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1. DESCRIPTION OF CTI’s IQA SYSTEM AND MAIN TOOLS AND ACTIVITIES

CTI put into place an internal quality system in 2008. Since then, CTI has been committed to deploying its internal quality assurance and to developing specific tools for the tracking and control of its assessment and accreditation process.

As stated in the ESG standard 3.6., this system includes:

- Defining, assuring and enhancing the quality and integrity of CTI’s activities through steering committees and working groups which submit their proposals to be discussed and - where appropriate - voted during meetings of the Board and plenary assembly.
- By-laws and charters which describe and guarantee the appropriate professional and ethical behaviour of CTI members, experts, observers, staff.
- Training sessions for members and experts to ensure their appropriate ownership of CTI’s guidelines and processes and prepare their expected behaviour during evaluation procedures.
- Internal and external feedback mechanisms, for instance through:
  - satisfaction surveys filled in by HEIs, experts, members;
  - meetings and working groups with stakeholders;
  - an annual conference;
  - transversal analysis and reports on CTI's procedures; …
- Communication and information on all activities, internally with members, experts and staff; externally with stakeholders, including the relevant ministries which publish a yearly joint decree listing all accreditation decisions.
- Promote the academic and professional recognition of the engineering degree and support the institutions by:
  - publishing the results of the accreditation procedures and information on the level and contents of the engineering degree;
  - handing out certificates to graduates confirming the level and programme outcomes of the degree;
  - having CTI’s standards and guidelines certified by CNEFOP (and thus qualifying accredited programmes for public funding for continuing education) see chapter 9.7.4. below
  - signing agreements with foreign organisations;
  - participating in European projects;
  - organising and participating in national and international events;
  - transversal analysis and reports on the engineering education and profession.

**Evidence and references**

Evidence 9.6.1: [Link to CTI's website page on internal quality assurance](#)
Evidence 9.6.2: [Link to CTI's website page on CTI's steering committees](#)
Evidence 9.6.3: [Link towards the by-laws and charters on CTI's website](#)
Evidence 9.6.4: [Internal satisfaction survey addressed to CTI members](#)
Evidence 9.6.5: [Internal satisfaction survey addressed to CTI French and international experts](#)
Evidence 9.6.6: [Annual satisfaction survey addressed to deans of HEIs](#)
Evidence 9.6.7: **CTI's standards and guidelines (R&O), Volume 4**: In-depth thematic notes
2. MAPPING DIAGRAM

COMMISSION DES TITRES D’INGENIEUR:
MAPPING OF THE INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMME EVALUATION REQUESTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANIFICATION OF EVALUATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMME EVALUATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCREDITATION REPORTING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT PROCESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGISTICS OF EVALUATION PROCESS &amp; MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTING &amp; BUDGET MONITORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION SYSTEM &amp; ARCHIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS &amp; PLENARY ASSEMBLY MONITORING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SERVICE PROVIDED AND STAKEHOLDERS' SATISFACTION
3. CTI’S QUALITY OBJECTIVES AND IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES AS REGARDS STAKEHOLDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level / stakeholder</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Implementation priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Internal / CTI      | Professionalism  
Efficiency  
Consistency, objectivity of decisions | Formalisation and clarity of procedures  
Periodic self-assessment |
| HEIs’ level         | Transparency and clarity  
Credibility and legitimacy  
Solid external assistance for continuous improvement | Formalisation and updates of standards and procedures  
Answers and specific information as needed  
Clarity of decisions, reports, and system indicators |
| National and international level: French Higher Education Ministry, HEIs associations, Higher education partners, International organisations… | Credibility and legitimacy  
Recognition | External evaluations  
Answers and specific information as needed  
Shared projects and publications that comply with the CTI missions and objectives |
| General public, students, families… | Transparency  
Information | Clear and reliable public information on HEIs and evaluated programmes |
4. EXAMPLE OF RESULTS OF SATISFACTION SURVEYS

4.1. 2016-2017 survey addressed to HEIs

The following figures are abstracts from the 2016-2017 survey addressed to HEIs. The results were analyzed by the Quality and Communication and Audit steering committees. Afterwards they were disseminated (leaflet and oral presentation), as well as the key actions taken, to the Engineering Deans and other partners and stakeholders at CTI’s annual conference. They are also published on CTI’s website (https://www.cti-commission.fr/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/CTI_Colloque_Champs_sur_Marne_2018_Diaporama_4_Enquete_qualite_communication_2016-2017.pdf).

☐ Survey conducted each year, at the end of the accreditation campaign
☐ Sent to all French and international HEIs having undergone an audit procedure, periodic or not
☐ Results communicated to the panel of experts
☐ Data processed individually (each HEI) and globally (only French HEIs)

Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section Communication / preliminary information / general organization of the procedure
Q5 : Was CTI’s website useful for your accreditation application?

Key actions:
New website launched at CTI’s 2017 annual conference, since then:
- Online release of the English version
- Implementation of the « agenda » tool
- Graphic adaptation in line with the different private sections
- Search engine evolutions

+3.04% of « Useful » or « Very useful » answers.
Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section Communication / preliminary information / general organization of the procedure
Q6 : How do you assess the support provided by CTI and the Registry throughout the process?

Improvement tracks :
- Information towards HEIs at the beginning of the campaign
- Members and experts' training

Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section Accreditation renewal / self-assessment :
Q7 : Does the new periodicity of the systematic evaluation seem appropriate for your school?

Key action :
Implementation of risk-based audits (EHEA trend)

Audit steering committee :
~ 50% of periodic files HEIs load linked also to dynamism / new projects

- 7.07% of »Suitable« or »Very suitable« answers
Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

**Section Site visit :**

Q11 : How do you assess the relevance of the composition of the audit team ?

**Key actions :**

Experts committee + focused
- On **skills**
- On the **size** of the panels

**R&O working group :**

Focus of the experts also on
- Process, QA
- Global ecosystem

---

Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

**Section Site visit :**

Q12 : How do you perceive the contribution of the engineering student experts in the audit team?

**Key action :**

Dedicated training session for EEI

**Improvement tracks :**

Focus on EEI's role during members and experts' training sessions

---

- 26.04% of « Useful » or « Very useful » answers
Section Site visit :
Q13 : How do you perceive the contribution of the international experts in the audit team ?

Key actions :
- Experts committee : systematic Eint
- Annual consultation members/RP about E/Eint/EEI

Improvement track :
Members and experts’ training about French HE context

Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section Site visit :
Q19 : How do you assess the quality of the exchanges between the HEI and the audit team during this visit?

HEIs words:
Richness
Opening
Enhances reflection
Continuous improvement

Stable results
Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section Site visit :
Q21 : Did you perceive the required neutrality from the audit team during this visit?

Key actions :
- Revision of the deontology charter
- Dedicated training module « deontology »
- Revision docs. « Panel chair role » et « Expert role »

Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section Site visit :
Q22 : How do you estimate the impact for your HEI of the site visit?

HEIs words:
Section CTI's mission report and decision report:

Q25: What is the interest for your HEI to be part of a European programme certification system?

Key actions:
- Label charter of use
- Increased communication (CTI and ENAEE)
- Development of the label attribution without CTI accreditation (abroad)
- Members and experts' training

- 14.05% of "Interesting" or "Very interesting" answers
Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section CTI’s mission report and decision report:
Q26: How do you assess the added value of the EUR-ACE® label on your international policy?

- 13.52% of «interesting» or «Very interesting» answers

Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section Accreditation renewal / self-assessment:
Q8: Do you think that the writing of the self-assessment report has contributed to the quality assurance system of your HEI?
Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section Criteria and tools Q27, 28 et 29

How do you assess the relevance of the major evaluation criteria used by CTI?

Key actions:
- CDEFI consultation for R&O’s revision
- Common reflection on HEIs typologies
- Decision reports for public HEIs within Universities decline the recommendations per faculty

Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section Criteria and tools Q27, 28 et 29

How do you assess the value of CTI’s online reference document: Self Assessment Guide?

Improvement tracks:
- Systematically consult documents
- Dedicated training module « GAE » in the next session
Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section The accreditation process :
Q33 : Is the content of the mission report consistent with your own vision of your HEI?

4.03% of « Consistent » or « Very consistent »

Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section The accreditation process :
Q34 : Will decision reports and recommendations be useful for your continuous improvement process?

Stable results.
Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section The accreditation process:

Q35: Do you overall agree with the recommendations stated in the decision report?

Satisfaction survey addressed to the evaluated HEIs

Section The accreditation process:

Q36: How do you consider the impact of the whole accreditation process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IMPACT DÉTERMINANT</th>
<th>IMPACT IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPACT MOYEN</th>
<th>IMPACT NUL</th>
<th>SANS OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sur l'école</td>
<td>49.12%</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur le personnel</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>63.16%</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enseignant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur le personnel</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td>26.79%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingénieur, technique,</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administratif et</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur les élèves</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>52.43%</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingénieurs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur l'environnement</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>40.35%</td>
<td>35.09%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professionnel de l'école</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stable results
4.2. 2016-2017 survey addressed to experts

The following figures are the results of the 2016-2017 survey addressed to experts. The results were analyzed by the Quality and Communication and Audit steering committees. Afterwards they were disseminated, as well as the key actions taken, to the Plenary assembly and to the experts during several meetings.

- Survey conducted each year, at the end of the accreditation campaign
- Sent to all current experts and to all outgoing experts (field experts, international experts and engineering student experts)
- Data exploited globally (all fields) and individually (for 1 free field about the additional topics/WG experts would like to get involved in)

**What is your opinion about the work entrusted to you?**

- 0.00% Sans intérêt
- 1.32% Intérêt limité
- 15.79% intéressant
- 71.05% Très intéressant
- 5.26% Non concerné
- 6.58% Remarques

Responses
What do you think about the workload per audit?

- Charge légère: 1.32%
- Charge adaptée: 52.63%
- Charge importante: 34.21%
- Charge trop élevée: 2.63%
- Non concerné: 9.21%

What is your opinion on the material conditions of the site visits?

- Peu satisfaisantes: 0.00%
- Moyennement satisfaisantes: 1.33%
- Satisfaisantes: 34.67%
- Très satisfaisantes: 54.67%
- Non concerné: 9.33%
Were CTI procedures and standards & guidelines respected in the evaluation procedure?

- Peu respectés: 1,33%
- Moyennement respectés: 61,33%
- Respectés: 26,67%
- Très respectés: 10,67%
- Non concerné: 0,00%

Are you familiar with EUR-ACE® procedures and standards & guidelines?

- Très familier: 47,30%
- Moyennement familier: 27,03%
- Peu familier: 12,16%
- Pas du tout familier: 2,70%
- Non concerné: 10,81%
Do you think your profile was appropriate for the mission(s) you performed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Très adapté</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapte</td>
<td>57.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyennement adapté</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peu adapté</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non concerné</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your opinion on the way the results of your work were taken into account?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peu satisfaisante</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyennement satisfaisante</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaisante</td>
<td>51.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Très satisfaisante</td>
<td>37.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non concerné</td>
<td>9.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your opinion on your overall level of training for your CTI missions?

- Satisfaisant: 46.05%
- Très satisfaisant: 38.16%
- Non concerné: 9.21%
- Peu satisfaisant: 0.00%
- Moyennement satisfaisant: 6.58%

What is your opinion on your overall level of information for your CTI missions?

- Satisfaisant: 44.00%
- Très satisfaisant: 45.33%
- Non concerné: 6.67%
- Peu satisfaisant: 0.00%
- Moyennement satisfaisant: 4.00%
Did the training & networking day of June 9, 2017 give you sufficient information and tools for your participation in the audits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>0,00%</th>
<th>2,70%</th>
<th>17,57%</th>
<th>17,57%</th>
<th>62,16%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peu satisfaisant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyennement satisfaisant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaisant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Très satisfaisant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non concerné</td>
<td>62,16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your opinion on the 2016 version of CTI's online Standards&Guidelines? (Http://fond-documentaire.cti-commission.fr/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>0,00%</th>
<th>1,35%</th>
<th>50,00%</th>
<th>35,14%</th>
<th>13,51%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyennement utile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>1,35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Très utile</td>
<td>35,14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non concerné</td>
<td>13,51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are you satisfied with your involvement with CTI?

- Peu satisfait: 1.32%
- Moyennement satisfait: 6.58%
- Satisfait: 32.89%
- Très satisfait: 56.58%
- Non concerné: 2.63%
5. QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION PROCEDURES [in French]

The following figures are the 2016-2017 accreditation campaign indicators. They were consolidated thanks to our internal information system, CTI’s extranet. CTI, together with a developer, specifically created an IS tool dedicated to its activities and their monitoring. It allows multiple actions for multiple types of users, but in this case it was used to quantitatively evaluate CTI’s workload and activities for the past accreditation campaign. This analysis, performed on a yearly basis, is disseminated at the annual conference and is very useful to the Audit steering committee, allowing it to monitor and rationalize the workload and the overall organization of the campaign. Most of this analysis being closely linked to the national French HE context, it is not available in English language.
II. Bilan de la campagne d'accréditation 2016-2017

Champs-sur-Marne
Vague E - 2018-2019

Évaluations relevant du calendrier périodique

Évaluations type A
Dans 5 académies
29 écoles
70 formations

-> 65 titres d'ingénieur à ré-accréditer
-> 5 nouveaux titres d'ingénieur
-> Fusion ENSIL-ENSCI
-> Nouveau site EIGSI à l'étranger
-> Consultation du site Nouvelle Aquitaine
-> Consultation de Bordeaux INP
-> Consultation de réseaux : Gay Lussac, Écoles du Ministère en charge de l'agriculture

II. Bilan de la campagne d'accréditation 2016-2017

Évaluations hors du calendrier périodique en France

Évaluations type B, C, D, E
Dans 11 académies
31 écoles
62 dossiers

15 écoles
-> 22 titres d'ingénieur à ré-accréditer

21 écoles présentant de nouveaux projets :
-> 14 nouveaux titres d'ingénieur
-> 1 titre d'ingénieur spécialisé
-> Fusions, transformations d'écoles, nouveaux sites de formation etc.
-> Étude de 23 rapports intermédiaires

 Création de 2 nouvelles écoles :
-> 1 école d'ingénieur Post-Bac
-> 1 école de spécialisation

Académie de Caen
ESNA Normandie

Académie de Compiègne
ENSG Calvados

Académie de Dijon
ESNA Bourgogne

Académie de Dole
ESNA Franche-Comté

Académie de Fontainebleau
ESNA Seine-et-Marne

Académie de Grenoble
ESNA Savoie

Académie de Lille
ESNA Nord-Pas-de-Calais

Académie de Lyon
ESNA Rhône-Alpes

Académie de Marseille
ESNA Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur

Académie de Montpellier
ESNA Occitanie

Académie de Nancy-Metz
ENSC Nancy-Metz

Académie de Paris
ESNA Île-de-France

Académie de Poitiers
ESNA Poitou-Charentes

Académie de Strasbourg
ESNA Alsace

Académie de Toulouse
ESNA Midi-Pyrénées

Académie de Versailles
ESNA Île-de-France

Académie de Vincennes
ESNA Val de Marne

Champs-sur-Marne
Vague E - 2018-2019

22
Évaluations à l’international

**Dans 5 pays**

- 3 titres d’ingénieur admis par l’État en renouvellement
- 8 nouveaux titres d’ingénieur admis par l’État
- 1 site étranger d’une école française
- 14 demandes d’octroi du Label Eur-Ace Master seul
- Étude de 8 rapports intermédiaires

---

**Caractéristiques des missions**

**68 missions en 2016-2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nombre d’établissements évalués</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publics</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privés</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consulaires</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>établissements étrangers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**250 journées de mission relevant de l’activité d’accréditation périodique**

soit 49.4 % de l’activité totale de la campagne 2016-2017

---

**86% des missions en France pour des écoles du MESRI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nombre d'établissements publics évalués dont</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sous tutelle du ministère en charge de l’enseignement supérieur</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sous tutelle du ministère en charge de l’agriculture, l’alimentation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sous tutelle du ministère en charge de l’économie, l’industrie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sous tutelle du ministère en charge de la défense, l’armée</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sous tutelle du ministère en charge de l’écologie, la transition énergétique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**2016-2017 Campaign**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Évaluer</th>
<th>Audits France</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Personnes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEI</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Bilan de la campagne d'accréditation 2016-2017

**Caractéristiques des missions**

**Missions en Europe et en Afrique francophones ainsi qu’en Asie**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nombre d'établissements étrangers évalués dont</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en Chine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en Belgique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en Suisse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au Viêt Nam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en Bulgarie</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au Cameroun</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au Maroc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en Tunisie</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126 journées de mission à l'étranger
soit 25 % de l'activité à l'international

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>en France</th>
<th>à l'international</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>380 journées de mission</td>
<td>126 journées de mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 auditeurs</td>
<td>35 auditeurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Bilan de la campagne d'accréditation 2016-2017

**Résultats des accréditations en France**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nombre de formations</th>
<th>Accréditation maximale</th>
<th>Accréditation restreinte</th>
<th>% d'accréditation maximale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renouvellement des accréditations (dossiers type A et B)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accréditation de nouveaux projets (dossiers type D et E)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sur 52 avis ou décisions d'accréditation
6 sont assortis d'une injonction soit 11,5 %
12 sont complétées par une demande de rapport intermédiaire soit 23 %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cursus évalués</th>
<th>FISE : 49 %</th>
<th>FISA : 23 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>en formation initiale sous statut d'étudiant (FISE)</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en formation initiale sous statut d'apprenti (FISA)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en formation continue (FC)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nombre total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Résultats des accréditations en France

 Création de 5 nouvelles spécialités en 2016-2017

3 nouveaux titres en FISE à Polytech Nancy :
- « Energétique et Mécanique »
- « Génie industriel et Gestion des risques »
- « Systèmes et Technologies de l’information »

1 création de titre en FISE à SUP BIOTECH (nouvelle école d’Ingénieur) :
- Domaine des biotechnologies

1 Création de titre d’Ingénieur spécialisé en FISE au CHEC (école de spécialisation) :
- Domaine de la construction

Résultats des évaluations à l’international

46 % d’accréditations maximales pour les diplômes étrangers admis par l’État

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nombre de formations évaluées</th>
<th>Accréditation maximale</th>
<th>Accréditation restreinte</th>
<th>Non accréditées</th>
<th>% d’accréditation maximale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renouvellement des diplômes admis par l’État (dossiers type H)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouvelles demandes d’admissions par l’État (dossiers type G)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86 % d’accréditations maximales pour les octrois du Label Eur-Ace Master seul

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nombre de formations</th>
<th>Accréditation maximale</th>
<th>Accréditation restreinte</th>
<th>% d’accréditation maximale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renouvellement des labellisation Eur-Ace Master (dossiers type H)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouvelles demandes de labellisation Eur-Ace Master (dossiers type G)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83,3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Examples of follow-up of accreditation procedures

6.1. 2019-2020 Audit planification board
https://www.dropbox.com/s/pw5rpte2yoowxt/Projet_R2020_20181105.xlsx?dl=0

6.2. International pluriannual audit monitoring board
https://www.dropbox.com/s/n1dqg97sgd5ir1t/%C3%A9tranger_V13septembre2018.xlsx?dl=0

7. Training sessions for CTI members and experts, 2017-2018

CTI organises regularly training sessions for its members and experts. These sessions may take various forms, either regular one day training programmes for members and experts or one-day workshops or shorter tutoring sessions for small groups adapted to defined profiles (new members, student experts, ...); specific topics (joint procedures, role of different panel members, ...) or updating (evolution of the standards and guidelines of CTI, EUR-ACE®, ESG, ...)

During the period 2017-2018, following training sessions were organized:

- June 19th 2017, Paris, training programme for all experts
- September 11th 2017, Paris, seminar for all members
- October 10th 2017, Paris, tutoring session for members on the registry’s database
- October 13th 2017, Paris, training programme for new student experts
- February 13th 2018, Champs-sur-Marne (Greater Paris region), for all experts and members, participation in CTI’s annual conference
- March 13th 2018, Paris, two tutoring sessions for members on CTI’s extranet
- April 10th 2018, Paris, tutoring session for members on simplified procedures
- April 11th 2018, Paris, tutoring session for members on simplified procedures
- May 15th 2018, Paris, tutoring session for members on CTI’s extranet
- July 9th 2018, Paris, training programme for new members (module I)
- September 10th 2018, Paris, training programme for new members (module II)
- September 11th 2018, Paris, tutoring session for members on joint Hcéres-CTI procedures
- October 3rd 2018, Bruxelles, training programme for members and experts participating in joint AEQ ES-CTI evaluation procedures in Belgium
- October 5th 2018, Paris, training programme for new student experts
- December 10th 2018, Paris, training programme for new members (module III) & for all members and experts
- December 11th 2018, Paris, tutoring session for members on EUR-ACE®