



CHAMBRE DES DÉPUTÉS
GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG

Session ordinaire 2014-2015

CH/vg

P.V. ERMCE 05

**Commission de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche, des
Médias, des Communications et de l'Espace**

Procès-verbal de la réunion du 16 mars 2015

Ordre du jour :

1. Adoption du projet de procès-verbal de la réunion du 2 mars 2015
2. Etude et analyse afin d'explorer la mise en place d'une formation en médecine à l'Université du Luxembourg
3. Rapport de suivi sur l'évaluation externe de l'Université du Luxembourg
4. Divers

*

Présents : M. Claude Adam, Mme Diane Adehm, M. Gilles Baum remplaçant M. André Bauler, Mme Simone Beissel, M. Eugène Berger, Mme Taina Bofferding, Mme Tess Burton, M. Jean-Marie Halsdorf remplaçant M. Serge Wilmes, Mme Martine Hansen, Mme Octavie Modert, M. Roger Negri, M. Marcel Oberweis, M. Roy Reding

M. Marc Hansen, Secrétaire d'Etat à l'Enseignement supérieur et à la Recherche

M. Léon Diederich, M. Gaston Schmit, du Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche

Mme Christiane Huberty, de l'Administration parlementaire

Excusés : M. André Bauler, M. Serge Wilmes

*

Présidence : Mme Simone Beissel, Président de la Commission

*

1. Adoption du projet de procès-verbal de la réunion du 2 mars 2015

Le projet de procès-verbal susmentionné est adopté.

2. Etude et analyse afin d'explorer la mise en place d'une formation en médecine à l'Université du Luxembourg

En introduction, M. le Secrétaire d'Etat à l'Enseignement supérieur et à la Recherche rappelle que le programme gouvernemental 2013-2018 prévoit que « [l]e Gouvernement étudiera l'opportunité d'une extension de la formation universitaire médicale à l'université de Luxembourg ou alternativement la mise en place d'une collaboration plus intensive avec une ou des universités de la région jouissant d'une excellente réputation dans ce secteur ».

C'est dans ce contexte que s'inscrivent les deux études sous rubrique, transmises aux membres de la Commission par courrier électronique du 12 mars 2015. D'une part, il s'agit d'une étude réalisée par l'Agence suisse d'accréditation et d'assurance qualité (ci-après : « AAQ »), en collaboration avec l'Université du Luxembourg, et ayant pour objet d'évaluer la faisabilité de la mise en place d'une « Luxembourg Medical School » (ci-après : « LMS »). D'autre part, sur demande du Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche, une analyse socioéconomique a été menée en parallèle par la société d'audit Deloitte, afin d'évaluer l'impact éventuel d'une LMS sur le secteur de la santé, la recherche en biomédecine et le développement économique. Cette analyse a été réalisée en collaboration avec le Ministère de la Santé et le Ministère de l'Economie.

Selon le modèle préconisé, la LMS offrirait une formation de base en médecine d'une durée de six ans, comprenant un programme de bachelor de trois ans et un programme de master de trois ans. Il s'agirait d'une formation centrée sur la pratique, qui serait organisée en collaboration étroite avec des partenaires hospitaliers. Elle accueillerait quelque 50 étudiants par année, parmi lesquels devraient se trouver, en vertu du projet soumis à l'AAQ, 70% de résidents et 30% de non-résidents. Or, étant donné que de tels quotas présidant à l'admission à des programmes de l'enseignement supérieur public sont de plus en plus remis en cause au niveau européen et que, selon les prévisions, ils devront être abandonnés fin 2016, cette dernière disposition n'est plus viable. Il en résulte que la LMS n'aurait pas pour seule ou principale vocation de garantir l'accès aux études de médecine à des résidents et de parer ainsi au besoin de médecins du Luxembourg.

Tout bien considéré, les deux rapports susmentionnés sont complémentaires. Dans son étude, l'AAQ conclut que le Luxembourg est en mesure de mettre en place une formation de qualité en médecine. Selon l'AAQ, l'Université du Luxembourg dispose des compétences requises et ses partenaires hospitaliers de l'équipement, des ressources et du nombre de patients nécessaires pour la création d'une LMS. L'analyse de Deloitte se penche sur plusieurs pistes envisageables. Elle en vient à la conclusion que, d'un côté, la mise en place d'une LMS représenterait une opportunité pour le Luxembourg, mais que, de l'autre côté, le projet comporte aussi des risques, d'autant que son potentiel bénéfice socioéconomique n'est pas encore établi. Les experts recommandent d'examiner des modèles alternatifs au concept de LMS, par exemple celui d'une coopération avec d'autres universités.

Dans l'hypothèse où le projet d'une LMS serait effectivement lancé en 2017-2018, celle-ci atteindrait son rythme de croisière en 2026. Pour cette raison, les estimations sommaires relatives à l'impact financier du projet avancées par les deux études se rapportent à 2026. Force est de constater que ces estimations divergent considérablement. Selon l'AAQ, le coût d'une formation de six ans s'élèverait à 300.000 euros par étudiant, ce qui correspondrait à un coût total de quelque 30 à 35 millions d'euros en 2026. L'analyse de Deloitte, par contre, fait valoir qu'en Suisse, les frais de formation sont de 680.000 euros par étudiant, ce qui

équivaldrait à un coût annuel total de quelque 60 à 65 millions d'euros. A souligner toutefois qu'il ne s'agit que de premières estimations.

En définitive, les deux rapports confirment les responsables politiques dans leur intention de faire encore réaliser une évaluation financière plus détaillée, mais d'examiner aussi d'éventuelles solutions alternatives à la mise en place d'une formation de base complète en médecine au Luxembourg. Une possibilité consisterait à miser sur une collaboration renforcée avec une ou plusieurs autres universités, éventuellement au sein de la Grande Région. Une autre option serait de mettre en place une formation spécialisée plutôt qu'une formation de base, étant entendu que cette solution permettrait d'établir des liens plus directs avec le domaine de la biomédecine. Dans les mois à venir, les différentes pistes devront être analysées avec tous les partenaires concernés, notamment l'Université du Luxembourg. Selon le calendrier prévisionnel, les analyses supplémentaires devraient être disponibles fin 2015 – début 2016. C'est à ce moment qu'il s'agira de prendre une décision, en parfaite connaissance des risques et des chances inhérents au projet.

Echange de vues

De l'échange de vues subséquent, il y a lieu de retenir succinctement les éléments suivants :

- Il est précisé qu'au niveau européen, la possibilité de prévoir, en vue de l'admission à des programmes d'enseignement supérieur, des quotas liés à des critères de résidence a été prolongée jusqu'à la fin de 2016. Si aucune nouvelle prolongation n'est accordée par la suite, de telles dispositions ne seront plus tenables après 2016.

Par contre, à l'heure actuelle, il s'agit encore d'une pratique courante dans certains pays – on n'a qu'à penser au décret Simonet en Belgique.

- Il est vrai qu'à l'origine des réflexions concernant l'opportunité de mettre en place une LMS s'est trouvé le constat que les étudiants luxembourgeois en médecine ont de plus en plus de mal à se faire admettre par une université étrangère, étant donné que dans bon nombre d'entre elles, l'admission à ces programmes est régie par des quotas fondés sur des critères de résidence. Si cette pratique devait effectivement être abandonnée après 2016, cela modifierait de façon substantielle l'argumentaire servant à justifier la création d'une LMS.

Quant à la politique qui sera pratiquée par les universités étrangères une fois qu'elles auront dû renoncer aux quotas, l'on peut imaginer qu'elles miseront soit sur des examens ou des concours d'entrée, soit sur des examens-concours après la première année d'études.

- Il est fait observer qu'à la présente problématique est liée la question de la masse critique : de combien de médecins et de quelles compétences médicales a besoin le Luxembourg ? Il serait important de disposer d'informations précises à ce sujet, afin de dégager si la mise en place d'une LMS correspond à une réelle nécessité, découlant d'un besoin pressant, ou s'il s'agit plutôt d'une question de prestige.

Par ailleurs, plusieurs membres font valoir que la piste des solutions alternatives, notamment celle d'une coopération renforcée avec une ou plusieurs universités de la Grande Région, doit en tout cas être creusée. A rappeler dans ce contexte qu'il n'existe pas moins de douze facultés de médecine dans un périmètre de moins de deux heures de trajet. Plus concrètement, ne serait-il pas indiqué de sonder d'abord et à titre principal la possibilité d'établir des complémentarités dans le cadre du groupement transfrontalier « Université de la Grande Région » ?

M. le Secrétaire d'Etat souligne que la piste précitée sera en tout cas soumise à une analyse approfondie. Dans ce contexte, il ne faut pas oublier qu'il existe d'ores et déjà des accords entre des hôpitaux luxembourgeois et des universités étrangères en vertu desquels les premiers accueillent des étudiants des universités en question.

Quant à la démarche retenue, l'orateur tient à souligner qu'au moment de l'entrée en fonction du nouveau Gouvernement en décembre 2013, le processus visant à analyser

l'opportunité de mettre en place une LMS, modèle d'ailleurs innovant pour l'Europe continentale, était déjà lancé.

Maintenant qu'on dispose de deux études relatives à la faisabilité d'un tel projet, il s'agit d'analyser encore les solutions alternatives. Une décision définitive ne sera prise qu'à l'issue de cette démarche.

- Il est attiré l'attention sur le fait que même dans le cas où serait mise en place une LMS qui offrirait une formation englobant les six premières années d'études en médecine, les étudiants qui, à l'issue de la formation de base, visent une spécialisation autre que la médecine générale devraient néanmoins poursuivre leurs études à l'étranger. Le modèle préconisé ne fournit donc pas non plus la garantie qu'au terme de leur parcours de formation, les jeunes médecins s'établissent au Luxembourg. Dans le même ordre d'idées, il serait intéressant de savoir combien d'étudiants qui font des études de médecine auprès d'une université étrangère finissent par revenir au pays.

Il est encore donné à penser qu'après une éventuelle formation de base de six ans au Luxembourg, il ne sera pas aisé pour les étudiants de poursuivre leurs études en France ou en Belgique, en raison de différents concours nationaux organisés dans ces pays.

- Suite à une question afférente, il est précisé que dans l'hypothèse où la LMS démarrerait en 2017-2018, elle atteindrait son rythme de croisière en 2026. En vertu du modèle proposé, 50 nouveaux étudiants seraient admis annuellement en première année.

- Le modèle sous examen table sur une coopération intense de l'Université avec ses partenaires hospitaliers. Des médecins du milieu hospitalier pourraient ainsi intervenir dans la formation. Or, cette donnée n'est pas sans soulever des questionnements concernant la rémunération et la qualification (pédagogique) des médecins intervenants. Par ailleurs, quelles en seraient les conséquences pour la disponibilité de ces médecins dans les hôpitaux et donc, en fin de compte, pour les patients ?

En réaction, M. le Secrétaire d'Etat ne peut que confirmer que le volet de la coopération avec le secteur de la santé publique soulève encore bon nombre de questionnements. Même si l'étude de l'AQQ atteste la faisabilité d'une telle coopération, il faut s'interroger sur les conséquences pratiques qui en résulteraient, entre autres en termes d'infrastructures ou d'organisation interne des hôpitaux.

A préciser toutefois que des représentants de la Fédération des Hôpitaux Luxembourgeois ainsi que de l'Association des Médecins et Médecins-Dentistes (AMMD) ont été consultés dans le cadre des études en présence.

- Suite à une intervention afférente, il est signalé que l'analyse de Deloitte consacre tout un chapitre à la question de l'impact éventuel d'une LMS sur la recherche en biomédecine, dans la mesure où il s'agit effectivement d'un secteur émergent au Luxembourg. Or, il est évident que l'éventuelle mise en place d'une formation de base en médecine, offrant les six premières années d'études, n'est pas susceptible de stimuler outre mesure le domaine de la biomédecine. Il faudrait alors plutôt miser sur une formation spécialisée liée à cette matière.

- Il est fait valoir que dans le cas où l'un des principaux objectifs visés par la mise en place de la LMS consisterait à générer des retombées positives pour le secteur de la recherche au Luxembourg, il faudrait vérifier si une telle initiative correspond aux attentes et aux besoins réels des acteurs concernés.

En réponse, il est signalé que les auteurs des deux études en présence ont aussi eu des entrevues avec des représentants du secteur de la recherche.

En tout cas, la question de l'opportunité de proposer une formation spécialisée ainsi que celle de la nature d'une telle spécialisation seront encore examinées lors de la prochaine étape du processus de réflexion.

- Il existe un consensus pour dire que la qualité voire l'excellence d'une éventuelle formation en médecine offerte par l'Université du Luxembourg doivent à tout prix être assurées. Tout compte fait, il y va à la fois de la réputation de l'Université et de la qualité de la santé publique.

- Quant à la divergence substantielle de l'évaluation sommaire des coûts d'une LMS proposée respectivement par l'AAQ et par Deloitte, celle-ci est liée au fait que le projet comporte des aspects qui n'ont pas encore été clarifiés. Il s'agit par exemple de la question de savoir où seraient comptabilisées les rémunérations des médecins du milieu hospitalier qui interviendraient dans la formation. Par ailleurs, il semble établi que les frais d'une LMS sont moins élevés que ceux occasionnés par une véritable faculté de médecine. Voilà pourquoi il importe de soumettre les estimations relatives au coût de la formation par étudiant à un examen approfondi.

Au vu de toutes ces incertitudes, les responsables politiques ont décidé de faire réaliser encore une évaluation financière plus détaillée.

- En relation avec la problématique des coûts d'une LMS, M. le Secrétaire d'Etat rappelle que la dotation annuelle de l'Université s'élève à quelque 145 millions d'euros. Dans l'hypothèse où les frais d'une LMS se situeraient effectivement entre 60 et 65 millions d'euros, ils correspondraient à la quasi-moitié de cette dotation. Faudrait-il donc ajouter cette somme à la dotation actuelle ou plutôt inviter l'Université à recentrer ses priorités ? Voilà une question non négligeable qui se poserait inéluctablement si l'on décidait de s'engager dans la voie d'une LMS.

- Concernant la question de l'indépendance et du coût de l'étude de l'AAQ, qui a été commandée par l'Université du Luxembourg, ainsi que celle de la composition du comité de pilotage du projet « LMS », il est fait valoir que ces aspects relèvent de la responsabilité de l'Université du Luxembourg. Il serait peut-être opportun de les approfondir dans le cadre de la deuxième entrevue avec M. le Recteur de l'Université, qui aura lieu le 30 mars 2015.

- Le coût de l'étude réalisée par Deloitte, sur demande du Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche, se situe entre 48.000 et 48.500 euros, TVA incluse.

- Suite à un questionnaire afférent, il est exposé que le contrat d'établissement 2010-2013 conclu entre l'Etat et l'Université du Luxembourg stipule que « [à] la demande du Gouvernement, [...] l'Université étudiera la possible mise en place d'un dispositif de formations pour la médecine et certaines professions de santé » (article 7, paragraphe 4).

Or, force est de constater qu'aucune formation en médecine n'a été mise en place pendant cette période. Actuellement, l'Université offre seulement la première année d'études en médecine, ainsi que la formation spécifique en médecine générale, se situant après la formation de base.

Si l'on peut sans doute tirer parti de ces expériences et donc construire sur une base existante, il ne faut toutefois pas oublier que la première année d'études en médecine est celle qui implique le moins de frais, dans la mesure où la formation théorique initiale y occupe une grande place.

- En conclusion, il est retenu qu'une fois que les différentes pistes esquissées ci-dessus auront été soumises à une analyse approfondie, les études afférentes seront présentées à la Commission. Il est à prévoir que celles-ci seront disponibles fin 2015 – début 2016.

3. Rapport de suivi sur l'évaluation externe de l'Université du Luxembourg

Les membres de la Commission se voient mettre à disposition le rapport de suivi sur l'évaluation externe de l'Université du Luxembourg, tel qu'il a été présenté par le comité d'évaluation externe en mars 2015. A cet effet, il est renvoyé à l'annexe 1 du procès-verbal, qui reprend le document en question.

A rappeler que l'évaluation tant interne qu'externe de l'Université du Luxembourg est prévue par l'article 43 de la loi modifiée du 12 août 2003 portant création de l'Université du Luxembourg. L'évaluation externe, qui porte sur la recherche, l'enseignement et l'administration de l'Université, se fait « par des personnalités ou des agences reconnues pour établir des comparaisons internationales en matière de qualité de l'enseignement et de la recherche ainsi que de prestation de service au niveau universitaire ». La périodicité de l'évaluation est de quatre ans, avec un examen à mi-parcours.

Jusqu'à présent, les différentes évaluations ont été effectuées par un comité composé de sept membres de provenance internationale et présidé par M. Páll Skúlason, professeur de philosophie et recteur émérite de l'Université d'Islande. Le comité a fait appel à des experts supplémentaires pour évaluer les différents domaines de l'Université selon le principe de la *peer review*, c'est-à-dire de l'évaluation par des pairs.

Le premier rapport d'évaluation externe de l'Université a été présenté en janvier 2009, et le deuxième en mars 2013. Ces rapports ont été à chaque fois soumis à la Commission parlementaire, lors des réunions respectives du 12 mars 2009 et du 8 avril 2013 (cf. procès-verbaux afférents).

Dans le deuxième rapport d'évaluation, les experts ont souligné que la jeune Université a réalisé des performances méritoires dans un laps de temps très bref, et ils ont insisté sur le fait qu'elle a accompli des progrès considérables depuis la première évaluation en 2009. Ces progrès se font le plus ressentir dans le domaine de la recherche, où la priorité de recherche en droit s'est vu attribuer la note « excellent ». La *Luxembourg School of Finance* et les deux centres interdisciplinaires (le SnT (*Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust*) et le LCSB (*Luxembourg Centre for Systems Biomedicine*)) ont obtenu la note « très bien ».

Le document sous rubrique correspond à l'examen à mi-parcours s'inscrivant dans la suite de la deuxième évaluation externe. Il porte sur le premier semestre 2014.

Suite à une intervention afférente, il est confirmé qu'alors que les rapports précédents ont tous relevé des problèmes de communication interne et la faiblesse du dialogue au sein de l'Université, le présent document atteste à l'Université des progrès dans ce domaine. Comme il l'a souligné lors de la réunion de la Commission du 2 mars 2015, le nouveau recteur entend d'ailleurs accorder une attention particulière à cet aspect (cf. procès-verbal afférent).

Une autre problématique soulevée par le rapport sous rubrique est celle du rôle du conseil universitaire.

La troisième évaluation externe est prévue pour 2016, étant entendu que le rapport afférent sera alors présenté en 2017. Actuellement, le Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche vérifie avec l'Université s'il convient de confier cette évaluation au même comité ou s'il serait opportun d'avoir éventuellement recours à une structure externe d'accréditation et d'évaluation, par exemple au programme d'évaluation proposé par l'EUA (*European University Association*).

Il est retenu que le document sous rubrique pourra être discuté de façon plus approfondie lors de la réunion du **lundi 30 mars 2015, à 10.30 heures**, consacrée à la suite de l'échange de vues avec M. le Recteur de l'Université du Luxembourg.

4. **Divers**

- La **réunion jointe avec la Commission de l'Economie**, sollicitée par le groupe politique CSV en vue de faire le bilan de la mission de prospection en matière de technologies de l'information et de la communication (ICT) qu'a menée récemment M. le Ministre des Communications et des Médias aux Etats-Unis (cf. annexe 2), aura lieu le **lundi 20 avril 2015, à 10.30 heures**.

- Le **vendredi 24 avril 2015, à 11 heures**, la Commission se verra présenter la **deuxième étude de l'OCDE sur le dispositif de la recherche et de l'innovation au Luxembourg**. Selon les prévisions, cette présentation se déroulera en présence de M. William Danvers, secrétaire général adjoint de l'OCDE.

Luxembourg, le 20 mars 2015

Le Secrétaire-administrateur,
Christiane Huberty

Le Président,
Simone Beissel

Annexes :

1. *External Evaluation of the University of Luxembourg – Follow-up Report by the Committee for the Evaluation of the University of Luxembourg*
2. Demande de mise à l'ordre du jour du groupe politique CSV du 25 février 2015

EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LUXEMBOURG

FOLLOW-UP REPORT

by the Committee for the Evaluation of the
University of Luxembourg

March 2015

1. Introduction

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

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

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

2. Contextual changes

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

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

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

3. Strengths and signs of improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Remaining challenges

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Conclusion and final envoi from the Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANNEX

M E M O **from the Committee of External Evaluation of the** **University of Luxembourg** **on the** **FOLLOW UP PROCEDURE**

[15 April 2014]

INTRODUCTION

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

APPROACH AND MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE FOLLOW UP

Approach

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

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

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

Main objectives

For the University the follow up should be:

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

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

For the Committee the follow up should provide:

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

PROCEDURES AND PRACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS

Internal phase: Progress Statements

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

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

Individual progress statements by units:

Each progress statement should contain the following three parts:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Unit	List of recommendations in 2013 Report
1. Rectorate	pp. 25-26 ²

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

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

Progress Statement by University Council:

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

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

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

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

External phase: Site visit

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

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

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

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

Committee Report

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

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

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

Groupe parlementaire CSV : Demande de convocation d'une réunion jointe de la Commission de l'Economie et de la Commission de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche, des Médias, des Communications et de l'Espace pour faire le bilan de la mission de prospection de Monsieur le Ministre des Communications et des Médias dans le domaine des technologies de l'information et de la communication (ICT) aux Etats-Unis

Transmis en copie pour information

- aux Membres de la Commission de l'Economie
- aux Membres de la Commission de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche, des Médias, des Communications et de l'Espace
- aux Membres de la Conférence des Présidents

Luxembourg, le 25 février 2015

Le Secrétaire général de la Chambre des Députés,





CHAMBRE DES DEPUTES
Entrée le:
25 FEV. 2015

Monsieur Mars Di Bartolomeo
Président de la Chambre des Députés

Luxembourg, le 25 février 2015

Concerne : Convocation d'une réunion jointe

Monsieur le Président,

Par la présente, nous vous informons que notre groupe politique souhaiterait voir convoquer une réunion jointe de la Commission de l'Economie et de la Commission de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche, des Médias, des Communications et de l'Espace pour faire le bilan de la mission de prospection de Monsieur le Ministre des Communications et des Médias dans le domaine des technologies de l'information et de la communication (ICT) aux Etats-Unis.

Nous vous demandons dès lors d'inviter à cette réunion Monsieur le Ministre des Communications et des Médias.

Nous vous prions de bien vouloir transmettre la présente missive à Messieurs les Présidents des commissions parlementaires concernés.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur le Président, l'expression de notre parfaite considération.

Claude Wiseler
Président du groupe

Laurent Mosar
Député

Diane Adehm
Député