



# LITERATURE REVIEW ON QUALITY INDICATORS FOR QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

*- Clustering Document -*

SMART-QUAL

Structured Indicators to Manage HEI Quality System

Intellectual Output 1

**Project Reference: 2020-1-BE01-KA203-074900**



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



<b>1. Introduction</b>	3
<b>2. Results</b>	5
<b>2.1. Sources analyzed</b>	5
<b>2.2. Quality indicators collected</b>	6
<b>3. Principal findings to consider in QIS</b>	9
<b>4. References</b>	10
<b>5. Annex: indicators collected</b>	13

## 1. Introduction

Higher education quality management systems (QMS) are often criticised for being too-process oriented, box-ticking and insufficiently focused on consequential and generalizable outcomes. One of the reasons underlying these critics relies on the fact that QMS tend to rely on a large quantity of quality indicators, which makes their accuracy and timely analysis difficult, and consequently undermine their adequate use for decision-making at different levels (strategic, tactical, or operational).

In this context, the main objective of the SMART-QUAL project is to support higher education institutions (HEIs) in the implementation of effective internal QMS, by designing a set of quality indicators to support them. The indicators will be aligned in a structured catalogue according to the three main levels of decision making (strategic, tactical, and operational).

The quality indicators to be designed are meant to be applied by the institutions within their QMS and, as such, contribute to improve in the short and long term these systems (making them more efficient and effective).

The Activity 2 of SMART-QUAL project (*Literature Review on Quality Indicators for Quality Management Systems*) aims to collect quality indicators from relevant literature sources. The activity, together with Activity 1<sup>1</sup>, contribute to collect and cluster a relevant corpus of quality indicators used in QMS and/or highlighted in specialized literature. This corpus will be the framework to build our final Quality Indicators Scoreboard (QIS).

The methodology followed in this activity consists in documental analysis of relevant sources recommended by the project' experienced partners, trying to cover all the scope of SMART-QUAL project, namely, all the three missions of university. Up to 39 unique and valid resources have been analyzed, a mean of 4,3 resources per partner. These resources are of different types: scientific articles, project and institutional reports, books and other scholar

---

<sup>1</sup> See report of 19h February 2021 about this Activity, focused on collecting indicators and best practices identified in different Quality Management Systems.

publications and management documents, and partners collected up to 302 indicators from them, that will be added to the 223 quality indicators collected in the previous activity.

In this report, we are going to describe the results of the Activity 2 and cluster the Quality Indicators found, analyzing its coverage and identifying the relevant learnings we must consider in final QIS. The codification and integration of indicators will be a task of the next activity. This document is supplemented with a spreadsheet where all the indicators are gathered.

## 2. Results

### 2.1. Sources analyzed

Among the total of 49 resources analyzed, 39 are unique and valid resources. In Figure 1 some metadata are described.

Figure 1. Description of resources analyzed.

<b>Type of resource</b>	<b>%</b>
Scientific article	58%
Report	23%
Management doc.	8%
Others	11%
<b>Date</b>	<b>%</b>
2020-2018	46%
2017-2014	18%
2013-2011	10%
Older	26%
<b>Peer reviewed (articles)</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	100%

Scientific article is the type of resources mostly collected, followed by reports. We can find reports about other projects and studies, and institutional reports from bodies like the European University Association, the European Commission or different Quality Agencies. Management document, books or conference proceedings are other type of resources considered.

Almost a half of resources analyzed where published/released in the last 3 years, so we can confirm that we have analyzed quite updated sources that lower the risk of ignoring current trends and uses in Quality Indicators. Besides, all scientific articles are peer reviewed, ensuring a minimum level of quality. Reports are not normally peer reviewed but, as the intellectual output of an institution or project, its multilateral nature guarantee a level of consistency.

Finally, we would like to point out some strengths of the analyzed resources:

- a) Some relevant projects are considered. For example, the SQELT project is another Erasmus+ initiative aiming to build a core dataset focused on Learning & Teaching indicators. 4 out of 9 partners have considered outputs related with this project, representing an undeniable precedent of SMART-QUAL project. This project identified more than 800 indicators used in HEIs. Other relevant projects or studies carry out a collection and clustering of quality indicators in different contexts: Anglo-Saxon, Latin-American and European.
- b) Management documents are also analyzed, focusing on quality indicators currently used by HEIs in different context and getting a point of view different than the scholar one.
- c) It is easier to find resources about Teaching & Learning, but different resources collected are focused specifically on Research and Relations with Society. This will help us to cover all the project scope.
- d) Up to 12 resources analyzed propose a subset of common quality indicators to be used in different scopes (6 for Teaching & Learning, 6 for Research, and 5 for Relations with Society), regions (Europe, the Nordic countries, Latin-America or world-wide) or idiosyncrasies (open science, politecnic HEIs, sustainability assessment...). This 12 resources will be a good starting point to build the SMART-QUAL QIS.

## 2.2. Quality indicators collected

During this activity partners have collected 302 quality indicators, that will be added to the 223 quality indicators collected in the previous activity. Some characteristics are described below.

Above 75% of the quality indicators are classified as Quantitative by partners. In Figure 2 we can see the predominance of Teaching & Learning indicators as it was expected, but a remarkable fact is that the other scopes are also covered. There are also some combinations of scopes, as some indicators could be suited in the monitoring of more than one university missions, depending on the approach considered.

Figure 2. Scope coverage.

Scope	%
Teaching & Learning	46%
Research	25%
Relations wih Society	14%
Combinations	15%

As far as decision-making level is concerned (Figure 3), project partners have classified the indicators mostly in tactical and combination of levels. This make sense as the strategical use of indicators depends on the approach and objectives of each HEIs, and the tactical-operational nature are more generalizable between HEIs. The high amount of combinations of decision-making levels (around a third of indicators), indicates also different uses per each indicator. Despite this fact, some indicators have been identified in a strategical level and will be a good basis for the future SMART-QUAL proposal.

Figure 3. Decision-making level practices identified.

Decision-making level	%
Strategic	13%
Tactical	36%
Operational	20%
Combinations	31%

Finally, in Figure 4 the coverage of ESG is described. Almost every standard is covered by indicators. The biggest amount of indicators is related with Research & development (70), followed by indicators about Student admission, progression, recognition and certification indicators (43), and External relations (40). It would be interesting to carry out further research of indicators related with Public Information and Cyclical External Quality Assurance, though the latter is quite more a qualitative condition determined by national legislation than a quantifiable standard.

Figure 4. ESG+A3ES adaptation coverage (indicators might be classified in more than 1 standard).

ESG (A3ES adaptation)	Indicators
1. Policy for quality assurance	14
1.1 Policy for quality assurance and pursuit of quality objectives	14
2. Quality assurance in the nuclear processes of the institutional mission	203
2.1 Design and approval of programs	4
2.2 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment	31
2.3 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification	43
2.4 Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programs	6

2.5 Research and development / targeted research and high level professional development	70
2.6 External relations	40
2.7 Internationalisation	9
3. Quality assurance in the management of resources and support services	33
3.1 Human resources	19
3.2 Material resources and services	13
4. Management and publication of information	20
4.1 Information management	13
4.2 Public information	1
5. Periodical assessment	9
5.1 Cyclical external quality assurance	0
5.2 Cyclical internal monitoring, evaluation and continuous improvement of the QMS.	9

A list of a subset<sup>2</sup> of the indicators collected, clustered by university mission addressed, can be found in the Annex. Partners have collected the most relevant indicators based on each resource approach or conclusions, and their own qualified experience. As the codification and integration of indicators will be a task of the next activity, the indicators in the list are neither treated nor harmonized.

<sup>2</sup> Indicators classified in a combination of missions are not included in this list. A complete list of indicators can be found in the spreadsheet supplemented.



### 3. Principal findings to consider in QIS

To sum up, we can identify some main findings from the literature review carried out in this activity of SMART-QUAL project:

- a) Adequate variety, updating and relevance of resources analyzed. Almost a half of resources analyzed were published/released in the last 3 years, and relevant antecedents, like SQELT project, are considered. Up to 12 proposals of common indicators to be used have been identified.
- b) The resources analyzed and the quality indicators collected cover the scope of the project. The risk of undervalue Research and Relations with Society missions, in front of the prolific topic of Teaching & Learning, is correctly managed. As far as ESG coverage is concerned, Figure 4 shows also the variety of quality dimensions covered.
- c) Further conceptual leveling will be required between partners in order to agree on main classificatory elements. This need is identified in the fact that the same indicator has been classified in a different nature, decision-making level or mission, depending on the resource and/or the partner background. Far from being a limitation it is a challenge that an harmonized and international QIS should address if it pretends to be useful and understandable.
- d) The latter is related with the idea that the SMART-QUAL project is not a theoretical project about indicators, quality or Higher Education. Our aim is to collect and analyze what is being done and propose a harmonized, synthetic and applicable scoreboard of indicators for QMS based on resources, best practices and relevant experiences. Accordingly, SMART-QUAL will have to put forward a well-founded proposal of, for example, relevant indicators for a decision-making level.

## 4. References

- Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C., & Pugini, F. (2008). The measurement of Italian universities' research productivity by a non parametric-bibliometric methodology. *Scientometrics*, 76(2), 225-244.
- Agencia Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad y Acreditación (2018). Nuevo modelo del Programa AUDIT (v1\_2018). ANECA <http://www.aneca.es/Programas-de-evaluacion/Evaluacion-institucional/AUDIT>
- Aix-Marseille University (2018). *Indicateurs et cibles de performance d'Aix-Marseille Univeriste. Maquette indicateurs de performance communs universités vague C 2018-2022* (Management document). [https://daji.univ-amu.fr/sites/daji.univ-amu.fr/files/ca\\_pv/indicateur\\_amu-ca\\_29\\_mai\\_cabinet.pdf](https://daji.univ-amu.fr/sites/daji.univ-amu.fr/files/ca_pv/indicateur_amu-ca_29_mai_cabinet.pdf)
- Anne Heldenbergh, Olivier Sénéchal. (2013). Adaptation du Balanced Scorecard en soutien aux démarches qualité et au pilotage d'universités. (Management Document) <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-0082312.7/file/BSCunivsite.pdf>
- Australian Learning & Teaching Council. (2008). *Review of Australian and International Performance Indicators and Measures of the Quality of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*. Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270456189\\_Review\\_of\\_Australian\\_and\\_international\\_performance\\_indicators\\_and\\_measures\\_of\\_the\\_quality\\_of\\_Teaching\\_and\\_Learning\\_in\\_higher\\_education\\_2008\\_Report\\_to\\_DEEWR](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270456189_Review_of_Australian_and_international_performance_indicators_and_measures_of_the_quality_of_Teaching_and_Learning_in_higher_education_2008_Report_to_DEEWR)
- Benito, M., & Romera, R. (2011). Improving quality assessment of composite indicators in university rankings: a case study of French and German universities of excellence. *Scientometrics* 89, 153 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-011-0419-5>
- Berzosa, A., Bernaldo, M. O., & Fernández-Sánchez, G. (2017). Sustainability assessment tools for higher education: An empirical comparative analysis. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 161, 812-820.
- Biscaia, R., Melo, A.I., Machado, I. Figueiredo, H., Rosa, M.J., & Rocha, P. (2020). Performance indicators for research and cultural creation activities in polytechnic higher education institutions: a consensus building approach. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 26, 281–294. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-019-09035-y>.
- Bruckmann, S., Rosa, M.J. & Nazaré, L. (2019). Third mission activities in quality assurance systems: do theory and practice match?. *EQAF Paper, 2019 European Quality Assurance Forum*, Berlin, Deutschland, 21-23
- Bruni, R., Catalano, G., Daraio, C., Gregori, M., & Moed, H.F. (2020). Studying the heterogeneity of European higher education institutions. *Scientometrics*, 125, 1117–1144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03717-w>
- Bucur, A., Kifor, C.V. & Marginean (2018). Evaluation of the quality and quantity of research results in higher education. *Quality & Quantity*, 52, 101-118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-016-0452-9>
- Di Berardino, D., & Corsi, C. (2018). A quality evaluation approach to disclosing third mission activities and intellectual capital in Italian universities. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*.
- Drennan, L.T. & Beck, M. (2001). Teaching quality performance indicators – key influences on the UK universities' scores. *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 92-102. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880110389663>
- 
- Expert Group on Knowledge Transfer Metrics. (2009). *Metrics for knowledge transfer from public research organisations in Europe*. European Commission. <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/d0dbd13d-6b28-4398-896b-0fe9cf0ed2cb>
- Ferreira, A., Santos, C., Azevedo, G., Gonçalves, J. & Oliveira, J. (2018). *Performance Indicators and Accountability in Portuguese Public Universities*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-3731-1.ch010>
- Fijałkowska, J. (2017). Key Performance Indicators for HEI's Measurement as an Important Element of Their Accountability. *Przedsiębiorczość i Zarządzanie*, 18(1.1), 57-71.

- Findler, F., Schönherr, N., Lozano, R., & Stacherl, B. (2018). Assessing the Impacts of Higher Education Institutions on Sustainable Development—An Analysis of Tools and Indicators. *Sustainability*, 11(1), 59. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11010059>
- Franceschini, F., & Turina, E. (2013). Quality improvement and redesign of performance measurement systems: an application to the academic field. *Quality & Quantity*, 47(1), 465-483.
- Hernandez-Diaz, P.M., Polanco, J.-A. & Escobar-Sierra, M. (2020). Building a measurement system of higher education performance: evidence from a Latin-American country, *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management* <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-04-2020-0133>.
- Kallio, K. M., Kallio, T. J., & Grossi, G. (2017). Performance measurement in universities: Ambiguities in the use of quality versus quantity in performance indicators. *Public Money & Management*, 37(4), 293-300.
- Leest, B., Mommers, A., Sijstermans, E & Verrijt, T. (2015). *Kwaliteitszorg en kwaliteitscultuur in het hoger onderwijs*. Onderwijsraad / Radboud Universiteit. <https://www.onderwijsraad.nl/binaries/onderwijsraad/documenten/rapporten/2015/08/28/studie-kwaliteitszorg-en-kwaliteitscultuur-in-het-hoger-onderwijs.-deel-1-literatuurstudie/Kwaliteitszorg-en-kwaliteitscultuur-Deel-1-1.7.pdf>
- Leiber, T. (2019). A general theory of learning and teaching and a related comprehensive set of performance indicators for higher education institutions. *Quality in Higher Education*, 25(1), 76-97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2019.1594030>
- Loukkola, T., Peterbauer, H., & Gover, A. (2020). *Exploring higher education indicators*. European University Association. <https://www.eua.eu/downloads/publications/indicators%20report.pdf>
- Marques, M. (2001). *Key performance indicators in Portuguese public universities*. <http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/09240.pdf>
- Miedema, F.; Mayer, K.; Holmberg, K. & Leonelli, S.(2018). *Incentives and Rewards to Engage in Open Science Activities*. Directorate-General for Research and Innovation- European Commission publishing services
- Murias, P., de Miguel, J. C., & Rodríguez, D. (2008). A composite indicator for university quality assesment: The case of Spanish higher education system. *Social Indicators Research*, 89(1), 129-146. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9226-z>
- Musa, M. (2019). An Analysis of Quality Assurance Key Performance Indicators in Research in Ugandan Universities. *International Journal of Instruction*. Volume 12, Issue 1, Pages 1567-1584. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.121100a>
- Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie. (2018). *Kwaliteitszorgstelsel vlaanderen 2019-2025: beoordelingskader opleidingsaccreditatie op maat van de eigen regie*. [https://www.nvao.net/files/attachments/.95/Beoordelingskader\\_opleidingsaccreditatie\\_omv\\_eigen\\_regie\\_2019\\_2025.pdf](https://www.nvao.net/files/attachments/.95/Beoordelingskader_opleidingsaccreditatie_omv_eigen_regie_2019_2025.pdf)
- Quaremme, M. (2012). *Influence du processus d'évaluation AEQES sur les démarches qualité dans l'enseignement supérieur* [Master dissertation, Univesite de Mons]. AEQES. [http://www.aeqes.be/documents/influence-aeqes%20\(3\).pdf](http://www.aeqes.be/documents/influence-aeqes%20(3).pdf)
- Sarrico, C. & Pinheiro, M. (2014). The characteristics of Portuguese management academics and their fit with teaching accreditation standards. *Management Decision*. Volume 53 Issue 3. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/MD-10-2013-0524/full/html>
- Sarrico, C. (Org.) (2010). *Indicadores de Desempenho para Apoiar os Processos de Avaliação e Acreditação de Cursos*. Lisboa: Agência de Avaliação e Acreditação do Ensino Superior. Accessed January 2020, at: [https://www.a3es.pt/sites/default/files/Estudo\\_IndicadoresDesempenho.pdf](https://www.a3es.pt/sites/default/files/Estudo_IndicadoresDesempenho.pdf)

Saúde, S., Rosa, M. J., Melo, A. I., Borralho, C., Figueiredo, H., Machado, I., Féria, I., Rocha, P., Biscaia, R., & Lopes, S. (Coord.) (2017). *Indicadores de Desempenho para as Instituições de Ensino Superior Politécnico: Investigação Aplicada, Criação Cultural e o Impacto Regional*. Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.

SQELT Project (2020). *Performance indicator set IV for learning and teaching (in Higher Education)*. Erasmus+ Programme.

[https://www.evalag.de/fileadmin/dateien/pdf/forschung\\_international/sqelt/Intellectual\\_outputs/sqelt\\_perfindicset4\\_o9\\_201127\\_final\\_sec.pdf](https://www.evalag.de/fileadmin/dateien/pdf/forschung_international/sqelt/Intellectual_outputs/sqelt_perfindicset4_o9_201127_final_sec.pdf)

Teixeira, P. (coord) (2019). *ATENA – Know to Intervene: Education Observatory*. Edulog - Fundação Belmiro de Azevedo [https://www.edulog.pt/investigacao\\_projeto/1](https://www.edulog.pt/investigacao_projeto/1)

The Danish Accreditation Institution. (2019). *Calculating quality: an overview of indicators used in external quality assurance of Hogher Education in the Nordics*. The Danish Accreditation Institution.

<https://akkr.dk/wp-content/filer/akkr/Calculating-quality-1.pdf>

Trinidad Requena, A. & Jaime Castillo, A. M. (2017). Meta-analysis of qualitative research. The Case of the Evaluation of the National Plan for Evaluation and Quality of Universities in Spain. *Revista Internacional de Sociología*. vol. LXV, nº 47, mayo-agosto, 45-71, 2007

Tucci, M., & Cellesi, L. (2008, February). Quality management in administrative services of the Italian universities. *In 10th QMOD Conference. Quality Management and Organizational Development. Our Dreams of Excellence*; 18-20 June; 2007 in Helsingborg; Sweden (No. 026). Linköping University Electronic Press.

Van den Eede, P. (2015). *Évaluation de la qualité dans l'enseignement supérieur :Légitimité et valeur ajoutée des experts-étudiants selon les différentes parties prenantes* [Master dissertation, Univesite de Mons].

AEQES. <http://www.aeqes.be/documents/m%C3%A9moire%20-%20PvdE%20AEQES.pdf>

Vieira E.S., Nouws H.P.A., Albergaria J.T., Matos C.D. & Gomes J.A.N.F. (2009). Research quality indicators for Brazilian, Portuguese and Spanish universities. *12th International Conference on Scientometrics and Informetrics, ISSI*

## 5. Annex: indicators collected

The following 3 tables show a gross (non-treated) subset of indicators collected, clustered by university mission addressed. Indicators classified in a combination of missions are not included (a complete list of indicators can be found in the spreadsheet supplemented).

Annexed table 1. Teaching & Learning gross list of quality indicators collected.

Name	Description
<b>Supportive learning environment</b>	Students' feeling of legitimization within the university community
<b>Overall student satisfaction</b>	The proportion of coursework graduates who were satisfied with the overall quality of their course
<b>Staff with teaching qualification</b>	Proportion of staff who have attained a teaching qualification
<b>Use of research findings to inform teaching</b>	Extent to which academic staff are aware of and use research on the relationship between teaching strategies and student learning in the educational
<b>Median salary</b>	The median salary level of graduates who were in full-time employment.
<b>Attrition rate</b>	Proportion of student drop-out from course
<b>Employer satisfaction</b>	Satisfaction of employers with graduates
<b>Policies for minority enrolment</b>	Relevant policies for increased minority enrolment
<b>Student enrollment</b>	Number of students enrolled
<b>% of teaching staff holding a PhD</b>	Proportion of teaching staff holding a PhD
<b>Student-staff ratio</b>	Number of student per each staff unit
<b>Overall student satisfaction</b>	Overall satisfaction of students
<b>Drop-out rate</b>	Proportion of students who don't achieve a degree
<b>% graduate employment</b>	Proportion of graduates employment some time after graduation
<b>% student mobility</b>	Proportion of students that undertake a mobility during their studies
<b>Number of students enrollment</b>	Contextual information. Distinguished by program level.
<b>Graduation rate</b>	Proportion of bachelor's students and master's students passing each year (namely, not drop-out)
<b>Percentage of students completing in nominal time</b>	Percentage of students completing in nominal time
<b>Percentage of students completing in nominal time plus one</b>	Percentage of students completing in nominal time + 1
<b>Share of students on exchange</b>	Share of foreign students coming or students going abroad
<b>Share of full professors</b>	Share of professors not in recruitment positions (PHD students, postdocs...)
<b>Quality of library services</b>	Quality of physical and virtual library service
<b>Teaching experience</b>	Overall quality of study programmes, courses and students' experience of teaching
<b>Student workload</b>	Student workload (according to relevant quality criteria to be identified, e.g. number of learning hours per semester week, number of courses)
<b>Appropriateness of intended learning outcomes</b>	Appropriateness of intended learning outcomes (exemplary quality criteria include clear formulation and transparency of goals of study modules and courses, correlation of intended learning outcomes to contents of study programmes and courses)

<b>RSP</b>	Ratio of students to professors
<b>RPC</b>	Ratio of professors to clerks
<b>RSC</b>	Ratio of students to clerks
<b>Number of bachelors' degrees</b>	number of students graduating in bachelor degrees
<b>Number of masters' degrees</b>	number of students graduating in master's degrees
<b>Number of degrees by foreigners and student exchange</b>	number of foreign students graduating from courses offered by the university
<b>Percentage of employment of graduated</b>	Ratio of the number of students who found employment to the total number of graduate students
<b>Teaching offer.</b>	It is related to the amount of teaching hours provided by the Department to the Faculties.
<b>Lecturing</b>	Full time teaching staff/student ratio
<b>Lecturing</b>	Students that graduate within a "suitable" length of time
<b>Fulfilment of social needs</b>	Students enrolled on their chosen course
<b>International student mobility</b>	Exchange students
<b>Social sustainability</b>	To involve students in social actions through to promote students associations on sustainability issues
<b>Curricular environmental sustainability</b>	To improve the sustainability offer with entire courses or new degree or masters
<b>Student progression</b>	Statistics that indicate to which extent students are able to efficiently and successfully complete the programme.
<b>Student/staff ratio</b>	A statistic that indicates how many students, on average, there are for each staff member.
<b>Internationalization statistics</b>	Indicators that reveal to which extent students gain 'international experience' during the programme. This can be in the form of students partaking in exchange programmes, but also in the form of international elements in the curriculum or events.
<b>Gender balance concerning staff &amp; students</b>	The extent of which there is a gender balance in student and/or staff population.
<b>Learning outcomes</b>	The learning outcomes of the programme constitute a clear and programme-specific application of the international demands regarding level, content and orientation of the curriculum
<b>Teaching staff</b>	Teaching staff recruited by the programme are able to optimally present the students with the opportunities needed to reach the learning outcomes
<b>Facilities</b>	The programme presents students with adequate and easily accessible facilities and study guidance
<b>Teaching environment</b>	The teaching environment stimulates students to play an active role in their learning process and contributes to rapid study progress.
<b>Assessment</b>	The assessment of students reflects the learning process and concretises the intended learning outcome
<b>Information for students</b>	The programme offers complete and easily understood information regarding all phases of the study tract
<b>Student's entry levels</b>	Starting levels of students, used as a proxy indicator of future scholastic achievement.
<b>Faculty/student ratio</b>	(en blanc)
<b>Resources</b>	Resources, financial and otherwise, spend on creating an optimal learning environment.
<b>Student satisfaction</b>	Surveys that probe the satisfaction of students with the curriculum, facilities, evaluations and their experience within the programme in a wider sense.
<b>Education outputs</b>	A collection of indicators that shed light on the relative success of students following graduation.

<b>Reputation</b>	The reputation of the programme or institution, both internally and externally. Can be among external stakeholders, but also society at large.
<b>Institutional expenditure</b>	Various indicators that shed light on the extent of which the institute financially prioritizes various expenditures on the student's behalf.
<b>Social and societal competences</b>	Student satisfaction survey about measures of encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, ethnic, religious)/provision of opportunities for students to be involved socially/provision of student support for managing non-academic responsibilities (e.g. work, family)/experience in discussions with diverse others
<b>Teaching skills</b>	Indicators that shed light on the extent teaching staff invests and takes parts in activities that increase teaching skills and competences.
<b>Student interaction with learning tools</b>	Various proxy measures that indicate how and how much students interact and engage with the provided (online) learning tools. Especially with modern online platforms a lot of this data is automatically collected and, often, readily available for analysis
<b>Coursework performance</b>	A measure of how 'important' intra-coursework is relative to final examinations.
<b>Curriculum</b>	This combines both the content and structure of the curriculum; whether it covers sufficient ground to guarantee the learning outcomes are obtained as well as whether it forms a cohesive logical structure.
<b>Assessment</b>	The extent of which the assessment/evaluation of the students' work can be demonstrated to be reliable and valid.
<b>Staff</b>	Both quality and quantity of teaching staff combines into this singular indicator.
<b>Facilities/resources</b>	This combines both the programme-specific as well as institution-wide facilities, services and resources provided to the students. This is reviewed in light of the needs of students of a specific programme.
<b>Internal QA</b>	Structure and organization of the internal QA departments, and how this is intended to structurally improve the quality of the programme.
<b>Ratio of students per teacher</b>	Measures the ratio between the number of students in higher education or in each partition and the number of academic staff in higher education or in that same partition.
<b>Percentage of higher education students in each course, institution, region, subsystem, subsector, gender and level of education that complete their degree in the expected number of years</b>	Measures the percentage of higher education students in each partition that conclude their degree in the expected number of years. It measures the success of students in concluding their degree and also the efficiency and quality of institutions.
<b>Ratio of students per teacher holding a doctorate</b>	Measures the ratio of students to teachers holding a doctorate. It is an indicator of the characteristics of the system and institutions with implications for its efficiency and quality.
<b>Final mean classification of each degree's (undergraduate or integrated master) graduates</b>	Measures the final mean classification of the graduates of each degree (undergraduate or integrated master) in year X
<b>Ratio of students per FTE teacher</b>	Measures the ratio of students to FTE academic staff. It is an indicator of the characteristics of the system and institutions with implications for its efficiency and quality.
<b>Academic staff number</b>	Measures the number of staff per study programme or higher education institution
<b>Level of student satisfaction</b>	Measures the level of student satisfaction through student surveys

<b>Students per staff ratio</b>	Measures the number of students per academic staff
<b>Percentage of academic staff holding a doctorate</b>	Measures the number of doctorates per number of staff
<b>Percentage of graduates</b>	Measures the number of graduates per number of students
<b>Graduation rate</b>	Measures the number of graduates per number of students enrolled
<b>Dropout rate</b>	Measures the number of dropout students per number of enrolled students
<b>Progression rate</b>	Measures the progression rates per study programme
<b>Number of enrollments until completion</b>	Average number of enrollments until completion of the study programme
<b>Time to degree completion (per degree)</b>	Average time to complete a degree (per degree)
<b>Graduates' grade</b>	Average grade of the graduates
<b>Teachers' workload</b>	Official teaching commitment in semester hours per week
<b>Quality of teaching staff</b>	Percentage of teaching staff who participated in activities to improve their learning skills
<b>Quality of students' assessments/ examinations</b>	Teaching staff peer evaluation of assessment/examination protocols
<b>Students' experience</b>	Freshmen and/or undergraduates and/or graduates and/or postgraduates and/or alumni level of satisfaction about their study experience/student life cycle
<b>Dropout</b>	Number of students who abandoned their study programme/who changed to another institution/who left higher education per year and per study programme
<b>Non-completion of study programmes</b>	Number of students who did not complete the programme modules they had started/the first year of study/ the undergraduate programmes (Bachelor graduation)/ undergraduate programmes within the planned programme duration (Bachelor graduation on time)/graduate programmes (Master graduation)/the graduate programmes within the planned programme duration (Master graduation on time)/ their long first degree (=more than 4 years) (long first-degree graduation)/their long first degree within the planned programme duration (long first-degree graduation on time)/ the postgraduate programmes (postgraduate graduation)/the postgraduate programmes within the planned programme duration (postgraduate graduation on time)
<b>Students' coursework performance</b>	Personal student coursework grades and earned credit points
<b>Level of satisfaction with the organisation of course sessions</b>	Level of satisfaction of students about organisation of course sessions/flexible learning (flexibility in the requirements, time and location of study, teaching, assessment and certification)
<b>Learning support services</b>	Expert assessment and/or satisfaction of students and/or satisfaction of teaching staff about the quality support for students from disadvantaged backgrounds (e.g., minorities, disabled, refugees)
<b>Three-years BA success rate</b>	Percentage of students enrolled in the three years BAs who successfully got their Degree
<b>Four-years BA success rate</b>	Percentage of students enrolled in the four years BAs who successfully got their Degree
<b>2 or 3 years "Diplome Universitaire de Technologie" rate</b>	Percentage of students enrolled in 2 or 3 years DUT who successfully got their Degree
<b>2 years Master degree success' rate</b>	Percentage of students enrolled in the 2 years Master Degree who successfully got their Degree
<b>Score of perceived quality of teaching through pedagogical surveys</b>	Surveys filled by students who answer series of closed questions about their instructors



<b>Mentoring rate</b>	This shows the ratio between the number of students and the number of instructors at various levels
<b>Number of hours of university pedagogy training offered to teachers</b>	The training opportunities offered to HEIs staff
<b>Average duration of studies</b>	Shows the distribution of students by degrees (BA, MA, Ph.D)
<b>Student results</b>	Observation and analysis of student results.
<b>The implication of the student</b>	The student is a co-producer of his training.
<b>The functioning of the institution</b>	The methods applied by the institution, the institutional dynamics, its pedagogical policy.
<b>Student satisfaction</b>	Refers to the objectives of training and teaching.
<b>Teaching Resources - Teaching staff</b>	Proportion of teaching staff with verified doctorate qualifications (PhD or equivalent)/with verified teaching qualifications/participating in professional development activities, per subject field
<b>Learning Resources - Library related</b>	Title and number of books and/or periodical print subscriptions and/or periodical online subscriptions held in library per subject field or per study programme
<b>Financial investment and income in T&amp;L - Institutional expenditure</b>	Percentage of total institutional expenditure dedicated to L&T activities (core education expenditure)
<b>Gender balance - Students</b>	Ratio of female to male Bachelor/Master/postgraduate students enrolled per subject field or study programme
<b>Quality of teaching staff, quality teaching and teaching staff engagement - Teaching staff competences</b>	Satisfaction survey of students about teaching staff's subject-matter competences/methodological competences/vocational training competences/digital skills competences/social competences (e.g., team, communication and leadership competences)/respect and interest for students/encouraging students' autonomous thinking and acting/pedagogical knowledge and skills (e.g., knowledge of teaching models and learning processes)/sensitivity to class level and progress/fostering sustainability values (social, ecological, economical)/feedback to students (e.g., on work in progress, test, completed assignments)
<b>Quality learning and student engagement - Student workload</b>	Student assessment of workload (e.g., selfassessment, learning diary, think-aloud protocols)
<b>Quality learning and student engagement - Overall quality of learning experience</b>	Satisfaction survey of students about overall quality of their learning experience
<b>Student success - Coursework performance</b>	Assessment/examination grades and earned credit points during the study
<b>Completion rate</b>	Completion rate
<b>Student success - satisfaction</b>	Student success - satisfaction
<b>Admissions by gender/face/geographic/specials/socio-economic</b>	Admissions by gender/face/geographic/specials/socio-economic
<b>Percentage of full professor on the total academic staff</b>	Percentage of full professor on the total academic staff
<b>Percentage of women on the total number of professors</b>	Percentage of women on the total number of professors
<b>Highest degree</b>	Habilitation is a degree which is a prerequisite to become a full professor (bachelor, master, doctorate)
<b>Professional category</b>	Teacher professional category (Assistant, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor)
<b>Employment regime</b>	Employment regime of the HEIs teachers (Full time with exclusivity; Full time without exclusivity; Part time)
<b>Internationalisation</b>	Last degree awarded in Portugal; Last degree not awarded in Portugal

<b>Number of doctors' theses with a favourable award</b>	Number of doctors' theses with a favourable award / total number of doctorate candidates (per academic course or degree)
<b>Number of students</b>	Number of students enrolled / Square metres for the teaching activity and their complementary services (per degree).
<b>Number of hours for professional training of staff</b>	Number of hours for professional training of staff / Total number of staff in administration and services
<b>Number of master's/ post-graduate courses</b>	Number of Masters and Post-graduate courses / Number of graduates (per academic course and degrees)
<b>number of teaching staff</b>	the standard teaching staff/student
<b>Number of students</b>	the standard teaching staff/student
<b>mobility actions</b>	Incentives for the qualification of the teaching and non teaching staff
<b>Colloquium/Forum/Congress</b>	Incentives for the qualification of the teaching and non teaching staff
<b>number of Department</b>	courses pedagogical efficiency indicators
<b>retention rate</b>	courses pedagogical efficiency indicators
<b>Enrolment of students at the University</b>	number of students enrolled at Islamic University in Uganda
<b>Percentage of foreign students</b>	Proportion of students with a foreign nationality to the number of full-time students in the academic course
<b>Percentage of academic staff with a PhD degree</b>	Proportion of Doctors from full-time staff number in the academic course
<b>Percentage of graduate studies (official Master's and PhD)</b>	Includes official Master's and PhD courses offered by the institutions in the academic course relative to the overall official studies
<b>Percentage of graduate students (enrolled in official Master's and PhD)</b>	Represents the students who are enrolled in graduate studies, that is, in official Master's and PhD courses in the academic course 2007/2008 relative to the total number of students enrolled in official courses (undergraduate and graduate studies)
<b>Full time teaching staff/student ratio</b>	Full time teaching staff/student ratio
<b>Students that graduate within a "suitable" length of time</b>	Students that graduate within a "suitable" length of time
<b>Students enrolled on their chosen course</b>	Percentage of students that successfully enrol in one of the degrees which is either their first or second preference as a proportion of the total number of students that begin year one of the degree
<b>Student/staff ratio</b>	Average ratio for FTE total student numbers on non-franchised courses and total teaching only, plus teaching/research staff.
<b>Library and computing spend</b>	Spending averaged over three years on the academic services: central libraries and information services and central computers and computer networks per FTE student numbers.

Annexed table 2. Research gross list of quality indicators collected.

Name	Description
<b>Share of publications in highest ranking journals</b>	Percentage of publications in journals classified as "highest rank" according to Norwegian index
<b>Publication points</b>	Based on some Index (Norwegian Scientific Index or Danish BFI system)
<b>Research agreements</b>	All contracts where a firm funds the Research Organization to perform research on behalf of the firm, with the results usually provided to the firm. Include collaborative agreements where both partners provide funding and share the results. Exclude cases where the firm funds a research chair or other research of no expected commercial value to the firm. Also exclude consultancy contracts.
<b>Invention disclosures</b>	Descriptions of inventions or discoveries that are evaluated by the Office staff or other technology experts to assess their commercial application.
<b>Patent applications</b>	New priority patent applications. Exclude double counting, such as a patent application for the same invention in more than one patent jurisdiction
<b>Patent grants</b>	Technically unique patents granted. Count a patent grant for the same invention in two or more countries as one technically unique patent. If a technically unique patent grant has been counted in a previous year, it cannot be counted again.
<b>Licences executed</b>	Include all licenses, options and assignments (LOAs) for all types of Intellectual Property (copyright, know-how, patents, trademarks, etc.). Count multiple (identical) licenses with a value each of less than 500 Euros as one license. A license grants the right to use IP in a defined field of use or territory. An option grants the potential licensee a time period to evaluate the technology and negotiate the terms of a license. An assignment transfers all or part of the right to IP to the licensee.
<b>License income earned</b>	Total income from all types of know-how and IP (patents, copyright, designs, material transfer agreements, confidentiality agreements, plant breeder rights, etc.) before disbursement to the inventor or other parties. Include license issue fees, annual fees, option fees and milestone, termination and cash-in payments. Exclude license income forwarded to other institutions than those served by the KTO or to companies.
<b>Spin-offs established</b>	A new company expressly established to develop or exploit IP or know-how created by the Research Organization with a formal contractual relationship for this IP or know-how, such as a license or equity agreement. Include, but do not limit to, spin-offs established by the institution's staff. Exclude start-ups that do not sign a formal agreement for developing IP or know-how created by the institution.
<b>PU output</b>	The PU output, for the i-th UDA (University Disciplinary Areas) of the j-th university, is calculated as the sum of publications with at least one author from university j belonging to Area i.
<b>PC output</b>	The PC output is a similar index to the PU, but takes into account authors' "contribution", measured as the ratio between the number of authors belonging to that UDA (University Disciplinary Areas) and the total number of authors of the publication

<b>SS output (scientific strenght)</b>	Equals to the weighted average of total publications by each university within each UDA (University Disciplinary Areas). The weights, in particular, are referred to the impact factor of the journal in which each publication is included
<b>Number of publications</b>	Number of scientific publications by university staff
<b>Amount of external funding</b>	Economic funds obtained through activities with third parties
<b>Expenses.</b>	It considers the operating expenses of the Department
<b>Funding.</b>	Indicator considers the amount of funds raised by the Department from local, national and international research programs.
<b>PhD students.</b>	Number of PhD students in the Department.
<b>Scientific output.</b>	It evaluates the Departments scientific output on the basis of some bibliometric criteria.
<b>Research</b>	Per-researcher Income from research
<b>Research</b>	Doctoral theses per PhD
<b>Postgraduate students</b>	Postgraduate students
<b>Sustainability Community Outreach</b>	To promote research on sustainability (increase the number of researchers in this field, to collaborate with expert groups and to attend seminars)
<b>Research</b>	Total research output of the programme/HEI.
<b>Percentage of revenue from research</b>	Measures the relative weight of the revenue coming from research in the total revenue generated by the institution
<b>Scientific production with peer review per FTE teacher</b>	Measures the scientific production per FTE teacher
<b>Impact of scientific production per FTE teacher</b>	Measure the impact of scientific production per FTE teacher
<b>Research effort index per FTE teacher</b>	Measures the dedication and involvement in research activities
<b>Ratio of publications referenced in SCOPUS in which at least one of the authors is affiliated to the institution, per FTE teacher</b>	Measures the ratio between the number of publications referenced in SCOPUS in which at least one of the authors is affiliated with the institution (or another partition) and the total number of teachers in full-time regime in this unit of analysis. It is an indicator of efficiency and impact.
<b>Ratio of citations referenced in the SCOPUS database in which at least one of the authors is affiliated to the institution per FTE teacher</b>	Measures the ratio between the number of citations referenced in the SCOPUS database in which at least one of the authors is affiliated to the institution (or another partition) and the total number of FTE academic staff in this unit of analysis. It is an indicator of efficiency and impact.
<b>Ratio of patents obtained in which at least one of the authors is affiliated to the institution per FTE teacher</b>	Measures the ratio between the number of patents registered in the Instituto Nacional de Propriedade Intelectual (INPI)'s database in which at least one of the authors is affiliated into the institution (or another partition) and the total number of FTE academic staff in this unit of analysis. It is an indicator of efficiency and impact.
<b>Academic staff publications</b>	Measures the number of academic staff publications
<b>Academics in research units</b>	Measures the average number of academics per funded research units
<b>Doctoral students supervised per academic</b>	Measures the number of candidates enrolled in doctoral programmes per number of academic staff holding a PhD
<b>Publications per academic holding a PhD</b>	Measures the number of publications indexed in bibliographic databases per number of academics holding a PhD
<b>R&amp;D expenses per academic holding a PhD</b>	Expenses with R&D per academic holding a PhD
<b>Patents per academic holding a PhD</b>	Number of patents per academic holding a PhD
<b>Publicatios and presentations at academic conferences per FTE teacher</b>	Number of publications and/or presentations at academic conferences during a certain time period per full-time-equivalent member of the teaching staff and/or per subject field

<b>Ph.D. success' rate</b>	Percentage of students enrolled in a Ph.D who successfully got their Degree
<b>Rate of obtaining research contracts versus bids</b>	Indicates the percentage of research contracts obtained by a HEI in comparison to the number of bids it has submitted
<b>Papers and Citations</b>	Papers and Citations
<b>Research-income expenditures</b>	Research-income expenditures
<b>Research awards</b>	Research awards
<b>Peer reviewed scientific production per full-time equivalent academic</b>	Peer reviewed scientific production per full-time equivalent academic
<b>Own revenues for academic research per full-time equivalent academic</b>	Own revenues for academic research per full-time equivalent academic
<b>Number of papers in top 10% divided by the Total academic staff (FTE)</b>	Number of papers in top 10% (yearly average) divided by the Total academic staff (FTE)
<b>Percentage of papers in top 10%</b>	Percentage of papers in top 10% (yearly average)
<b>Percentage of papers with international collaborations</b>	Percentage of papers with international collaborations (yearly average)
<b>Number of Papers indexed in WoS (WoS = Thomson Reuters Web of Science) classified journals with relative influence score</b>	Publications in Web of Science well classified journals.
<b>Number of WoS–AHCI publications, national or international</b>	Publications in the Web of Science - Arts and Humanities Citation Index.
<b>Number of scientific books published with international publishing houses, in an international language</b>	Number of scientific books published with international publishing houses, in an international language
<b>Number of book chapters published with international publishing houses, in an international language</b>	Number of book chapters published with international publishing houses, in an international language
<b>Number of citations</b>	Number of citations
<b>Number of OSIM patents / international patents / triadic patents</b>	Patents from Romania (OSIM) / International / Recognized simultaneously by the European Patent Office (EPO), the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) and the Japan Patent Office (JPO).
<b>Number of organized international scientific conferences: main organizer / member</b>	Number of organized international scientific conferences: main organizer / member
<b>Number of applications to international / national research competitions</b>	Number of applications to international / national research competitions
<b>Number of invited professors / researchers at foreign universities or research centres</b>	Number of invited professors / researchers at foreign universities or research centres
<b>Research</b>	Categorised by the researchers (no research; some research; relevant research)
<b>Number of articles in magazines</b>	Number of articles in magazines such as referee / Total number of researchers (per knowledge area).
<b>Budget resources used in research activities</b>	Budget resources used in research activities / Total number of researchers (by areas of knowledge)
<b>Number of seminars</b>	Number of seminars carried out, outside of the university scope / Total number of teach and research staff
<b>publications by faculty</b>	indicator of quality of the teaching staff of each institution
<b>publications/articles</b>	indicator of quality of the teaching staff of each institution
<b>Funding of research activities at the University</b>	Amount of funds raised to research
<b>Research facilities available at the University</b>	Facilities directed to support research (such as technology, libraries, laboratories, link to the cyber world, and mechanisms to support the provided technology)

<b>Faculties/ departments research scholarly activities at the University</b>	Number of scholarly activities at the university
<b>Staff to conduct/ supervise research at the University</b>	Number of staff available to conduct/supervise research at the University
<b>Students' success in conducting research at the University</b>	Success of students conducting research at the university
<b>Publishing researched work</b>	Number of publications
<b>Third-party funding/total funding</b>	Represents the income that institutions receive for research from different public and private institutions.
<b>Employer's expenses (nonacademic and academic staff support)/total funding</b>	Represents the non-academic and academic expenses supported by the institutions, relative to the total funding received by the institutions.
<b>Global Relative Impact</b>	The ratio between the actual number of citations obtained by the Documents and the expected citations for the same set of documents if they were to perform as the world average. The expected citations are calculated multiplying the number of published documents by the world average number of citations per document.
<b>The ratio of the number of documents to the number of doctorates awarded</b>	The ratio of the number of documents to the number of doctorates awarded.
<b>Per-researcher Income from research (in thousands of euros)</b>	Reflects the income (in thousands of euros) obtained to each researcher
<b>Doctoral theses per PhD</b>	Reflects the number of successful doctoral theses in relation to the total number of PhD holders (i.e. potential thesis directors)

Annexed table 3. Relation with Society gross list of quality indicators collected.

Name	Description
<b>Stat-ups in the region</b>	Stat-ups in the region
<b>% alumni in regional job market</b>	Share of graduated that is working in regional job market
<b>Quality of third-party contracts</b>	Ratio of funds procured by universities from external actors to the number of contracts signed
<b>ResPat: No. research patents</b>	Number of patents registered by the university
<b>FundsPat</b>	Economic value generated from the sale or licensing of patents
<b>ASO: No. spin offs</b>	Number of spin offs founded by the university
<b>Quality of museum goods</b>	Number of objects of museum value present for each research area
<b>Environmental sustainability</b>	To organize a sustainable and efficient use of resources (incentive for the use of sustainable transport, use of plastic, type os energy, etc)
<b>Operations/Educations</b>	To include new challenges in written policies for local and global sustainability
<b>Number of patents per FTE teacher</b>	Measures the knowledge production capacity with potential for commercial application
<b>Royalty revenue and licensing agreements per FTE teacher</b>	Measures the ability to generate revenue for the institution from knowledge transfer activities
<b>Percentage of revenue from services rendered</b>	Measures the relative weight of the revenue generated by the institution in consultancy activities, the provision of services and professional development or specialization courses that are not integrated in first and second cycle degrees.
<b>Contribution to the qualification of the active population of the NUTS III</b>	Measures the contribution to the qualification of the active population, in the region where the institution is inserted (NUTS III)
<b>Ratio of revenue in service provision per FTE teacher</b>	Measures the ratio between the volume of revenue from service provision, including continuous training, of the institution (or other partition), and the number of FTE academic staff. It is an indicator of efficiency and capacity to generate own revenue through the provision of services.
<b>Percentage of revenue from services rendered compared to the operating budget</b>	The indicator represents the proportion between the volume of revenue from the provision of services, including lifelong training actions of the institution (or other partition), and the operating budget of that unit. It is an indicator of efficiency and capacity to generate own revenue through the provision of services.
<b>Professional insertion's rate</b>	Professional situation of the graduate students at the end of the first and second years after the year of graduation
<b>Professional integration's rate</b>	Professional situation of the graduate students after a given period of time
<b>Percentage of subsidized students</b>	Indicates the percentage of students who receive a financial support
<b>Erasmus exchange students in the total students' population</b>	Indicates the percentage of exchange students within the total students' population
<b>Knowledge- transfer business connections</b>	Knowledge- transfer business connections
<b>Knowledge-transfer community connections</b>	Knowledge-transfer community connections
<b>Employer reputation</b>	Employer reputation
<b>Employability</b>	Employability
<b>Co-patents per polytechnic higher education institution</b>	Co-patents per polytechnic higher education institution

<b>Patents per polytechnic higher education institution</b>	Patents per polytechnic higher education institution
<b>Royalties and licence agreements revenue per full-time equivalent academic</b>	Royalties and licence agreements revenue per full-time equivalent academic
<b>Contribution to active population qualification of the region</b>	Contribution to active population qualification of the region
<b>Attractiveness of young population for the region</b>	Attractiveness of young population for the region
<b>Overall total number of patent applications</b>	Overall total number of patent applications (yearly average)
<b>Percentage of funding from third parties on total funding</b>	Percentage of funding from third parties on total funding
<b>Third party funds (coming from public and private sources) per academic staff (expressed in FTE)</b>	Third party funds (coming from public and private sources) per academic staff (expressed in FTE)
<b>Existence of a strategy for technology transfer and innovation, included in the mission statement and/or in the strategic plan</b>	Existence of a strategy for technology transfer and innovation, included in the mission statement and/or in the strategic plan
<b>Number of R&amp;D contracts with non-academic partners / Number of teaching staff FTE</b>	Number of R&D contracts with non-academic partners / Number of teaching staff FTE
<b>Existence of entrepreneurship fostering initiatives</b>	Existence of entrepreneurship fostering initiatives
<b>Number of cultural events promoted by the university open to community</b>	Number of cultural events promoted by the university open to community
<b>Number of university members (staff and students) engaged in civic projects for community / Number of university members</b>	Number of university members (staff and students) engaged in civic projects for community / Number of university members
<b>Number of athletes involved in sports events held at the university's infrastructures</b>	Number of athletes involved in sports events held at the university's infrastructures
<b>Patents</b>	Number of registered patents / Number research projects (by areas of knowledge).
<b>Patenting ideas got out of research</b>	Number of patents ideas generated by research
<b>Making of prototypes got out of research</b>	Number of prototypes generated by research
<b>Making products out of research</b>	Number of products generated by research





[www.smartqual.eu](http://www.smartqual.eu)



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union