendations made by the panel, especially in the standards assessed as satisfactory. The panel welcomes the policy document LINEAMIENTOS ESTRATÉGICOS PARA LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN ACADÉMICA UNIVERSIDAD DE LA SALLE, March – 2015 as an intended policy document for the years to come.

The panel, given the score of two times satisfactory and three times good on the five standards, therefore recommends that La Salle University is awarded the Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation. The panel has been informed that La Salle University has been able to develop shortly after the visit its policy document LINEAMIENTOS ESTRATÉGICOS PARA LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN ACADÉMICA UNIVERSIDAD DE LA SALLE, March 2015, including the establishment of a central committee for internationalisation. This provides the expert panel with sufficient confidence to recommend the awarding of the Certificate to the university.

The assessment procedure

This report is the result of the assessment of LSU. The procedure was coordinated by CNA. This assessment procedure took place within the framework of the Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation project.

The assessment procedure was organised as laid down in the Frameworks for the Assessment of Quality in Internationalisation published by the European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA).

Assessment standards and assessment scale

The framework for the assessment of quality in internationalisation at institutional level consists of five standards:

- 1. Intended internationalisation**
 - 1a: Supported goals
 - 1b: Verifiable objectives
 - 1c: Measures for improvement
- 2. Action plans**
 - 2a: Fitness for purpose
 - 2b: Dimensions
 - 2c: Instruments and resources
- 3. Implementation**
 - 3a: Information system
 - 3b: Information driven management
 - 3c: Realisations
- 4. Enhancement**
 - 4a: Internal quality assurance
 - 4b: Approaches for enhancement
 - 4c: Stakeholders' involvement
- 5. Governance**
 - 5a: Responsibilities
 - 5b: Effectiveness
 - 5c: Responsiveness

The judgment is provided for each standard and each underlying criterion included in the framework. All standards have the same weight.

The framework consists four-point scale: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Good and Excellent.

An institution gets the Certificate when at least 3 standards are assessed as good or excellent and no standards is assessed as unsatisfactory.

A panel of experts was convened by CNA. The assessment panel consisted of the following members:

- **Dr. Hans de Wit, panel chair:** Director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation, Università Cattolica Sacro Cuore (Italy) and Professor of Internationalisation of Higher Education at the School of Economics and Management of the Hogeschool van Amsterdam, University of Applied Sciences (The Netherlands).
- **Dr. Eugenia Llamas, International expert:** Director of International Relations and head of the Department of Languages at the EIVP (Ecole des Ingénieurs des la Ville de Paris, France)
- **Mr. Javier Cañón Pinto, National Expert:** Projects manager at INCODEP Consulting SAS (Colombia). Former Director of the international office at COLCIENCIAS.
- **Mr. Omar Camilo Pinto, student.** Law graduate student at Universidad Nacional de Colombia. Advisor at the MEN, international office.



The composition of the panel reflects the expertise deemed necessary by the Assessment Framework. The individual panel members' expertise and experience can be found in Annex 1: Composition of the assessment panel. The procedure was coordinated by Fernando Téllez Mendivelso, internationalisation advisor at CNA.

The assessment panel studied the SER and annexed documentation provided by the institution before the site visit (Annex 2: Documents reviewed). The panel organised a preparatory meeting the 17th November and exchange several emails before the procedure. The panel also asked for and received some further documentation in preparation of the site visit. The site visit took place on 17th and 18th November 2014. (Annex 3: Site visit programme).

The panel formulated its preliminary assessments per standards immediately after the site visit. These were based on the findings of the site visit, and built on the assessment of the SER and annexed documentation.

The draft version of this report was finalised taking into account the available information and relevant findings of the assessment. Where necessary the panel corrected and amended the report. The panel finalised the draft report on 7th December 2014. It was then send to LSU to review the report for factual mistakes.

The panel approved the final version of the report on 17 April 2015.

2. Basic information

Institution: Lasalle University- (Universidad de la Salle)

Type of institution: Private University

Status: Accredited

QA / accreditation agency: National Accreditation Council

Status period: 14-12-12 to 14- 12-18

Additional information:

La Salle University is a higher education institution with headquarters in Bogotá D.C., Colombia. Currently, ULS has over 15.343 students, 14.453 in undergraduate programs and 890 in graduate programs, distributed in three main campuses in the city and another one located in the Department of Casanare –with a project known as Utopia. The University has received twice High Quality University Accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation (CNA for its acronym in Spanish). It received an award by IESALC-UNESCO on Territorial Social Responsibility, the special recognition of the National Peace Award by the Colombian government and the ISO 9001/2008 certification. Its mission is the comprehensive education and knowledge development to contribute for the social and productive transformation of Colombia. Its institutional premises are based on the following ideas:

- The construction of a **fairer society** and of **peace**.
- The education of **professionals** who based on their knowledge, values, teamwork capacity, social sensibility and sense of belonging are able to **contribute to the search for equity**.
- The defense of life, the construction of the national identity and the commitment towards a comprehensive and **sustainable human development**.

The University offers 54 academic programs (25 undergraduate, 16 specializations, 11 masters and 2 doctorates) in the following schools:



- Administration and Accounting (Business Administration, Accounting)
- Agricultural Sciences (Veterinary Medicine, Zootecnic-Animal husbandry-, Agronomic Engineering, and Agricultural Business Administration)
- Economics & Social Sciences (Economy, Social Work, Finances and International Trade, Business and International Relations, and Librarianship and Archives Studies)
- Education (B.A. in Spanish, English and French and B.A. in Religious Education)
- Engineering. (Environmental, Civil Eng., Food Eng., Automation Eng., Industrial Eng. and Electrical Eng.)
- Habitat Sciences (Architecture, Urbanism)
- Health Sciences (Optometry)
- Philosophy and Humanities (Philosophy)

Its strategic focuses look for the positioning in rural development with a territorial approach with five strategic emphasis:

- Consolidation of research
- Permanent academic quality assurance
- Strengthening a university social responsibility model
- Reinforcing the interaction with the external sector
- Financial sustainability

Most students come from the different regions in Colombia and some international students come from South American countries mainly, but it certainly has students from the U.S.A., Europe and Asia. It has eight Research Centres with the I+D formula (Investigation + Development) to promote scientific and technological activities.

- High Complexity Instrumental Laboratory
- La Salle Institute of Advanced Research - ISIA
- CIMRA: Research Centre on Medicine and Animal Reproduction
- CISAHE: Research Centre on the Interrelation between Animal, Human and Ecological Health
- CIINDA: Research Centre on Innovation and Agro-Alimentary Development
- CIDESCAC: Research Centre on Sustainable Development and Climate Change
- CIHDEP: Research Centre on Habitat, Development and Peace
- CTAD: Cross-Curricular Centre for the Alternative Development
- CIMAS: Research Centre on Environment and General Health -Visual and Ocular-
- CIEP: Research Centre on Education and Pedagogy

La Salle is an educational community shaped by traditional Catholic and Lasallian values: a deep respect for each individual, a belief that intellectual and spiritual development goes hand-in-hand, a passion for creative teaching and learning, and a conviction that education should be useful—for personal growth, professional advancement, and service to others. Currently, the Lasallian community makes presence in about 82 countries worldwide.

3. Assessment criteria

Standard 1: Intended internationalisation

Criterion 1a: Supported goals

The internationalisation goals for the institution are documented and these are shared and supported by stakeholders within and outside the institution.

In the introduction to the SER, La Salle University makes reference to the international foundations that are embedded in its creation: being part of the La Salle community and its social role, working in over 80 countries around the world. In that context the university speaks of a ‘humanized internationalisation’, that “invites to a permanent reflection about the human being and its role in the knowledge society,” what inspires its staff to develop critical students, stimulate contacts and communication with other cultures and develop scientific knowledge that is relevant for addressing national problems and for that require international participation.

This vision of a humanized internationalisation is the inspiration for the inclusion of internationalisation in the strategy of ULS and is linked to two components: the place of the university in the international academic and scientific knowledge environment, and the creation of a flexible curriculum that allows for mobility. In other words, the internationalisation is strongly related to its research, its education, and its service to society.

This vision, founded in the international La Salle spirit as well as in the Latin American tradition of higher education as strongly connected to its service to society, is itself a solid basis and reflects itself in the activities and instruments that the university has developed to internationalise. Although it is the case that international activities have been there in the university already before the institutional plan 2010-2015, the focus on internationalisation as an important pillar is still relatively recent.

Both in the 2007 CNA accreditation report as in the renovation report of 2012, it is stated that internationalisation is an area for improvement. In 2007 it was explicitly related to the opportunities of the broad international network of La Salle universities; and in 2012 it was stated that there is room for improvement both in language policy and in international academic cooperation. From the SER as well as other documents provided by the university and from the interviews, it has become clear that the university is taking up on these recommendations and investing in a more explicit internationalisation policy and strategy.

What is lacking though is an explicit formulation of the internal and external context and rationales for internationalisation as a basis for long term internationalisation goals. What is described in the SER as internationalisation goals are the overall three strategic goals of the university with respect to research, education and service to society, but not their translation into internationalisation goals. It is positive that the university considers internationalisation not as a goal in itself but as a means to enhance the quality of research, education and service to society, but the why, what and how and the intended goals for internationalisation are not explicitly formulated, more implicitly embedded in

its intentions. In that context, the SWOT analysis provided in the SER in the opinion of the panel is not adequately reflecting required long term goals and short term objectives and could be adapted based on a more strategic plan.

It is for that reason that it is difficult to get a clear picture whether the goals are reasonable and challenging enough to be accomplished. And it is also not possible to see how and if the stakeholders within and outside the university identify explicitly with the intended goals. The panel has noticed during the interviews and from the documentation that in general terms there is identification with the mission and vision of the university and with the intentions for internationalisation, but due to the lack of clear internationalisation goals it is not possible to perceive them as explicitly supported. The expert panel welcomes the formulation of the policy document LINEAMIENTOS ESTRATÉGICOS PARA LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN ACADÉMICA UNIVERSIDAD DE LA SALLE in March 2015 is a first important step in that direction.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the internationalisation goals for the institution are not explicitly formulated but intentional presented and in that sense satisfactorily documented. The goals, in their implicit and generic form, are shared and supported by stakeholders within and outside the institution. The panel recommends that the university describes the internal and external contexts for its intended internationalisation and based on that the intended goals for internationalisation for the long term more explicitly.

Criterion 1b: Verifiable objectives

The institution has formulated verifiable objectives that enable it to monitor the achievement of its internationalisation goals.

What has been said above for the intended internationalisation goals, to a large extent also applies to the objectives. As long as there are no clear and explicit internationalisation goals for the long term, it is difficult to describe short term objectives to reach those goals. In the Self-Assessment Report, the eight objectives as described for internationalisation are of a rather broad nature, and with some further concretization can and should be developed into verifiable internationalisation objectives:

- Relationship of the university with national and international academic communities
- Orient the academic programmes to internationalisation
- Permanent actualisation of the undergraduate and postgraduate programmes
- Continuous improvement of the quality
- Permanent formation of the academic staff
- Improvement of the relation with alumni
- Strengthening of the relations with the La Salle universities internationally
- Enhancement of the integration of the university with the private and public sector.

Only four, out of these eight, have a direct international focus but for the other four it is relevant also to look at their international dimensions. And for all eight it might be useful to be more precise to define objectives with concrete quantitative and qualitative outcomes.

The instruments mentioned under the same criterion as projects are a good basis for the action plan to enhance the internationalisation. But their impact will only be measurable in an effective way when the objectives are more aligned with these projects as internationalisation objectives.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that objectives have been formulated. In their current form these objectives are in a satisfactory way formulated but not verifiable other than in a very generic way. They do not allow monitoring the achievement of the institution's internationalisation goals as these are not explicitly described. The panel recommends in line with the previous recommendation that the university describes the short term concrete objectives contributing to the realisation of the long term goals with concrete quantitative and qualitative outcomes.

Criterion 1c: Measures for improvement

As a result of periodic evaluations of the institution's internationalisation, the successful implementation of measures for improvement can be demonstrated.

Measurements are in place for improvement of the internationalisation activities, as part of the overall quality assurance system of the university and more specifically for the international operations. They are more activity oriented, as described in the SER then related to intended international goals and objectives, as these are not explicitly formulated. In the report no concrete examples are given of improvements in the relevant section of the report but elsewhere in the report and during the interviews these were presented. The actions for improvement as given under the so-called *Project J*, 'acciones de la internacionalización' give an indication of the way evaluation is taking place as part of the action plan and self-evaluation process of the university. And there is also indicated in which way internationalisation is addressed in the different reports of ULS: annual reports of institutional development, institutional improvement report PIM, management reports, and institutional self-evaluation reports 2007 and 2011.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that there are evaluations of the institution's internationalisation and that these are organised periodically. Measures for improvement have been implemented although its success cannot always be demonstrated. The panel recommends to align evaluation of internationalisation more with to be defined internationalisation goals and objectives, as to develop a more systematic evaluation and improvement scheme of these goals and objectives than in the current situation is possible. Overall, the panel assesses this criterion as good.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 1. Intended internationalisation

The panel found that the university has an intended internationalisation vision. The panel deems all the underlying criteria of this standard to be met. The panel therefore assesses Standard 1. Intended internationalisation as satisfactory.

The panel recommends that the university describes the internal and external contexts for its intended internationalisation. Based on those context the university then needs to present its intended goals for internationalisation for the long term and its objectives for the short term more explicitly, and use these also for evaluation and measures of improvement. This might also lead to a revised SWOT analysis, reflecting these goals and objectives more clearly. The panel welcomes the formulation of the policy document LINEAMIENTOS ESTRATÉGICOS PARA LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN ACADÉMICA UNIVERSIDAD DE LA SALLE in March 2015 is a first important step in that direction.

Standard 2: Action plans

Criterion 2a: Fitness for purpose

The institution's internationalisation plans warrant the achievement of its internationalisation goals.

La Salle University's action plans for internationalisation are mainly found in the document *Proyecto J*, where ten specific internationalisation objectives are listed, each one with the corresponding expected outcomes and result indicators. *Proyecto J* includes a chronogram, where the realisation

degree for each activity during the past three years is shown. The document provides both specific tasks and the instances responsible for actions implementation.

These action plans are part of the overall plans of the institution, since there is a clear commitment on the part of the University governance to execute quality improvement measures in order to make ULS an international reference in the region. The PID implemented in 2010 makes of internationalisation a key strategic issue, through several practical measures, such as bilingualism (English proficiency for all the individuals, be that teaching staff, students or administrators), increasing the number of international mobility agreements (double degrees included), participation in international research networks and internationalisation at home through international teaching staff participation in the various faculties curricular activities.

The panel appreciates the fact that the ORII participates in the meetings of all the different decision-making committees at the institutional highest level.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that institution's internationalisation plans warrant the achievement of its internationalisation goals. Since the strategic commitment in the internationalisation field is quite recent, the panel recommends that a thorough follow-up of internationalisation actions plans should be established, in order to guarantee the feasibility of objectives and the exploitation of results.

Criterion 2b: Dimensions

The institution's internationalisation plans appropriately include at least the following dimensions: "international and intercultural learning outcomes", "teaching, learning and research", "staff" and "students".

La Salle's internationalisation action plans cover the most relevant institutional dimensions, as shown in the SER (pages 12-14). Annexes 9 to 12 specify some of the outputs as far as students' and teaching staff's mobility are concerned. There exists an institutional policy towards bilingualism, attempting to guarantee English proficiency both for students and teaching staff. If we take into account the overall Colombian context, the numbers for mobility are quite good. During the site visit, the panel had the opportunity to verify that outgoing mobility was well organized and strongly encouraged by the University governing instances, always with the unconditional ORII's support. Notably, as far as permanent teaching staff is concerned, almost all its members had undergone a mobility experience in the past few years. As for incoming teaching staff mobility, a visiting professors scheme (see Annex 12) has been set up, taking advantage of the different Faculties' research projects and their participation in international networks.

In order to encourage students' outgoing mobility, those nominated to participate in exchange programmes coordinated by the ORII benefit from an 80% reduction of La Salle's inscription fees. This allows students to better plan their mobility experience, minimizing the financial impact of a period abroad.

Incoming students may ask to be assigned a local student mentor, who is known as a "body", and whose role consists in helping international students to organize their first weeks in Bogota and to

explain to them the best way to face eventual adaptation problems, as well as to successfully complete administrative procedures.

As for the acquisition of international learning outcomes and to promote internationalisation at home, the University organises every year a Summer School, where experts, lecturers and researchers coming from partner institutions discuss current international issues during two weeks. All the sessions are held in English and no tuition fees are charged to La Salle students, who can obtain free election credits, provided they follow all the lectures and submit the required papers and/or course work.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the institution's internationalisation plans include most of the relevant dimensions in a suitable manner. The panel appreciates the fact that all courses include a percentage of bibliographical sources in English, as a support to the acquisition of international learning outcomes, but recommends international and intercultural learning outcomes to be explicitly formulated for the curricula. To enhance the incoming students experience at the University, the panel also recommends a more thorough support and follow-up of incoming students on the part of the ORII, as well as a systematisation of the “body” programme.

Criterion 2c: Instruments and resources

The institution's internationalisation plans are complemented by specific institution-wide instruments and adequate resources.

La Salle University internationalisation plans are a relevant part of the overall University strategy. As such, the governing instances of the University fully endorse internationalisation policies and provide the necessary means to achieve them, thanks to its well-developed infrastructure. External stakeholders are equally concerned by the University internationalisation process. Thanks to the existence of the international “Universidades Lasallistas” organisation, La Salle University at Bogota can benefit from a highly performing network of 84 universities worldwide. The excellence of some of the University programmes (most notably, that in Optometry, deemed to be the best one in Latin America) allows the University to raise external funds from international corporations.

The ORII effectively supports the implementation of these policies and contributes to the international projection of some of the University cooperation projects such as “Utopia”.

In 2010, the University opened a campus in the Yopal district aiming at training engineers in the field of agricultural sciences. What makes this project unique is that students come from low-income families in rural areas which have been particularly touched by the armed conflict between the Colombian state and the FARC. Utopian students do not pay any tuition fees, receive a high-quality education (including the possibility of carrying out internships abroad, fully granted by international partners' scholarships) and can also benefit from international visiting faculty lectures. Utopia is a

most relevant contribution to the overall internationalisation plans of the University, since it greatly enhances the institutions' international projection: apart from three national cooperation prizes, it has been awarded the 2014 UNESCO's "Ojo de Plata" to the Best Experience in Social Responsibility developed by a non-governmental organisation, as well as being finalist of the French and German Embassies award in cooperation.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the institution's internationalisation plans are complemented by specific institution-wide instruments and adequate resources.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 2. Action plans

The panel found that the institution's internationalisation plans are complemented by specific institution-wide instruments and adequate resources. The panel deems all the underlying criteria of this standard to be met, and considers that "Utopia" can be regarded as an international example. The panel therefore assesses Standard 2. Action plans as good.

Standard 3: Implementation

Criterion 3a: Information system

The institution has a functional management information system which enables it to collect and process relevant information regarding internationalisation.

La Salle University has implemented a new management information system for internationalisation named NEXUS <http://nexus.lasalle.edu.co/> which suppose an important initiative to enhance internationalisation management. This system is part of the institutional general objective of integrating all institutional information systems, which is currently on implementation. NEXUS has started its implementation this year with only 3 modules, by now, one of them is working for **agreements management**, one more oriented to **mobility management** and the third one to make visible different **opportunities of international cooperation** and reporting current international cooperation projects carried out by the institution to make them public for the ULS community. The system allows to monitor the procedures by all the users (reporters, coordinators, operative offices, students and faculty), so with the implementation of this system, is possible to guarantee the reporting function which is usually not the best at ULS, and it will be imply an important reduction of the instances and the time involved in those procedures. Moreover, it will fit the ecological management purpose.

By now, the information system is only covering student mobility, agreements and opportunities on international cooperation, however NEXUS needs to be improved as soon as possible because there are not enough categories in the modules, for example, to report and to monitor faculty staff mobility and another important types of mobility, such as students internships, volunteers, research staying, management visits, missions, courses, virtual mobility, visiting professors etc.). On the other hand the system is only registering agreements but not, other types of alliances such as international

networks, associations, consortiums, projects, platforms etc., in which the University and their academic unities, administrative instances or faculty are participating.

As a conclusion, the current management information system is potentially able to be used to collect and process relevant information regarding internationalisation, but it needs to be improved. The main question that comes here is, why ULS hasn't implemented at least an integrated excel chart for collecting and reporting relevant internationalisation data before NEXUS? This lacking was evident according with the annexes 9, 10, 11 and 12 attached to the SER, because those mobility data bases are different and it was evident the lack of reports about faculty mobility (incoming and outgoing,) as well as the lack of data bases about categories such as international events, students on double degree programs, beneficiaries of all internationalisation programmes managed by the international office, networks, projects, associations, consortiums, platforms, specific data on internationalisation of the curriculum and internationalisation of research, faculty with international degrees, number of persons advised by the International Office, etc.).

Currently, it is only possible to process information collected about incoming and outgoing students' mobility (countries, some types of mobility etc.) since 2008, which is useful to monitor procedures easily and, also, to analyse trends throughout NEXUS. Also with the agreements module of NEXUS it is possible monitoring the developments and real use of them by ULS members. It would facilitate the procedure of signing agreements and to analyse trends since now.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the institution has a functional management information system which the institution uses it to collect and process relevant information regarding internationalisation. The panel recommends improving and completing it as soon as possible taking into account the institution have been weak collecting and reporting relevant internationalisation data until now in order to have base-lines to build realistic indicators for it planning and decision making.

Criterion 3b: Information driven management

The institution makes use of processed information for the effective management of its internationalisation activities.

As it was said before, NEXUS only covers some strategic and operational activities managed by the ORII, such as student mobility, agreements and opportunities. On the other hand, some other administrative offices and areas are able to provide internationalisation data such as faculty developing doctoral and postgraduate studies abroad or budget spending on internationalisation activities, throughout systems different to NEXUS. Nonetheless, information provided by NEXUS is being used mainly on the day by day procedures on mobility and agreement management but not yet on analytics, decision-making processes or planning. The evidence is that no one of the internationalisation plans (PID, the Internationalisation Plan nor the *Project J*) has base-lines or use statistics provided by the information system.

Since NEXUS is working, the information enables management of internationalisation activities. Agreements signed or in process are visible now for all institution members allowing efficiency in their operative use and student mobility process information is now also visible for the administrative instances which are involved in the procedure chain so it allow a progressive efficiency.

By the visit we concluded that the information provided by the new information system named NEXUS is being used mainly in an operative level in order to gain efficiency for the day by day processing of mobility and agreements. Also NEXUS are building a data base of opportunities and some institutional development projects in which the institution have been contracted by international cooperation which is a good way to build an institutional CV in order to apply to future international grants calls. But as soon as possible this information must to be used in the planning and decision-making levels because there is no evidence that it is happening currently.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the institution makes use of processed information for the effective management of its internationalisation activities. The panel recommends however to start to make more use of this information at the planning and decision-making levels.

Criterion 3c: Realisations

The institution can demonstrate the extent to which its internationalisation plans are realised through documented outcomes and results.

The SER provides evidence of some outcomes and results based in some data collected, specifically in students' mobility management because it's possible to see the yearly increasing of the number of outgoing and incoming students and it was certainly one of the goals of the internationalisation plans. Unfortunately, the plans are not supported by annual analysis or reports of management and data base-lines and other goals are not supported by data for example double degree programs, beneficiaries of them, networks and other alliances, internationalisation of the curriculum, internationalisation of the research, internationalisation of faculty.

Realisations are basically demonstrated by annexes numbers 9, 10, 11 y 12 in the SER which correspond to student mobility 2008-2014 (outgoing and incoming), students beneficiaries of the Summer School and an a list of incoming faculty beneficiaries of the state Programme "Profesores Visitantes ICETEX" which, obviously, represent just a little part of the whole amount of visiting faculty within ULS. It is a fact that the university have a clear weakness in supporting and planning decision-making processes with data and base-lines in their indicators, as a result of, their strategy outputs cannot be properly documented. However, it does not mean there is no way to prove results from the internationalisation strategy, but only after the site visit it become possible.

The implementation of the NEXUS this year surely will assure the institutional capacity to document the internationalisation developments, outputs, and outcomes corresponding to planning processes, but this capability is only starting at the institution.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the institution has not documented outcomes and results. These outcomes and results cannot demonstrate that the institution’s internationalisation plans have been accomplished. The panel recommends registering and collecting all information and data needed by the goals and objectives in order to document the advances, outcomes and results of the plans and strategies already put in action. NEXUS needs to be strengthened and complemented by relevant data of all the processes involved by the internationalisation and it needs establish an interface with the other information systems in the institution such as human resources, research, financial information systems. It will be important to report analysis of the whole plan and management, each semester or academic year in order to monitoring and provide information to the decision-making activities.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 3: Implementation

The panel found that when the institution implemented the NEXUS system, put in action a great advance in order to assure a management and future planning’s success, however currently is not possible to see all the plans results and outcomes properly documented. The panel deems some of the underlying criteria of this standard to be met. The panel recommends improving the integration of all institutional information systems as soon as possible complementing the categories involved in the internationalisation activities, plans and goals. In the same way it is important to make half-year reports of all the internationalisation issues in order to allow specific analysis for a better monitoring and planning activities and for to document the internationalisation achievements and processes. The panel therefore assesses Standard 3: Implementation as satisfactory.

Standard 4: Enhancement

Criterion 4a: Internal quality assurance

The institution’s internal quality assurance system covers all internationalisation dimensions and activities.

La Salle University has consolidated a strategy for the continuous enhancement of quality that has its origins at the organizational structure of the institution, in which the Strategic Planning Division is in charge of the leadership and the coordination of the process of continuous improvement with the rest of the dependencies of the institution.

The panel has noted that the institution has been building different guidelines as part of the process of quality improvement, and stablished self-evaluation as part of the institutional quality culture. As a result, the University has internal regulation for these processes, which contains rules and procedures, mentioned in the following guidance documents: guidelines for an accreditation model

(2002), self-evaluation of academic programs (2002), methodological guide to advance the institutional self-evaluation (2005), curriculum assessment of La Salle University (2007), guidelines and methodological document for self-assessment processes of la Salle University (2013), among others.

The system of internal QA is integrated according to the evaluation processes of the institution with the following dynamic: the university has teamwork and coordination groups, including support groups of faculties and/or departments; the goal of the process is socialized into the institution in various ways; the documentary collection of information is made by for example the review of improvement plans and reports of previous processes, revising national guidelines on the subject, statistical analysis; the collection of information that isn't documented; deliberation of the importance of information according to the process, study of the horizon that is expected to be reach by the process; it is analyzed, synthesized and reported to be socialize with the involved areas with particular emphasis on the degree of approximation to the proposed horizon.

The panel also observes that adjustments are made to the self-assessment report and submitted to the review of internal and external collaborative peers to produce the latest version of the process, which ends with an improvement plan.

Under the process of continuous enhancement of quality, dimensions such as teaching, learning, research, teachers and students are taken into account as key factors in the methodological guide for self-assessment process of La Salle University. It should be noted that the university has included within the dimensions the assessment of the dimension suggested by the National Accreditation Council, for the academic programs and the institutional part. The "Project J" includes the dimensions of the internationalisation, its objectives, indicators and activities that contribute to the continuous enhancement of quality of education service offered by the university.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the institution has an internal QA system which covers most of the internationalisation dimensions and activities and, in the same way, the internationalisation plan and the Project J warrant articulated actions to impact positively the enhancement of the quality process.

The panel recommends including as a fundamental part for the process, the international and intercultural learning outcomes. This remark is made, having in mind that is not clear the process of assessment of learning outcomes, and is important to take into consideration the feedback of the students after having international and intercultural experiences. In addition it should be included a follow up to the Project J, as one of the steps to evaluate the activities that promotes the continuous enhancement of quality of the university.

Criterion 4b: Approaches for enhancement

The institution utilises internationalisation approaches as part of its regular quality assurance and enhancement activities.

Inside the process of assurance and continuous enhancement of quality, the university has established as fundamental the inclusion of internationalisation approaches, as basic factors of the process, having as reference the ones included in the “institutional development and strategic plan” of each academic unit. It has been added important factors such as artistic and cultural creation activities, national and international visibility, impact on the graduates, capacities for research and innovation, articulation with the environment and the contributions to the development, internationalisation and the immersion in worldwide scientific networks.

In addition to this, the document of self-evaluation established that students, teachers and researchers within the academic process of international and intercultural components, are essential elements of the quality assurance and continuous enhancement process of quality, because they reflect the activities contained in the 10 action lines of the Project J.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel determines that internationalisation approaches are used by the institution in its regular quality assurance and enhancement activities. The panel recommends that the evaluation and the methodological guidelines allow recognizing the qualitative and quantitative value that is susceptible to undergoing evaluation aspects.

Criterion 4c: Stakeholders involvement

The institution actively involves its internal and external stakeholders in its quality assurance and enhancement activities regarding internationalisation.

According to the wide portfolio of services that the University can offer, it has been identified in the internal regulation documents some of the stakeholders of the institution, such as students, researcher teachers, the productive sector, accreditation agencies, entities of national government, among others.

According to the role of the stakeholders, the system of information called NEXUS has include diverse profiles of each interested part of the process, in order to take into account the role and influence in the decision process, its responsibilities and its procedures. For this reason the stakeholders play a fundamental role in the process of assurance and enhancement of quality. On the one hand they are consulted in the process of self-evaluation in front of the internationalisation process, according to the approaches established by the university and those external adopted (CNA factors); and on the other hand as direct supporters of these processes in front external entities such as CNA, Ministry of Education, and the process of international accreditation. In every space the stakeholders are involucrate in general activities and the majority of them in actions related to internationalisation.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the institution actively involves its internal and external stakeholders on its quality assurance and enhancement activities regarding to internationalisation. The panel

recommends the inclusion in the institutional political documents, a paragraph of stakeholders and its relation with the process of the institution.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 4: Enhancement

The panel found that the university has consolidated a system of self-evaluation for the continuous enhancement of quality not only at the institutional level but also at the level of academic programs, founded in institutional documents such as: guidelines for a model of accreditation; self-evaluation of the academic programs; methodological guide to overtake the institutional self-evaluation; guidelines for the self-evaluation process of Universidad de la Salle. The process has defined a work structure for the improvement of quality. It has been identified the stakeholders related with the internationalisation, which are linked actively to the process of self-evaluation and external evaluation.

The strategy for the continuous enhancement of quality within the institution addresses the internationalisation as a complex and transversal process to the functions of the university, and it becomes possible throughout Project J; the plans of improvement implemented for the strengthening of academic programs; the project of integral internationalisation, derive from the participation on the Tailor Made Training (TMT) program.

The panel deems all the underlying criteria of this standard to be systematically surpassed.

The experience of creating a training curriculum focused on teaching and practice of theory in a campus as “Utopia” is a highlight element of the continuous improvement process implemented by the university. Beyond the different quality aspects surrounding the Utopia program, the correlation of international and intercultural factors to the training of objective population defined as stakeholders, the panel is convinced that these aspects can be regarded as an exemplary practice.

The panel recommends supplying documentary evidence of the good practice of the Project Utopia, in function of the strategy of continuous enhancement of quality of the institution and the academic programs, making special emphasis in the international approaches and aspects in the project. The panel therefore assesses standard 4: Enhancement as good.

Standard 5: Governance

Criterion 5a: Responsibilities

The responsibilities regarding the institution’s internationalisation (goals, plans, implementation and enhancement) are clearly defined and allocated.

In the Self-Assessment Report the responsibilities are described in a hierarchical way, with the leaders of the institution (rector and vice-rectors) at the top, followed by the Extended Academic Council, the Curriculum and Extension Committee and the Strategic Planning Division as directing the overall policy, including the internationalisation. The Office of International and Inter-institutional Relations relates to these entities as centre of articulation and support for internationalisation on the

actions developed by the academic and administrative units. According to the report, the synthesis with the institutional policies is assured in this way.

The panel observed during the visit that though the responsibilities with respect to mobility of staff and students are indeed clearly defined, that there is room for improvement on the responsibilities for incoming mobility of students and for academic advice on internationalisation. There appears to be some confusion about who is responsible for what in these two areas. So, not in all aspects the synthesis is realized, even though the director of the Office of International and Inter institutional Relations participates in all the main committees of the university, including the curriculum committee. But in a comprehensive internationalisation strategy it should not depend only on that Office to assure and support internationalisation. The international dimension should be embedded in all academic and administrative units and coordinated in a consistent and coherent way. There is room for further comprehensiveness in that respect.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the responsibilities regarding the institution’s internationalisation activities are defined and allocated in a satisfactory way. The panel recommends paying further attention to the development of a comprehensive approach to the responsibilities for internationalisation as to avoid the danger that too much is dependent on the actions of what is one administrative unit, where it should be part of all academic and administrative units.

Criterion 5b: Effectiveness

The organisational structure, decision-making processes and leadership (regarding internationalisation) support the realisation of the institution’s internationalisation goals and action plans.

The panel has noted that there is a strong leadership commitment to internationalisation, what has a positive impact on the effectiveness of the actions undertaken, as has also the participation of the director of the ORII in all the main committees of the university. The effectiveness can be further enhanced by creating a coordinating committee for internationalisation with representation of all academic and administrative units and from the student community, which will stimulate, propose and monitor the internationalisation activities of the university as a whole, chaired by the leadership of the institution.

The panel is also of the opinion that some important decisions on internationalisation, such as selection processes and budget allocations to specific projects, require more clarification of how the processes take place and what are the criteria used for decision, as to guarantee better transparency.

It would also be useful to provide a more systematic and transparent overview of activities taking place and projects developed at the central and faculty level, than those presented in the Self-Assessment Report in Table 8. The current list comes over as an unstructured compilation of small, medium and large projects and does not provide insight in the duration, the key internal and

external stakeholders, the main project owner, budget and impact of each. In that list different categories as indicators of activities might be provided, such as mobility of students, staff mobility, joint and double degrees, languages, teaching and learning, research and service to society. The panel welcomes the fact that on the basis of the policy document the formulation of the policy document LINEAMIENTOS ESTRATÉGICOS PARA LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN ACADÉMICA UNIVERSIDAD DE LA SALLE of March 2015 this committee is established.

A more coherent annual overview and assessment of the projects would provide more insight in the effectiveness of the projects underway and the role of the central and faculty level in them.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the institution's organisational structure, decision-making processes and leadership support the realisation of the internationalisation goals and action plans in a good way. The panel recommended the creation of an institutional internationalisation committee with representatives of all academic and administrative units of the university and from the students, chaired by the leadership of the institution and having as task to stimulate, propose and monitor the internationalisation activities for the university as a whole. The panel welcomes the fact that on the basis of the policy document the formulation of the policy document LINEAMIENTOS ESTRATÉGICOS PARA LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN ACADÉMICA UNIVERSIDAD DE LA SALLE of March 2015 this committee is established.

The panel also recommends creating an annual list of internationalisation projects, including their duration, the key internal and external stakeholders, the main project owner, budget and impact of each.

Criterion 5c: Responsiveness

The institution can demonstrate that it readily reacts to input from within and outside the institution regarding internationalisation activities.

The Self-Assessment Report states that input from inside the university is guaranteed by the fact that the leadership of the institution is also taking the lead on internationalisation and that the director of the Office of International and Institutional Relations is active in the main committees of the university. The panel has observed though that not always is clear how that input, other than by way of decisions from above, is taking place from within the academic and student community. The Nexus Programme has a positive impact on responding to the needs of the university community and in simplifying time consuming bureaucratic processes, but as a whole the responsiveness can be further improved inside the university community.

As for the input from outside, these come via the leadership and the Office and the panel has seen sufficient evidence of positive input on a project and activity basis. It might though be considered to include in the above proposed internationalisation committee also to include some external input, from organisations relevant to the internationalisation goals of the university.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the institution can demonstrate that it reacts in a good way to input from within and outside the institution regarding internationalisation activities, but that further improvement can be still realized. The panel recommends to include in the proposed internationalisation committee also representatives from external organisations relevant to the internationalisation goals of the university.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 5: Governance

The panel deems the underlying criteria of this standard to be met. The panel therefore assesses Standard 5: Governance as Good. The panel welcomes the fact that the university on the basis of the visit has created an institutional internationalisation committee with representatives from all academic and administrative units, from the student community and from organisations relevant to the internationalisation goals of the university.

Conclusion

La Salle University demonstrates a strong commitment in building, developing and consolidating clear and consistent internationalisation processes that have had a positive impact recently, which also are supported both by the “lasallista” academic community and external stakeholders. It is important to highlight the strong commitment at the management level, which becomes visible in the availability of resources and institutional arrangement for internationalisation. The vision of *humanized internationalisation* has been key for developing plans, strategies and internationalisation activities; *Proyecto Utopía* is undoubtedly the clearest example upon this issue. As a main suggestion, the ULS needs to make a more explicit definition of its objectives in order to evaluate internationalisation activities and therefore formulating improvement plans . Although ULS complies with all standards, ULS should pay special attention to the recommendations made by the panel, especially in the 3 standards assessed as satisfactory. The panel is positive about the fact that the university has formulated its policy document LINEAMIENTOS ESTRATÉGICOS PARA LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN ACADÉMICA UNIVERSIDAD DE LA SALLE of March 2015 with that purpose.

The panel, given the score of two times satisfactory and three times good on the five standards, therefore recommends that La Salle University is awarded the Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation. The panel has been informed that La Salle University has been able to develop shortly after the visit its policy document LINEAMIENTOS ESTRATÉGICOS PARA LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN ACADÉMICA UNIVERSIDAD DE LA SALLE, March 2015, including the establishment of a central committee for internationalisation. This provides the expert panel with sufficient confidence to recommend the awarding of the Certificate to the university.

4. Overview of assessments

Standard	Criterion	Level of fulfilment
1. Intended internationalisation	1a. Supported goals	Satisfactory
	1b. Verifiable objectives	
	1c. Measures for improvement	
2. Action plans	2a. Fitness for purpose	Good
	2b. Dimensions	
	2c. Instruments and resources	
3. Implementation	3a. Information system	Satisfactory
	3b. Information-driven management	
	3c. Realisations	
4. Enhancement	4a. Internal quality assurance	Good
	4b. Approaches for enhancement	
	4c. Stakeholders involvement	
5. Governance	5a. Responsibilities	Good
	5b. Effectiveness	
	5c. Responsiveness	

Annex 1. Composition of the panel

Chair: *Dr. Hans de Wit. Director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at the Università Cattolica Sacro Cuore(Italy)/ Professor of Internationalisation of HE at the School of Economics and Management of the Hogeschool van Amsterdam, University of Applied Sciences (The Netherlands)/ founding member and former president of the European EAIE.*

He is a Founding editor of the *Journal of Studies in International Education* and publishes a monthly blog in University World News on internationalisation of higher education, www.universityworldnews.com. Dr. de Wit is together with dr. Fiona Hunter co-editor of the annual 5th issue of 'International Higher Education', the newsletter of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. (co)writer of several books and articles on international education and actively involved in assessment and consultancy in international education (European Commission, UNESCO, World Bank, IMHE/OECD, IAU, European Parliament).

He has been involved in several programmes and projects for evaluating institutional and programme strategies for internationalisation (OECD, IAU, NVAO and ECA). He has also been involved in the design of the instruments and indicators for these programmes. He was chair of three other CeQuint expert panels.

International expert: *Dr. Eugenia Llamas. Director of International Relations and head of the Department of Languages at the EIVP (Ecole des Ingénieurs des la Ville de Paris, France).*

Dr. Llamas studied in Spain, Scotland and Ireland. She was in charge of International relations as Deputy Director of the ETSIT Valladolid (Spain) before taking on her current position in Paris. Eugenia is an expert of the French accreditation authority for engineering degrees (CTI) and has participated in several boards and organisations dealing with quality assurance in higher education not only in France but also Spain.

National expert: *Javier Cañón Pinto. Projects Manager at INCODEP Consulting SAS (Colombia). Former Director of the international office at COLCIENCIAS.*

He is a Sociologist from the National University of Colombia, Master on Research and Development from Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain), Certificated on Academic Curricula Design from Universidad del Rosario (Colombia) and certificated UNILEAD course from DAAD/University Oldenburg (Germany). He has been professor of sociology at Universidad del Rosario (Colombia) but his experience on internationalisation becomes from 10 years ago as Advisor and Director of the International Office at the National University of Colombia, Santo Tomás University (Colombia) and at the state Administrative Department of Science, Technology and Innovation (COLCIENCIAS) where he leaded and advised several international projects (Erasmus Mundus, FP6, FP7, CTPD, CYTED). He has been international cooperation adviser for different Colombian public and private entities such as the National Commission for the Civil Service, the Ministry of National Education, the Colombian Association of Universities ASCUN and different universities and some NGOs. He has been author of various papers and chapters on books about education and internationalisation of higher education and also he has been coordinator of the Colombian Network for the Internationalisation of Higher Education (RCI) – Bogota-Node and a representative of it at the Network of Latin-American internationalisation of Higher Education networks (RELARIES).

Student: Omar Mejia Camilo Ardila. Political Scientist and LL. M. Candidate at the National University of Colombia.

He works as an advisor to International Affairs and Cooperation Office at the Ministry of National Education, and is currently leading the Promotion/Fostering of Higher Education Internationalisation Project

Coordinator: Fernando Téllez Mendivelso. Internationalisation advisor at The National Accreditation Council (Colombia).

Overview panel requirements

<i>Panel member</i>	<i>Man.</i>	<i>Internat.</i>	<i>Educat.</i>	<i>QA</i>	<i>Student</i>
• Hans De Wit	X	X	X	X	
• María Eugenia Llamas	X	X	X	X	
• Javier Cañón Pinto	X	X	X	X	
• Omar Camilo Mejía		X		X	X

Man.: Management experience;

Internat.: International expertise, preferably expertise in internationalisation;

Educat.: Relevant experience in teaching or educational development;

QA: Relevant experience in quality assurance or auditing; or experience as student auditor;

Student: Student with international or internationalisation experience;

Annex 2. Documents reviewed

- Self-evaluation report
- Project J
- Table of incoming and outgoing students of the last three years
- Table of Staff mobility
- ULS Final Accreditation Report given by CNA (2007)
- ULS Final reaccreditation report given by CNA (2011)
- Strategic Plan for Internationalisation
- Institutional Developing Plan 2010- 2015
- NEXUS supporting document

Annex 3. Site visit programme

Overview

Date: 17th and 18th November 2014
Institution: Universidad de la Salle (La Salle University)
Location: carrera 5 No. 59A-44, Bogotá, Colombia

Programme

Day 0: Monday 17 November 2014

18.00 - 21.00: Dinner and preparatory meeting of the panel

DAY 1: Thursday 18 November 2014

TIME	ACTIVITY
8:00 – 8:30	OPENING COMMITTEE OF EVALUATION Venue: Main meeting room 6th floor. Administrative Building
8:30 - 9:00	INSTITUTIONAL PRESENTATION AND OPEN DIALOG WITH VICE-RECTORS AND SENIOR EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General report about the institutional evolution –Senior management representatives • Mission, Vision and Institutional Educational Project Venue: Superior Board Room. Participants: Rector, Vice-rectors, Head of International Affairs Office, Head of Planning Office and Academic Peers.
9:00 – 10:00	DIALOG ABOUT THE CURRENT STATUS OF INTERNATIONALISATION COMPONENT AT THE UNIVERSITY WITH RESPONSIBLE STAKEHOLDERS ON THE PROCESS. Venue: Superior Board Room

	Participants: Rector, Vice-rectors, Head of International Affairs Office, Head of Planning Office and Academic Peers.
10:00- 11:00	DIALOG WITH HEAD AND ADVISORS OF THE INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS OFFICE Venue: Main meeting room Participants: Head of International Affairs Office, Advisor and International Assistants.
11:00 – 12:30	DIALOG WITH PROFESSORS AND RESEARCHERS –INTERNATIONAL NETWORKS Venue: Bicentennial House-Auditorium 2 Participants: Professors and Researchers of Schools at the university.
12:30 – 14:00	LUNCH WITH STRATEGIC ALLIES IN TOPICS REGARDING INTERNATIONALISATION (EXTERNAL COMPANIES REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHERS) Venue: Social Room
14:00 – 15:30	MEETING WITH STUDENTS (<i>incoming - outgoing</i>) Venue: Red Auditorium
15:30 – 16:30	DIALOG WITH ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES RESPONSIBLES Venue: Fourth Floor Meeting Room. Administrative Building Attendants: Financial Division, Human Resources Office, IT Center, Infrastructure, CPD, Publications Division, Admissions, Academic Career, among others.
16:30 – 18:00	VISIT TO UNIVERSITY FACILITIES (INTERNATIONAL CAMPUS - CHAPINERO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library • Language Labs • IT Labs • Jhonson & Jhonson Research Institute • International guest house
18:30 – 19:30	MEETING WITH GRADUATES BENEFICIARIES OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMMES Venue: Red Auditorium
19:30 – 21:00	BALANCE REUNION- DINNER WITH ACADEMIC PEERS

	Venue: Rector's Meeting Room
--	-------------------------------------

Day Two: Wednesday, 19 November 2014

TIME	ACTIVITY
8:00 – 9:00	<p>DIALOG WITH UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM CENTRAL COMITEE</p> <p>Venue: VRAC. Meeting Room</p> <p>Attendants: Curriculum Central Comitee permanent members</p>
9:00 -10:00	<p>PRESENTATION OF UTOPIA PROJECT AND DIALOG WITH FILANTROPY AND EXTERNAL FINANCING COORDINATION</p> <p>Venue: Main meeting room</p> <p>(Tour to City Historic Downtown – 20 mins ETA)</p>
10:30 – 11:30	<p>VISIT TO CANDELARIA CAMPUS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technological Innovation Centre • Urban Observatory <p>Participants: Engineering Dean and Habitat Sciences Dean</p> <p>Venue: Candelaria Campus</p>
11:30 – 12:30	<p>VISIT TO LANGUAGE CENTRE AND DIALOG WITH REPRESENTATIVES</p> <p>Venue: Language Centre – Carrera 15 # 49-71</p>
12:30 - 14: 00	<p>PRIVATE LUNCH-ACADEMIC PEERS</p> <p>Venue: Estelar Suites Jones Hotel</p>
14:00 – 16:00	<p>PEERS REPORT</p> <p>Drafting final report.</p> <p>Venue: Main meeting room</p>
16:00 - 17:00	<p>CLOSING MEETING</p>

Venue: Main meeting room

Participants: Rector, Vice-rectors, Head of International Affairs Office, Head of Planning Office and Academic Peers.

e | c | a

european consortium for accreditation

www.ecahe.eu