

Substantive Change Report

by the Agency for Quality Assurance in the Galician University System
(ACSUG)

Register Committee

Ref. RC23/C34

Ver. 1.0

Date 12/04/2019

Page 1 / 1

Decision of:	03/04/2019
Report received on:	01/03/2019
Agency registered since:	18/11/2010
Last external review report:	July 2014
Registration until:	31/07/2019
Absented themselves from decision-making:	none
Attachments:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Substantive Change Report Annex: Evaluation Guide for university degrees outside of the Spanish university system

1. The Register Committee considered the Substantive Change Report of 01/03/2019.
2. The Register Committee took note of the change in composition of the Galician Committee for Reports, Assessment, Certification and Accreditation (CGIACA) and welcomed the improved involvement of stakeholders.
3. The Register Committee took note of the new evaluation guide that covers ACSUG's activities internationally, within and beyond the EHEA. The Committee welcomed that the report responds to the issue flagged in ACSUG's last renewal of registration
4. The Committee underlined that the international evaluation activities – whether within or outside the EHEA – are within the scope of the ESG and should be considered by the ongoing review of ACSUG in the same way as its “domestic” activities.

Betreff: Substantive Change Report: ACSUG – Agency for Quality Assurance in the Galician University System (Axencia para Calidade do Sistema Universitario de Galicia)

Von: "luis.velon at acsug.es" <form_engine@fs22.formsite.com>

Datum: 01.03.19, 14:10

An: substantive-changes@eqar.eu

Reference #	15321458
Status	Complete
Agency #1	ACSUG – Agency for Quality Assurance in the Galician University System (Axencia para Calidade do Sistema Universitario de Galicia)
Expiry date #1	31/07/2019
Contact #1	Luis Carlos Velón Sixto
Phone #1	+34 981534173
Email #1	luis.velon@acsug.es
Other organisations?	No
A. Has the organisational identity of the registered agency changed?	No
B. Has the organisational structure changed?	Yes
Description	<p>1) With the approval of the new ACSUG statutes in January 2018, the composition of the Galician Committee for Reports, Assessment, Certification and Accreditation (hereinafter CGIACA), highest evaluation body of ACSUG has changed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The ACSUG Director is no longer the CGIACA President – Representatives from the students and the professional sector are included in the composition. – There is the possibility to include in the CGIACA, representatives among outstanding members of the national and international academic and scientific community. <p>2) Regarding the staffing, the ACSUG staff organization chart has not changed, but there are 3 workers less for different reasons. It is expected that these positions are going to be covered during 2019.</p>
C.i. Are there new types of activities?	No

C.ii. Are there changes in existing activities?	Yes
C.iii. Have some or all existing activities been discontinued?	No
Description new/changed	During 2018 ACSUG has revised and approved a new version of the Evaluation guide for university degrees outside the Spanish University System in order to adapt them to the 2015 ESG requirements.
File #1	240418_Evaluation_guide_for_university_degrees_outside_SUE_English.pdf (1169k)
Last Update	2019-03-01 14:10:06



EVALUATION GUIDE FOR UNIVERSITY DEGREES OUTSIDE OF THE SPANISH UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

2018

V1_17.04.2018

Edited by:

Agency for Quality Assurance in the Galician University System (ACSUG)

Rúa Lamas de Abade, s/n

CIFP Compostela 5ª planta

15.702 Santiago de Compostela

Tel: 981 534173 – Fax: 981 534174

E-mail: acsug@acsug.es

Web Page: www.acsug.es

Version 1: April 2018

Approved by the Galician Committee on Reports, Verification, Certification and Accreditation (CGIACA): 17/04/2018

This document is the property of ACSUG. Reproduction is permitted in whole or in part as long as the title is mentioned and the "Agency for Quality Assurance in the Galician University System" is credited as the publisher.

ACSUG is a full member of ENQA



ACSUG is registered on the EQAR



ACSUG is a member of ECA



ACSUG has implemented a Quality and Environmental Internal Management System certified by AENOR according the ISO 9001:2008 and ISO 14001:2004 Standards. The Environmental Management System has been verified according to the Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS).



ACSUG complies with current data protection legislation.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.- INTRODUCTION	4
2.- EVALUATION DEFINITION AND SCOPE	5
3.- EVALUATION PROCESS	6
3.1.- SELF-EVALUATION	6
3.2.- EXTERNAL EVALUATION	7
4.- DEGREE FOLLOW-UP	9
5.- ACCREDITATION RENEWAL	10
6.- EVALUATION CRITERIA	11
7. CRITERIA ASSESSMENT	13
DIMENSION 1. DEGREE MANAGEMENT.....	14
DIMENSION 2. RESOURCES	19
DIMENSION 3. RESULTS.....	23
ANNEXES.....	26
ANNEX I: SELF-EVALUATION REPORT	27
ANNEX II: MINIMUM RELEVANT INFORMATION TO BE PUBLISHED ON THE DEGREE	38
ANNEX III: LIST OF EVIDENCE AND INDICATORS	39
ANNEX IV. INFORMATION FOR FEE CALCULATION	43
ANNEX V. IMPROVEMENT ACTION SHEET	50
ANNEX VI: ACADEMIC STAFF CHART	51
ANNEX VII: EXAMPLE OF THE VISIT PROGRAMME.....	52
ANNEX VIII: SAMPLE INTERIM ACCREDITATION REPORT	57
ANNEX IX: EXAMPLE OF AN INTERIM ACCREDITATION RENEWAL REPORT.....	60
ANNEX XX.- GLOSSARY	64

1.- INTRODUCTION

This guide was developed to evaluate the quality of the bachelor's and master's degrees (or equivalent) external to the Spanish University System (SUS). It includes the evaluating experience of the Axencia para a Calidade do Sistema Universitario de Galicia (Agency for Quality Assurance in the Galician University System, ACSUG) since 2002 in different evaluation processes for centres, degrees, programmes, quality guarantee systems, teaching staff, etc.

Quality evaluation is a process of analysing and diagnosing strengths and weaknesses. The ultimate goal of the evaluation process is to place the emphasis on continuing improvement, so the focus and execution of improvement initiatives are considered essential for ensuring the quality of the evaluated degree.

ACSUG, as a member of ENQA since 2009 and of EQAR since 2010, recognised within the European quality assurance framework, evaluates the official bachelor's and master's degrees from the Autonomous Region of Galicia, following the evaluation criteria established by the Spanish Network of University Quality Assurance Agencies (REACU), in accordance with the *"Standards and Guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA)"ⁱ*, using the guides and protocols agreed by that entity. This document follows the criteria established in these documents, with slight modifications to adapt them to the international context beyond the EHEA, eliminating legal references that apply to the Spanish University System.

ⁱ www.acsug.es/sites/default/files/esg_en_espanol_aneca_2015.pdf

2.- EVALUATION DEFINITION AND SCOPE

The quality of bachelor's and master's degrees (or equivalent) external to the Spanish University System (SUS) is evaluated according to the criteria included in this guide. The ultimate goal is to obtain **accreditation** from the evaluation body, in this case ACSUG. The certificate issued by ACSUG will be valid for 5 years and, once obtained, it is considered an **accredited degree**.

The accreditation of degrees is a very important informative element, as it indicates to the student and society at large that the quality of the education is assured and is reviewed periodically externally by an independent body, in this case ACSUG.

Accreditation is defined in this model as an *ex post* evaluation process that leads to a public, independent decision on the degree to which an education fulfils the quality criteria defined in this guide. The accreditation model referenced in this document focuses on university educations that lead to bachelor's and master's degrees (or equivalent) that are fully implemented; that is, that have at least two graduate cohorts.

The result will be a binary decision (it is accredited, or it is not accredited), which will also conclude with the **identification of areas of improvement**. The accreditation renewal process must be repeated in successive periods of 5 years. In the interval of time between these periods, a **degree follow-up process** is carried out that analyses the possible deficiencies detected and implements improvement actions. Degree follow-up is the responsibility of the university that offers it. ACSUG issues at least one follow-up report on each degree within the period between accreditation and renewal.

The accreditation must lead to **public results** so that all stakeholders (current and future students, university/centre personnel and society in general) may have information on the consequences derived from them. Both the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance* from the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and the *Best Practices* of the European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education (ECA) establish the need for accreditation agencies to duly inform the public of the accreditation decisions. The fact that the process is carried out by an **agency external** to the institution that offers the education, ensures the credibility of the decision made and contributes to the transparency of the process. This agency must guarantee that the accreditation is solvent; that is, it is based on quality criteria defined in advance and in an evaluation process that reveals and divulges technically suitable information on compliance with these criteria. ACSUG is prepared to meet these conditions with an **internal quality assurance system**, which is evaluated externally periodically, and has a procedure for appealing decisions, in addition to belonging to the European higher education entities mentioned above.

3.- EVALUATION PROCESS

The purpose of the evaluation process for the accreditation of a degree is to assess the compliance with certain minimum levels established in advance, as well as identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the education. The process will conclude with the establishment of improvement proposals that must be implemented to improve the quality of the education evaluated.

This process is organised into two phases: self-evaluation and external evaluation.

3.1.- SELF-EVALUATION

Self-evaluation is a process through which the evaluated degree reflects, describes, analyses and assesses its own reality, basing its assertions on objective data. This process requires the participation of all groups involved in the teaching-learning process; it must be led by an executive team, with the support and backing of the university's governing bodies.

So, a self-evaluation committee must be appointed that is responsible for undertaking the self-evaluation process. It should be chaired by the person responsible for the degree to be evaluated, who must also be responsible for leading and coordinating the process, and it must include representatives from all collectives/groups involved in the degree: professors, students, support staff, graduates, employers, and so on.

The self-evaluation committee is responsible for conducting a reflection and analysis process based on evidence that will result in the **self-evaluation report**, which describes and assesses the situation of the degree with respect to the criteria established in this guide, selecting and proposing the improvement plans that should be undertaken.

The result of the teaching self-evaluation process must enable the identification of the points in which it is necessary to make greater efforts to achieve continuous improvement. All of this must be detailed in the self-evaluation report.

The institution can provide examples of best practices that will be assessed by the external evaluation committee.

To achieve maximum efficiency in the process, the self-evaluation committee must establish a working plan, to include calendar, distribution and task assignment, and the human, material and IT resources needed, and it is essential that the decisions be made by consensus. The situation must be analysed based on the model established in this guide, in the "Evaluation Criteria" section. It must be grounded on the evidence and

indicators collected ("Suggested list of evidence and indicators for compliance with the criteria" section). In other words, there must be proof of the accuracy of the assertions and assessments made by the self-evaluation committee.

The evidence used as grounds for the assessments made in the self-evaluation report must be sent (in digital format) to the ACSUG, duly ordered by criteria, so that the external evaluators can conduct an initial review of them. In addition, those requested expressly by ACSUG must be available at the centre, in hard-copy or in the format indicated, to be examined during the external visit.

3.2- EXTERNAL EVALUATION

The External Evaluation Committee (the entity that conducts the evaluation and is comprised of expert evaluators from outside the institution and unit evaluated), appointed by ACSUG, is generally comprised of the following profiles: academic member(s) (one of which acting as the committee chairperson), professional member(s), student member(s) and secretary. The number of members of the committee will depend on the number of degrees to be evaluated, different branches of knowledge of the same, and so on.

ACSUG will, in addition to requiring the evaluators to have the proper profile, provide complementary training with the primary objective of enabling the members of the evaluation committee to understand the model, tools, concepts and the appraisal process.

The members of the committee will analyse the self-evaluation report individually, issuing assessments of each element included in it.

Once the individual studies have been completed, the committee will visit the facilities of the degree evaluated, used to verify, onsite, the evidence provided with the self-evaluation report, conducting the corresponding interviews with the internal and external groups. In these interviews, each member of the committee will verify especially the elements that are closest to their own profile. At the end of the visit, the Evaluation Committee will provide an oral report to the degree managers, as a preview of the evaluation, highlighting the main conclusions of the visit.

Finally, the committee issues, by consensus, an assessment of each element, which will serve as the basis for drafting the **provisional external evaluation report**. This report will include the strengths, the aspects that must be included in an improvement plan, as well as other recommendations for the improvement detected during the evaluation process.

ACSUG will send the provisional evaluation report to the university, which, after receiving it, has 30 calendar days to present allegations, including an improvement plan (annex IV of this document) with regard to the recommendations indicated by the External Evaluation Committee.

Later, the External Evaluation Committee, after the allegations period, analyses the information from the evaluation process again, with special emphasis on the improvement plan drafted by the degree, sending the **final report** for the external evaluation, which will be sent by ACSUG to the university. This final report may be Favourable or Unfavourable.

If a **favourable report** is received, the certificate issued by ACSUG will be valid for 5 years and will be an **Accredited Degree** based on the criteria established in this guide.

If an **unfavourable report** is obtained, the degree cannot begin a new evaluation process again with ACSUG for two years, as long as proof is provided showing that the improvement actions indicated in the ACSUG evaluation report have been taken.

4.- DEGREE FOLLOW-UP

If a favourable report is received, the certificate issued by ACSUG for the degree will be valid for five years.

During the period of validity of the certificate, the degree must undertake an annual follow-up process, issuing a self-evaluation report on the process, including new developments, updates and the state of execution of the actions in the improvement plan resulting from the external evaluation, as well as the evidence necessary and the results of the indicators. The follow-up self-evaluation reports must be sent to ACSUG annually.

At least once during the certificate validity period (normally three years after the favourable evaluation), ACSUG will conduct a follow-up evaluation to verify the effective completion of the actions and their impact on the continuous improvement of the degree. This follow-up evaluation may or may not include a site visit, depending on the status and evolution of the degree improvement plan, as well as the nature of the changes made during the period. A site visit may also be made by express request of the university.

ACSUG will issue a degree follow-up report that will indicate the effectiveness of the improvement implementation process, focusing on the aspects that need most attention.

If three years after issue of the accreditation certificate the degree has not presented a follow-up report, ACSUG could revoke the accreditation certificate it had granted.

5.- ACCREDITATION RENEWAL

Five years after the certificate is issued, if the degree wishes to renew the accreditation, a new evaluation process must be conducted.

The purpose of this process is to check the effective execution of the improvement actions posed during the certificate's validity period, as well as other actions carried out by the degree for continuous improvement.

The process involves the degree completing the self-evaluation phases again, as well as the external evaluation (including site visit) by ACSUG.

If the degree receives a positive evaluation, a new 5-year certification is issued, and the follow-up cycle begins again until the next certification renewal process.

6.- EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation is based on **seven criteria** grouped in **three dimensions**, which apply to all degrees. Each criterion is referenced to a standard that must be reached to fulfil the criterion:

- ✓ **DEGREE MANAGEMENT.** The organisation will be analysed, along with the development of the curriculum, including the entry and graduation profile of the degree, admission criteria, teaching coordination mechanisms and the application of different regulations. An analysis will also be done on the transparency and visibility of the degree through the information provided on it by the different stakeholders, as well as the Quality Assurance System as an instrument for collecting information, analysing it, implementing improvement actions and conducting the appropriate follow-up.
- ✓ **RESOURCES.** The suitability and sufficiency of the academic and support staff will be analysed, as well as the material resources, infrastructure and services available to guarantee that the results defined in the degree are attained.
- ✓ **RESULTS.** The results of the degree and their evolution will be analysed. In this sense, the mechanisms established by the university will be analysed to verify proper acquisition by the students of the competencies defined for the degree; that is, fulfilment of the learning results defined for the graduate profile. The evolution of the different academic, professional (employability) and personal (satisfaction with the education received) results indicators will also be analysed.

The criteria included in the dimensions are:

DIMENSION 1. DEGREE MANAGEMENT
<p>Criterion 1. Organisation and development</p> <p>Criterion 2. Information and transparency</p> <p>Criterion 3. Quality management system</p>
DIMENSION 2. RESOURCES
<p>Criterion 4. Human resources</p> <p>Criterion 5. Material resources and services</p>
DIMENSION 3. RESULTS
<p>Criterion 6. Results of learning</p> <p>Criterion 7. Satisfaction and performance indicators</p>

For each of the criteria, certain sub-criteria are established, indicating the aspects that are taken into consideration, as well as the evidence and the indicators on which the analysis will be based. The evidence (E) and indicators (I) are included on a list (annex III) that indicates the criteria they are related to.

7. CRITERIA ASSESSMENT

Each of the criteria will be assessed according to these four levels, based on achieving the corresponding standards:

- **Exceeded with excellence (A)**. The standard corresponding to the criterion is fully achieved and it is also an example that exceeds the basic requirements.
- **Achieved (B)**. The standard corresponding to the criterion is fully achieved.
- **Partially achieved (C)**. The standard is achieved at the minimum level, but there are some aspects that should be improved.
- **Not achieved (D)**. The criterion has not achieved the minimum level required for reaching the corresponding standard.

Taking into consideration the assessment assigned to each criterion, the overall assessment of the degree will be in terms of **favourable** or **unfavourable**.

In no case will accreditation be granted if a rating of “not achieved” is earned in any of the following criteria:

- a) Criterion 4. Human resources
- b) Criterion 5. Material resources and services
- c) Criterion 6. Results of learning

The above does not exclude issuing an unfavourable report if severe deficiencies are identified in other criteria, depending on the nature of the degree.

DIMENSION 1. DEGREE MANAGEMENT**CRITERION 1. ORGANISATION AND DEVELOPMENT*****Standard: The training programme is up-to-date, and it is implemented properly***

Analyse and assess whether the development of the curriculum is done appropriately and there are no severe incidents, which has led to a proper acquisition of the competencies by the students.

1.1.- The degree maintains academic interest and is up-to-date according to the requirements of the discipline, technological and scientific advances, socio-economic needs and requirements of the profession.

Aspects to be assessed:

- Training objectives are specified in the degree planning (as professional competencies or equivalent).
- The educational and graduation profile of the degree is specified, which maintains its relevance and is updated according to the requirements of its academic, scientific and professional field.

1.2.- The curriculum is being suitably developed following a coherent offer of modules, fields of knowledge and subjects.

Aspects to be assessed:

- The offer of modules, fields of knowledge and subjects is updated according to the teaching field and characteristics of the degree.
- The academic activities, teaching methodologies, evaluation and qualification systems enable students to achieve the competencies. The size of the groups is adapted to the educational activities.
- Student participation in mobility programmes.

1.3.- The degree has teaching coordination mechanisms that make it possible to analyse whether following the curriculum enables students to acquire skills and, where necessary, to establish appropriate improvement actions.

Aspects to be assessed:

- The horizontal and vertical coordination between the different subjects-fields in the curriculum avoids gaps and duplications and makes for a suitable workload for students.
- If there are subjects with educational activities that include a theoretical part and practical or laboratory activities, special attention will be paid to the coordination between both activities.
- In the case of external/clinical internships, an assessment will be made as to whether the coordination mechanisms allow students to achieve the skills associated with these placements.
- If the degree is taught in several modalities (face-to-face, mixed and/or distance), the teaching coordination between the modalities will be valued, so that the students reach the same competencies regardless of the type of study.

1.4. The admission criteria applied ensure that students admitted to the course have the right entry profile to begin these studies.

Aspects to be assessed:

- The entry profile is specified and is consistent with the actual profile of the student body enrolled in the degree course.

1.5.- The application of the various university regulations contributes to the efficiency in the results of the degree.

Aspects to be assessed:

- The application of the various regulations that apply to the degree (permanency regulations, regulations in the event of the termination of studies, credit recognition systems, regulations related to evaluation, end-of-degree/master's project, external internships, selection and hiring of teaching staff, administrative and service personnel, etc.).

The analysis is based on:

Evidence:

E1: Report/document containing the analysis of the actual entry/graduation profile

E2: Available documentation on the curriculum and subjects (competencies, training activities, teaching methodologies, assessment systems, learning outcomes, etc.)

E3: Documentation related to the coordination actions carried out, including the minutes of the meetings held by the committees and bodies in charge of these activities (the minutes must include a section with the agreements adopted at each meeting)

E4: Reports or documents containing the conclusions of the internal and external consultation procedures to assess the relevance and updating of the actual graduation profile of the degree students and the assessment of the acquisition of the learning outcomes

E5: University regulations

E6: Academic staff table (See Annex VI)

Indicators:

I1: Evolution of the number of new entrants per academic year/semester

I2: Evolution of mobility indicators (number and percentage of students participating in mobility programmes, ratio of students participating in mobility programmes to enrolled students...)

I3: Results of the satisfaction surveys of the different stakeholders (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)

I4: Ratio of supply/demand of the new entry vacancies

I5: Average number of students per teaching group (explanatory, interactive teaching)

DIMENSION 1. DEGREE MANAGEMENT**CRITERION 2. INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY**

Standard: *The institution has mechanisms to adequately communicate to all stakeholders the characteristics of the programme and the processes that guarantee its quality.*

Analyse and assess whether the relevant information on the degree is public and available, in time and form, to all the agents involved (students, employers, educational administrations and other stakeholders).

2.1.- The institution publishes, for all stakeholders, objective, sufficient and updated information on the characteristics of the degree and on the processes that guarantee its quality.

Aspects to be assessed:

- Sufficient and relevant information is published on the characteristics of the training programme, its development and the results achieved.
- Information on the degree is objective and up to date.
- Easy access to relevant information on the degree is guaranteed to all stakeholders.

The analysis is based on:

Evidence:

E7: Website of the University/Centre/Degree (at least the information referred to in Annex II must be included)

Indicators:

I3: Results of the satisfaction surveys of the different stakeholders (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)

DIMENSION 1. DEGREE MANAGEMENT**CRITERION 3. QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM:**

Standard: The institution has an internal quality assurance system formally established and implemented that effectively ensures the continuous improvement of the degree.

Analyse the design and implementation of the Quality Assurance System (QAS) and assess its contribution to the continuous improvement of the degree.

3.1.- The QAS has the necessary mechanisms to collect accurate information, analyse it, detect weaknesses and propose improvement actions, monitoring them.

Aspects to be assessed:

- There is a QAS structured as a systematic and cyclical process of continuous improvement that is deployed through a clearly designed manual and procedures (refer to the ACSUG QAS Design Evaluation Guide):
 - Procedures for the design, periodic review and improvement of training programmes.
 - Student-centred procedures that guarantee the quality of the learning process (admission process, external internships, mobility programmes, academic and vocational guidance, follow-up of graduates, etc.).
 - Procedures to ensure the quality of academic and administrative staff and services (selection, adequacy, qualifications, training plans, etc.).
 - Procedures that guarantee the quality of material resources and services.
 - Procedures related to public information.
 - Procedures for analysing the satisfaction of the various stakeholders (students, academic and administrative staff and services, graduates, etc.).
 - Procedures for dealing with suggestions and complaints.
- There is a quality policy and objectives that attend to the needs and expectations of the various stakeholders; it covers its revision, updating and public dissemination.
- There is a body responsible for the QAS of the institution/centre (structure, composition, functions, etc.). All stakeholders must take part in this body (teachers, students, administrative and service staff, other external agents, etc.).
- The QAS documentation and information management system means results and indicators can be compiled quickly and fully, and the updated versions of the documents generated accessed.

3.2.- The implementation of the QAS facilitates monitoring the degrees and guarantees their continuous improvement.

Aspects to be assessed:

- There are procedures for designing, approving, analysing and periodically reviewing training programmes and, if appropriate, terminating them.
- The analysis and review actions carried out from the QAS allow improvements to be made to the qualification. Preparing and/or annual updating of an Improvement Action Plan is envisaged, derived from the weaknesses detected in the qualification (each improvement action must include, as a minimum, the fields established in the sheet in Annex V of this guide).
- The actions to improve the qualification are monitored to check whether they have been effectively fulfilled and whether the objectives set have been achieved.

3.3.- The implemented QAS is reviewed periodically to analyse its suitability and, if necessary, the appropriate improvements are established.

Aspects to be assessed:

- There is clear and continuous evidence that the QAS is periodically reviewed and, where appropriate, improved. Preparing and/or annual updating of an Improvement Action Plan is envisaged, derived from the weaknesses detected in each procedure (each improvement action must include, as a minimum, the fields established in the sheet in Annex V of this guide).
- All stakeholders have been involved in the process of preparing, implementing and monitoring improvements to the QAS.
- The SGC's evidence shows the existence of a consolidated quality culture in the centre that contributes to continuous improvement.

The analysis is based on:**Evidence:**

E8: QAS documentation (QAS manual and procedures, quality policy and objectives, indicator panel, etc.)

E9: Strategic planning

E10: Documentation related to the review and continuous improvement actions carried out, including the minutes of the meetings held by the committees and bodies in charge of these activities (the minutes must include a section with the list of attendees and a summary of the agreements adopted at each meeting)

E11: Evidence of the implementation of QAS procedures (complete, revised and updated procedures that develop QAS guidelines: Quality policy, Design, periodic review and improvement of training programmes, learning Guarantee, student-centred teaching and assessment, Guarantee and improvement to the quality of human resources (including research), Guarantee and improvement to the quality of material resources and services and Public Information, etc.)

E12: Improvement Actions Plan derived from the implementation of the QAS

E13: Report/document containing the analysis of the satisfaction surveys (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)

Indicators:

I3: Results of the satisfaction surveys of the different stakeholders (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)

I6: Results of the indicators established in the QAS

DIMENSION 2. RESOURCES**CRITERION 4. HUMAN RESOURCES:**

Standard: Academic and support staff are sufficient and adequate according to the characteristics of the degree and the number of students.

To analyse and assess the suitability of the academic and support staff involved in the degree being assessed.

4.1.- Academic Staff. The degree has sufficient suitably qualified teaching staff, taking into account the characteristics of the curriculum, the modes of delivery and the skills to be attained by the students.

Aspects to be assessed:

- Hiring regulation.
- The teachers who participate in the degree have the proper level of qualification (teaching and research experience) for teaching the degree. The profile of academic staff assigned to external internships and Final Projects will be specially reviewed.
- The teaching staff is sufficient to develop the functions and attend to all the students.
- The institution has a system for evaluating its teaching staff and, taking into account the results, offers opportunities for teachers to update and continue their training with the aim of improving teaching and research activity.
- The institution promotes research. Institutional promotion and research acknowledgement activities, participation in research projects with other institutions, networks, etc. are carried out.
- There is a programme for acknowledging and promoting academic staff.
- Participation of teachers in mobility programmes.
- Participation of teachers in research activities.
- Participation of teachers in governing bodies.

4.2.- Support personnel (administration and services personnel, maintenance, laboratory technicians, etc.). The degree has sufficient support staff and is appropriately qualified, taking into account the characteristics of the curriculum.

Aspects to be assessed:

- Hiring regulation
- The support staff is sufficient to carry out the functions and serve all teaching and research staff, as well as students.
- The support staff involved in the degree has the proper level of qualification.
- The institution has a system for evaluating its support staff and taking into account the results, offers opportunities for support staff to update and continue their training with the aim of improving the teaching/learning activity.
- There is a programme for acknowledging and promoting support staff.
- Participation of support staff in governing bodies.

The analysis is based on:**Evidence:**

E6: Academic staff table (See Annex VI)

E14: Report/document referring to the teaching, research and/or professional experience of the teaching staff involved in the degree

E15: Training plans and/or training activities carried out by teachers

E16: Information on the research activity carried out, activities of institutional promotion and recognition of research, participation in research projects with other institutions, networks, etc., publications in scientific journals of international reference, etc.)

E17: Information on support staff by Centre (number, position/position held, experience, training activities undertaken, etc.)

E18: Report/document containing the analysis of the teaching evaluation surveys (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)

Indicators:

I3: Results of the satisfaction surveys of the different stakeholders (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)

I5: Average number of students per teaching group (explanatory, interactive teaching...)

I7: Percentage of degree teaching staff participating in university training plans and specific training activities

I8: Percentage of centre support staff participating in university training plans and specific training activities

I9: Results of surveys to evaluate teaching (% participation, results, evolution...)

I10: Evolution of mobility indicators (number and percentage of teachers participating in mobility programmes over the total number of teaching staff in the degree)

DIMENSION 2. RESOURCES**CRITERION 5. MATERIAL RESOURCES AND SERVICES:**

Standard: The material resources and services made available for developing the degree are adequate according to the nature, teaching-learning modality, the number of students enrolled and the skills to be acquired by them.

Analyse and assess whether the material resources and services made available to students are suitable for the needs of the degree.

5.1.- The material resources, infrastructure and services made available to students and teachers are sufficient and suitable for the characteristics of the curriculum, the modalities of delivery and the skills that students must achieve.

Aspects to be assessed:

- Teaching and research infrastructures are appropriate depending on the nature and type of degree. Special attention will be paid to the availability of classrooms, study rooms, computer rooms and resources, teaching and research laboratories, meeting rooms, library, etc.
- The material resources, made available to students and teachers, are appropriate according to the nature of the degree, the way it is taught and the skills to be acquired by them. Special attention will be paid to the availability of equipment and scientific and technical and artistic equipment (depending on the type of teaching).
- Implementation of universal accessibility and design for all, equality, safety, health and environment standards/programmes and their knowledge by the actors involved.
- Social responsibility: The institution has links with non-university social organizations or participates in social activities (cultural, sports, etc.)
- Bibliographic collections, documentary resources, etc., are sufficient and up to date.
- The tutorial and academic guidance services (subject selection, learning problems, special needs, accommodation...) and professional guidance (advice, job exchange, contact with employers...) made available to students are appropriate to direct and guide them in these subjects.
- The student care and administrative support services (documentation, reports of grades, minutes, academic certificates...) put at their disposal are appropriate to direct and orient them in these subjects.
- The welcome programmes guide the student in the functioning of the institution.
- Taking into account the different teaching modalities (face-to-face, distance, etc.), the degree of suitability, for the attainment of skills by the students, of the technological infrastructures and services both in the centre responsible for the degree and, where appropriate, in external centres (work experience centres, companies, associated centres, etc.) is analysed and revised.
- In the event that the degree contemplates the performance of external internships, the facilities where they are performed are suitable for acquiring skills.

The analysis is based on:

Evidence:

E19: Information on material resources and infrastructure directly linked to the degree (classrooms, laboratories, etc.)

E20: Universal accessibility and design for all, equality, safety, health and environment standards/programmes.

E21: Agreements with non-university social organizations (academic, cultural associations, etc.)

E22: Information on Academic Guidance Services and Host Programmes

E23: List of centres/entities for carrying out external internships

E24: Agreements in force with the entities where the external internships are carried out

E25: Bibliographic and other documentary resources related to the subject matter of the degree

E26: Didactic and/or technological materials that facilitate learning (virtual platform, forums, etc.)

Indicators:

I3: Results of the satisfaction surveys of the different stakeholders (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)

I5: Average number of students per teaching group (explanatory, interactive teaching...)

I11: Distribution of students by internship centres

DIMENSION 3. RESULTS**CRITERION 6. RESULTS OF LEARNING:**

Standard: The learning outcomes achieved by the graduates are consistent with the graduation profile.

Analyse the learning outcomes achieved by students and whether they are consistent with the graduation profile.

6.1.- At the end of the training process, the students have acquired the skills required for the degree.

Aspects to be assessed:

- The academic activities, teaching methodologies, evaluation and qualification systems contribute to achieve and evaluate the planned learning outcomes.
- The learning outcomes achieved meet the objectives of the training programme.
- Learning outcomes are taken into account for curriculum review and improvement.

The analysis is based on:**Evidence:**

E2: Available documentation on the curriculum and subjects (competencies, training activities, teaching methodologies, assessment systems, learning outcomes, etc.)

E4: Reports or documents containing the conclusions of the internal and external consultation procedures to assess the relevance and updating of the actual graduation profile of the degree students and the assessment of the acquisition of the learning outcomes

E27: List of End-of-Course Projects (degree, tutor and qualification) for the last 2 academic years

E28: Reports/grades list for each subject/degree subject

E29: Mechanisms used for analysing the acquisition of learning outcomes

E30: Documentation for the transversal review of the selected subjects (teaching material, examinations or other evaluation tests carried out...) (Only for external evaluation visits and follow-up)

E31: Selected End-of-Course Projects (Only for external evaluation visits and follow-up)

E32: Internship reports (Only for external evaluation visits and follow-up)

Indicators:

I3: Results of the satisfaction surveys of the different stakeholders (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)

I12: Evolution of performance indicators (all fees will be provided globally for the degree. Rates of return, success and evaluation will also be provided by field/subject)

DIMENSION 3. RESULTS
CRITERION 7. SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:
<i>Standard: The results of the indicators of the educational programme are congruent with the design, management and resources made available for the qualification and satisfy the social demands of their environment.</i>
Analyse the main data and results of the qualification and assess the evolution of a minimum core of indicators.
7.1.- The main data and indicators of the qualification evolve favourably according to the characteristics of the qualification.
Aspects to be assessed:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Demand indicators. ○ Result indicators. ○ Indicators are taken into account for curriculum improvements and review.
7.2.- The students, teachers, graduates and other stakeholders' satisfaction indexes are sufficient.
Aspects to be assessed:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Satisfaction indicators with academic staff, support staff, resources, external internships, training process, mobility, etc. ○ Satisfaction indicators are taken into account for curriculum improvements and review.
7.3.- The labour insertion values of the graduates of the degree are appropriate to its socio-economic and professional context.
Aspects to be assessed:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Analysis of existing results in the studies carried out on labour insertion of the degree or follow-up of degree graduates. ○ Adequacy of the evolution of the labour insertion indicators according to the degree characteristics. ○ Labour insertion indicators are taken into account for curriculum improvements and review.
The analysis is based on:
Evidence:
E12: Improvement Actions Plan derived from the implementation of the QAS
E13: Report/document containing the analysis of the satisfaction surveys (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)
E33: Report/document containing the analysis of the results of the degree (including labour insertion indicators or follow-up of graduates)
Indicators:
I1: Evolution of the number of new entrants per academic year/semester
I3: Results of the satisfaction surveys of the different stakeholders (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)
I12: Evolution of performance indicators (all fees will be provided globally for the degree. Rates of return, success and evaluation will also be provided by field/subject): (See Appendix IV: Information for fee calculation)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Graduation rate - Drop-out rate - Efficiency rate - Performance rate

- Success rate
- Evaluation rate

I4: Ratio of supply/demand of the new entry vacancies

I13: Labour market insertion results

ANNEXES



ANNEX I: SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

The self-evaluation committee must draft the self-evaluation report structured into three sections:

1.1 Data file. The report must include the following information:

1.1. DATA FILE.	
NAME OF THE DEGREE	
UNIVERSITY	
RESPONSIBLE CENTRE	
NAME OF THE PERSON IN CHARGE OF THE DEGREE	
E-MAIL ADDRESS OF THE PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEGREE	
NUMBER OF CREDITS/SEMESTERS OF DURATION	
IMPLEMENTATION COURSE	
ACCREDITATION DATE	

1.2 Introduction. The evaluation committee must cover the following sections in the introduction, at a minimum:

- *Describe the main characteristics of the degree and the centre where it is taught:* year of creation of the degree(s) subject to evaluation and a brief description of the evolution of these and other courses taught in the centre.
- *Composition of the self-evaluation committee:* include the names of the members of the committee, how they were selected, as well as the role they play and the position they hold.
- *Report on the self-evaluation process and working plan:* how the need for the degree(s) to be evaluated by an external committee arose, the objective of the evaluation, problems detected during preparation of the self-evaluation report,

approval process for the report, decisions made, as well as the timeline, specifications of each of the process phases, working procedures, etc.

1.3 Degree evaluation. In this section, the assessment of each sub-criterion must be carried out taking into account the evidence and indicators provided. It is therefore a question of reflecting on these aspects, providing comments that justify the assessment based on the evidence and indicators and specifying the strong points, weak points and areas for improvement.

DIMENSION 1. DEGREE MANAGEMENT
CRITERION 1. ORGANISATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Standard: The training programme is up-to-date, and it is implemented properly
Analyse and assess whether the development of the curriculum is done appropriately and there are no severe incidents, which has led to a proper acquisition of the competencies by the students.
1.1.- The degree maintains academic interest and is up-to-date according to the requirements of the discipline, technological and scientific advances, socio-economic needs and requirements of the profession.
Aspects to be assessed:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Training objectives are specified in the degree planning (as professional competencies or equivalent). ○ The educational and graduation profile of the degree is specified, which maintains its relevance and is updated according to the requirements of its academic, scientific and professional field.
Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:
1.2.- The curriculum is being suitably developed following a coherent offer of modules, fields of knowledge and subjects.
Aspects to be assessed:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The offer of modules, fields of knowledge and subjects is updated according to the teaching field and characteristics of the degree. ○ The academic activities, teaching methodologies, evaluation and qualification systems enable students to achieve the competencies. The size of the groups is adapted to the educational activities. ○ Student participation in mobility programmes.
Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:
1.3.- The degree has teaching coordination mechanisms that make it possible to analyse whether following the curriculum enables students to acquire skills and, where necessary, to establish appropriate improvement actions.
Aspects to be assessed:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The horizontal and vertical coordination between the different subjects-fields in the curriculum avoids gaps and duplications and makes for a suitable workload for students. ○ If there are subjects with educational activities that include a theoretical part and practical or laboratory activities, special attention will be paid to the coordination between both activities. ○ In the case of external/clinical internships, an assessment will be made as to whether the coordination mechanisms allow students to achieve the skills associated with these placements. ○ If the degree is taught in several modalities (face-to-face, mixed and/or distance), the teaching coordination between the modalities will be valued, so that the students reach the same competencies regardless of the type of study.
Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:
1.4. The admission criteria applied ensure that students admitted to the course have the right entry profile to begin these studies.

Aspects to be assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The entry profile is specified and is consistent with the actual profile of the student body enrolled in the degree course.
Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:
1.5.- The application of the various university regulations contributes to the efficiency in the results of the degree.
Aspects to be assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The application of the various regulations that apply to the degree (permanency regulations, regulations in the event of the termination of studies, credit recognition systems, regulations related to evaluation, end-of-degree/master's project, external internships, selection and hiring of teaching staff, administrative and service personnel, etc.).
Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:

DIMENSION 1. DEGREE MANAGEMENT
CRITERION 2. INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY
<i>Standard: The institution has mechanisms to adequately communicate to all stakeholders the characteristics of the programme and the processes that guarantee its quality.</i>
Analyse and assess whether the relevant information on the degree is public and available, in time and form, to all the agents involved (students, employers, educational administrations and other stakeholders).
2.1.- The institution publishes, for all stakeholders, objective, sufficient and updated information on the characteristics of the degree and on the processes that guarantee its quality.
Aspects to be assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Sufficient and relevant information is published on the characteristics of the training programme, its development and the results achieved.○ Information on the degree is objective and up to date.○ Easy access to relevant information on the degree is guaranteed to all stakeholders.
Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:

DIMENSION 1. DEGREE MANAGEMENT**CRITERION 3. QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM:**

Standard: The institution has an internal quality assurance system formally established and implemented that effectively ensures the continuous improvement of the degree.

Analyse the design and implementation of the Quality Assurance System (QAS) and assess its contribution to the continuous improvement of the degree.

3.1.- The QAS has the necessary mechanisms to collect accurate information, analyse it, detect weaknesses and propose improvement actions, monitoring them.

Aspects to be assessed:

- There is a QAS structured as a systematic and cyclical process of continuous improvement that is deployed through a clearly designed manual and procedures (refer to the ACSUG QAS Design Evaluation Guide):
 - Procedures for the design, periodic review and improvement of training programmes.
 - Student-centred procedures that guarantee the quality of the learning process (admission process, external internships, mobility programmes, academic and vocational guidance, follow-up of graduates, etc.).
 - Procedures to ensure the quality of academic and administrative staff and services (selection, adequacy, qualifications, training plans, etc.).
 - Procedures that guarantee the quality of material resources and services.
 - Procedures related to public information.
 - Procedures for analysing the satisfaction of the various stakeholders (students, academic and administrative staff and services, graduates, etc.).
 - Procedures for dealing with suggestions and complaints.
- There is a quality policy and objectives that attend to the needs and expectations of the various stakeholders; it covers its revision, updating and public dissemination.
- There is a body responsible for the QAS of the institution/centre (structure, composition, functions, etc.). All stakeholders must take part in this body (teachers, students, administrative and service staff, other external agents, etc.).
- The QAS documentation and information management system means results and indicators can be compiled quickly and fully, and the updated versions of the documents generated accessed.

Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:**3.2.- The implementation of the QAS facilitates monitoring the degrees and guarantees their continuous improvement.**

Aspects to be assessed:

- There are procedures for designing, approving, analysing and periodically reviewing training programmes and, if appropriate, terminating them.
- The analysis and review actions carried out from the QAS allow improvements to be made to the qualification. Preparing and/or annual updating of an Improvement Action Plan is envisaged, derived from the weaknesses detected in the qualification (each improvement action must include, as a minimum, the fields established in the sheet in Annex V of this guide).
- The actions to improve the qualification are monitored to check whether they have been effectively fulfilled and whether the objectives set have been achieved.

Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:

3.3.- The implemented QAS is reviewed periodically to analyse its suitability and, if necessary, the appropriate improvements are established.

Aspects to be assessed:

- There is clear and continuous evidence that the QAS is periodically reviewed and, where appropriate, improved. Preparing and/or annual updating of an Improvement Action Plan is envisaged, derived from the weaknesses detected in each procedure (each improvement action must include, as a minimum, the fields established in the sheet in Annex V of this guide).
- All stakeholders have been involved in the process of preparing, implementing and monitoring improvements to the QAS.
- The SGC's evidence shows the existence of a consolidated quality culture in the centre that contributes to continuous improvement.

Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:

DIMENSION 2. RESOURCES**CRITERION 4. HUMAN RESOURCES:**

Standard: Academic and support staff are sufficient and adequate according to the characteristics of the degree and the number of students.

To analyse and assess the suitability of the academic and support staff involved in the degree being assessed.

4.1.- Academic Staff. The degree has sufficient suitably qualified teaching staff, taking into account the characteristics of the curriculum, the modes of delivery and the skills to be attained by the students.

Aspects to be assessed:

- Hiring regulation.
- The teachers who participate in the degree have the proper level of qualification (teaching and research experience) for teaching the degree. The profile of academic staff assigned to external internships and Final Projects will be specially reviewed.
- The teaching staff is sufficient to develop the functions and attend to all the students.
- The institution has a system for evaluating its teaching staff and, taking into account the results, offers opportunities for teachers to update and continue their training with the aim of improving teaching and research activity.
- The institution promotes research. Institutional promotion and research acknowledgement activities, participation in research projects with other institutions, networks, etc. are carried out.
- There is a programme for acknowledging and promoting academic staff.
- Participation of teachers in mobility programmes.
- Participation of teachers in research activities.
- Participation of teachers in governing bodies.

Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:

4.2.- Support personnel (administration and services personnel, maintenance, laboratory technicians, etc.). The degree has sufficient support staff and is appropriately qualified, taking into account the characteristics of the curriculum.

Aspects to be assessed:

- Hiring regulation
- The support staff is sufficient to carry out the functions and serve all teaching and research staff, as well as students.
- The support staff involved in the degree has the proper level of qualification.
- The institution has a system for evaluating its support staff and taking into account the results, offers opportunities for support staff to update and continue their training with the aim of improving the teaching/learning activity.
- There is a programme for acknowledging and promoting support staff.
- Participation of support staff in governing bodies.

Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:

DIMENSION 2. RESOURCES**CRITERION 5. MATERIAL RESOURCES AND SERVICES:**

Standard: The material resources and services made available for developing the degree are adequate according to the nature, teaching-learning modality, the number of students enrolled and the skills to be acquired by them.

Analyse and assess whether the material resources and services made available to students are suitable for the needs of the degree.

5.1.- The material resources, infrastructure and services made available to students and teachers are sufficient and suitable for the characteristics of the curriculum, the modalities of delivery and the skills that students must achieve.

Aspects to be assessed:

- Teaching and research infrastructures are appropriate depending on the nature and type of degree. Special attention will be paid to the availability of classrooms, study rooms, computer rooms and resources, teaching and research laboratories, meeting rooms, library, etc.
- The material resources, made available to students and teachers, are appropriate according to the nature of the degree, the way it is taught and the skills to be acquired by them. Special attention will be paid to the availability of equipment and scientific and technical and artistic equipment (depending on the type of teaching).
- Implementation of universal accessibility and design for all, equality, safety, health and environment standards/programmes and their knowledge by the actors involved.
- Social responsibility: The institution has links with non-university social organizations or participates in social activities (cultural, sports, etc.)
- Bibliographic collections, documentary resources, etc., are sufficient and up to date.
- The tutorial and academic guidance services (subject selection, learning problems, special needs, accommodation...) and professional guidance (advice, job exchange, contact with employers...) made available to students are appropriate to direct and guide them in these subjects.
- The student care and administrative support services (documentation, reports of grades, minutes, academic certificates...) put at their disposal are appropriate to direct and orient them in these subjects.
- The welcome programmes guide the student in the functioning of the institution.
- Taking into account the different teaching modalities (face-to-face, distance, etc.), the degree of suitability, for the attainment of skills by the students, of the technological infrastructures and services both in the centre responsible for the degree and, where appropriate, in external centres (work experience centres, companies, associated centres, etc.) is analysed and revised.
- In the event that the degree contemplates the performance of external internships, the facilities where they are performed are suitable for acquiring skills.

Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:

DIMENSION 3. RESULTS**CRITERION 6. RESULTS OF LEARNING:**

Standard: The learning outcomes achieved by the graduates are consistent with the graduation profile.

Analyse the learning outcomes achieved by students and whether they are consistent with the graduation profile.

6.1.- At the end of the training process, the students have acquired the skills required for the degree.

Aspects to be assessed:

- The academic activities, teaching methodologies, evaluation and qualification systems contribute to achieve and evaluate the planned learning outcomes.
- The learning outcomes achieved meet the objectives of the training programme.
- Learning outcomes are taken into account for curriculum review and improvement.

Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:

DIMENSION 3. RESULTS
CRITERION 7. SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:
Standard: The results of the indicators of the educational programme are congruent with the design, management and resources made available for the qualification and satisfy the social demands of their environment.
Analyse the main data and results of the qualification and assess the evolution of a minimum core of indicators.
7.1.- The main data and indicators of the qualification evolve favourably according to the characteristics of the qualification.
Aspects to be assessed:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Demand indicators. ○ Result indicators. ○ Indicators are taken into account for curriculum improvements and review.
Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:
7.2.- The students, teachers, graduates and other stakeholders' satisfaction indexes are sufficient.
Aspects to be assessed:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Satisfaction indicators with academic staff, support staff, resources, external internships, training process, mobility, etc. ○ Satisfaction indicators are taken into account for curriculum improvements and review.
Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:
7.3.- The labour insertion values of the graduates of the degree are appropriate to its socio-economic and professional context.
Aspects to be assessed:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Analysis of existing results in the studies carried out on labour insertion of the degree or follow-up of degree graduates. ○ Adequacy of the evolution of the labour insertion indicators according to the degree characteristics. ○ Labour insertion indicators are taken into account for curriculum improvements and review.
Reflection/comments justifying the assessment:



ANEX II: MINIMUM RELEVANT INFORMATION TO BE PUBLISHED ON THE DEGREE

PUBLIC INFORMATION
Name of the degree
Number of credits and duration of the degree
Centre responsible for the degree
Coordinator and/or person responsible for the degree
Number of places for new entrants offered
Languages in which the degree is taught
Regulated professions for which it qualifies, where appropriate
Objectives and skills of the qualification
Access and admission criteria
Reception and orientation procedures for new students
Recommended entry profile
Special conditions or access tests, if any
Necessary educational complements, depending on the previous training accredited by the student, if applicable
Structure of the training programme: name of the module or subject, content in ECTS credits, temporary organisation, compulsory or optional nature
Hours
Teacher Guides/Teacher Programming ¹
End-of-degree/master's project (evaluation committees, calls, topics, etc.)
Information on external internships, if any (collaborating entities...)
Description of faculty (category, contact details...)
Description of other human resources needed and available for curriculum development
Classrooms and Seminars
Laboratories
IT rooms
Study halls
Library
Other services available
Spaces for student representatives
Results of the degree (Graduation rate, abandonment, efficiency, performance, success, evaluation, labour insertion)
Other fees/complementary results that the qualification makes public
Body responsible for the centre's quality assurance system
The centre's quality policy and objectives

¹ Type of subject, number of credits, skills, contents, methodology, evaluation system, tutorials, calendar and timetable, teacher responsible, language in which it is taught)

ANNEX III: LIST OF EVIDENCE AND INDICATORS

The following is a list of evidence (E) and indicators (I) that should serve to support the reflections and assessments included in the follow-up self-evaluation report and the accreditation of the degree (IA) and that will also serve as a source of information to be contrasted in the hearings with the different groups to be interviewed during the external visit to the centre. Evidence indicating "visit" should only be provided at the time of external visits. The evolution of the indicators should be presented.

No.	Criteria	EVIDENCE	When/where it is contributed
E1	1	Report/document containing the analysis of the actual entry/graduation profile	With IA/Link or pdf
E2	1,6	Available documentation on the curriculum and subjects (competencies, training activities, teaching methodologies, assessment systems, learning outcomes, etc.)	With IA/Link or pdf
E3	1	Documentation related to the coordination actions carried out, including the minutes of the meetings held by the committees and bodies in charge of these activities (the minutes must include a section with the agreements adopted at each meeting)	With IA/Link or pdf
E4	1,6	Reports or documents containing the conclusions of the internal and external consultation procedures to assess the relevance and updating of the actual graduation profile of the degree students and the assessment of the acquisition of the learning outcomes	With IA/Link or pdf
E5	1	University regulations	With IA/Link or pdf
E6	1,4	Academic Staff Chart (Annex VI)	With IA/Link or pdf
E7	2	Website of the University/Centre/Degree (at least the information referred to in Annex II must be included)	With IA/Link or pdf
E8	3	QAS documentation (QAS manual and procedures, quality policy and objectives, indicator panel, etc.)	With IA/Link or pdf
E9	3	Strategic planning	With IA/Link or pdf
E10	3	Documentation related to the review and continuous improvement actions carried out, including the minutes of the meetings held by the committees and bodies in charge of these activities (the minutes must include a section with the list of attendees and a summary of the agreements adopted at each meeting)	With IA/Link or pdf

No.	Criteria	EVIDENCE	When/where it is contributed
E11	3	Evidence of the implementation of QAS procedures (complete, revised and updated procedures that develop QAS guidelines: Quality policy, Design, periodic review and improvement of training programmes, learning Guarantee, student-centred teaching and assessment, Guarantee and improvement to the quality of human resources (including research), Guarantee and improvement to the quality of material resources and services and Public Information, etc.)	With IA/Link or pdf
E12	3,7	Improvement Actions Plan derived from the implementation of the QAS	With IA/Link or pdf
E13	3,7	Report/document containing the analysis of the satisfaction surveys (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)	With IA/Link or pdf
E14	4	Report/document referring to the teaching, research and/or professional experience of the teaching staff involved in the degree	With IA/Link or pdf
E15	4	Training plans and/or training activities carried out by teachers	With IA/Link or pdf
E16	4	Information on the research activity carried out, activities of institutional promotion and recognition of research, participation in research projects with other institutions, networks, etc., publications in scientific journals of international reference, etc.)	With IA/Link or pdf
E17	4	Information on support staff by Centre (number, position/position held, experience, training activities undertaken, etc.)	With IA/Link or pdf
E18	4	Report/document containing the analysis of the teaching evaluation surveys (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)	With IA/Link or pdf
E19	5	Information on material resources and infrastructure directly linked to the degree (classrooms, laboratories, etc.)	With IA/Link or pdf
E20	5	Universal accessibility and design for all, equality, safety, health and environment standards/programmes.	With IA/Link or pdf
E21	5	Agreements with non-university social organizations (academic, cultural associations, etc.)	With IA/Link or pdf
E22	5	Information on Academic Guidance Services and Host Programmes	With IA/Link or pdf
E23	5	List of centres/entities for carrying out external internships	With IA/Link or pdf
E24	5	Agreements in force with the entities where the external internships are carried out	With IA/Link or pdf
E25	5	Bibliographic and other documentary resources related to the subject matter of the degree	With IA/Link or pdf
E26	5	Didactic and/or technological materials that facilitate learning (virtual platform, forums, etc.)	With IA/Link or pdf

No.	Criteria	EVIDENCE	When/where it is contributed
E27	6	List of End-of-Course Projects (degree, tutor and qualification) for the last 2 academic years	With IA/Link or pdf
E28	6	Reports/grades list for each subject/degree subject	With IA/Link or pdf
E29	6	Mechanisms used for analysing the acquisition of learning outcomes	With IA/Link or pdf
E30	6	Documentation for the transversal review of the selected subjects (teaching material, examinations or other evaluation tests carried out...)	Visit
E31	6	Selected End-of-Course Projects	Visit
E32	6	Internship reports	Visit
E33	7	Report/document containing the analysis of the results of the degree (including labour insertion indicators or follow-up of graduates)	With IA/Link or pdf

No.	Criteria	INDICATORS	When/where it is contributed
I1	1,7	Evolution of the number of new entrants per academic year/semester	With IA/Link or pdf
I2	1	Evolution of mobility indicators (number of students participating in mobility programmes, ratio of students participating in mobility programmes to enrolled students...)	With IA/Link or pdf
I3	1,2,3,4,5,6,7	Results of the satisfaction surveys of the different stakeholders (percentage of participation, results and their evolution...)	With IA/Link or pdf
I4	1,7	Ratio of supply/demand of the new entry vacancies	With IA/Link or pdf
I5	1,4,5	Average number of students per teaching group (explanatory, interactive teaching)	With IA/Link or pdf
I6	3	Results of the indicators established in the QAS	With IA/Link or pdf
I7	4	Percentage of degree teaching staff participating in university training plans and specific training activities	With IA/Link or pdf
I8	4	Percentage of centre support staff participating in university training plans and specific training activities	With IA/Link or pdf
I9	4	Results of surveys to evaluate teaching (% participation, results, evolution...)	With IA/Link or pdf
I10	4	Evolution of mobility indicators (number and percentage of teachers participating in mobility programmes as a percentage over the total number of teaching staff in the degree)	With IA/Link or pdf
I11	5	Distribution of students by internship centres	With IA/Link or pdf
I12	6,7	Evolution of performance indicators (all fees will be provided globally for the degree. Rates of return, success and evaluation will also be provided by field/subject)	With IA/Link or pdf
I13	7	Labour market insertion results	With IA/Link or pdf



ANNEX IV. INFORMATION FOR FEE CALCULATION

Name	Graduation rate of the degree	
Description	Percentage ratio between the students of an entry cohort C who exceed, in the scheduled time plus one year, the credits leading to a qualification T and the total of the new students of the same cohort C in said T qualification.	
Justification	This indicator provides annual information on the proportion of students who manage to finish in the expected time plus one year ($t = t+1$) a degree with respect to students initially enrolled.	
Calculation method	$(N^{\circ}$ of students of a cohort of entry C in a Qualification T that manage to finish this qualification in the expected period + 1 / N° of students of new entry of a cohort of entry C in a Qualification T) * 100	
Features	Periodicity	Academic Year
	Information source	University
	History log	
	Type of representation	Percentage with one decimal place
Aggregation/disaggregation level	By qualification and entry cohort For the different degrees taught	
Example	<p>The number of students in the 2010-11 entry cohort in Qualification X was 100 students.</p> <p>And the number of these students (students of the 2010-11 entry cohort in Qualification X) who manage to complete that qualification in the planned time plus one year was 90 students.</p> <p>The graduation rate of the qualification would be: $(90/100) * 100 = 90,0\%$</p> <p>That is, the number of students in the 2010-11 entry cohort in Qualification X completed the qualification.</p>	
Specifications	<p>Each academic year is calculated for graduates of the same entry cohort.</p> <p>New students are those who, for Qualification T, started their studies from the beginning.</p> <p>The expected time will be understood as the number of academic years contemplated in the plan to achieve the credits that make up the degree.</p>	
Interpretation	<p>This indicator serves to calibrate the match between the initial design of the curriculum and its implementation and the goal of students completing their studies in a reasonable period of time.</p> <p>The further away from 100% the values are, the less the curriculum design will match the previous education of the students, or the more difficult the subjects will be, or the more inadequate the planning or the procedures will be for the evaluation of learning.</p>	
Name	Drop-out rate of the degree	

Description	Percentage ratio between the students of an entry cohort C who are enrolled on a qualification T in academic year X but fail to enrol on that same qualification T in academic years X+1 and X+2, and the total number of students in this same cohort group C who started the aforementioned qualification T or academic year X.	
Justification	This indicator provides annual information on the proportion of students who abandoned the degree with respect to students initially enrolled.	
Calculation method	$(\text{No. of newly-enrolled students on qualification T in academic year X who are no longer enrolled in that same qualification T in the academic years X+1 and X+2} / \text{No. of newly-enrolled students in qualification T in academic year X}) * 100$	
Features	Periodicity	Academic year
	Information source	University
	History log	From X+2 onwards, the amount is expressed as a cumulative total
	Type of representation	Percentage with one decimal place
Aggregation/disaggregation level	By qualification and entry cohort For the different degrees taught	
Example	<p>The number of students from cohort group C in qualification X in the 2009-10 academic year was 70.</p> <p>Among these students (from entry cohort X in the 2009-10 academic year), the number that are no longer enrolled in that qualification in the 2010-11 and 2011-12 academic years was 10.</p> <p>The dropout rate of the degree for the entry cohort in the 2009-2010 academic year would be: $(10/70) * 100 = 14,3\%$</p> <p>That is, 14.3% of new students in qualification X in the 2009-10 academic year dropped out during the two academic years after enrolment.</p>	
Specifications	<p>The calculation assesses how the cohort group in question changes each year.</p> <p>This indicator is calculated in academic years X+1 and X+2 in order to anticipate the number of students who will continue the qualification.</p> <p>Students who graduate from qualification T will not be considered dropouts.</p>	
Interpretation	<p>This indicator shows the percentage linked to the dropout rate year on year during students' first three academic years on a same curriculum.</p> <p>Where this dropout rate is high, an analysis should be performed to determine the reasons, with a view to adopting the appropriate corrective measures.</p> <p>For example, students may be dropping out at the end of the first academic year, and it could be due to the curriculum being too difficult.</p>	

Name	Efficiency rate of graduates	
Description	Percent ratio of the total number of credits in which graduate students of a G graduation cohort had to enrol to earn a qualification T to the total number of credits in which graduate students of a G graduation cohort actually enrolled to earn a qualification T.	
Justification	This indicator provides annual information on the difference between the number of credits graduates actually enrolled for with respect to the credits in which they should be enrolled.	
Calculation method	$(\sum \text{No. of credits in which they should have enrolled in a Qualification T by graduation cohort G} / \sum \text{N}^\circ \text{ of credits actually enrolled in a Qualification T by graduation cohort G}) * 100$	
Features	Periodicity	Academic Year
	Information source	University
	History log	
	Type of representation	Percentage with one decimal place
Aggregation/disaggregation level	<p>By qualification and graduation cohort.</p> <p>For the various qualifications taught at the centre.</p> <p>It may be calculated on the basis of the credits the student has enrolled in.</p> <p>It would be convenient that the interpretation of the data obtained be done taking into account the extra credits students enrolled in comparison with those that theoretically would be required to obtain the degree.</p>	
Example	<p>The number of credits effectively enrolled in by students in Qualification X by the graduation cohort of 150 graduates in 2012-13 was 37,500.</p> <p>And 36,000 is the number of credits that 150 graduate students should have enrolled in 2012-13 to complete their studies in the planned years.</p> <p>The efficiency rate of the degree would be: $(36000/37500) * 100 = 96,0\%$</p> <p>That is to say, the set of persons graduated in 2012-13 in Qualification X enrolled in a number of credits in relative terms close to the number necessary for obtaining the degree.</p>	
Specifications	<p>Only those new students who enrolled in the degree for the first time will be considered. That is, without any credit recognised as a consequence of transferring a file or having completed another degree.</p> <p>This rate will be obtained the academic year following the student's graduation in the degree.</p> <p>A graduate student is a student who has passed the number of credits required to earn the degree referred to.</p> <p>Each academic year is calculated for graduates of the same graduation cohort.</p> <p>Up to a maximum of the credits achieved necessary to complete the degree will be counted (i.e. all credits achieved that exceed the number required to obtain the degree will not be counted).</p>	
Interpretation	<p>This indicator shows, on average, the excess credits a student is required to earn the degree in which he or she is enrolled.</p> <p>The further away from 100% are the values of the indicator, the greater the difficulty of the curriculum, since students are forced to enrol several times in some subjects (which must be located to take the appropriate improvement measures).</p>	
Name	Qualification Success Rate	

Description	For an academic year X, the percentage ratio between the number of ordinary credits passed in Qualification T and the total number of ordinary credits enrolled in Qualification T.	
Justification	This indicator provides annual information on the proportion of ordinary credits passed by students with respect to ordinary credits presented for examination, in the different Qualifications taught.	
Calculation method	$(\Sigma \text{ No. of ordinary credits passed in a Qualification T in academic year X} / \Sigma \text{ N}^\circ \text{ of ordinary credits enrolled in a Qualification T in academic year X}) \times 100$.	
Features	Periodicity	Academic year
	Information source	University
	History log	
	Type of representation	Percentage with one decimal place
Aggregation/disaggregation level	By degree and academic year. For the different degrees taught at the University.	
Example	<p>The number of ordinary credits enrolled in academic year 2013-14 in a qualification X was 2,400.</p> <p>And the number of ordinary credits passed in academic year 2013-14 by these students was 2,000.</p> <p>So, the Degree Evaluation Rate would be: $(2000/2400) * 100 = 83.3\%$</p> <p>That is, 83.3% of enrolled ordinary credits in academic year 2013-14 in Qualification X were passed.</p>	
Specifications	Recognised and transferred credits are not included in credits earned or enrolled.	
Interpretation	<p>This indicator can be interpreted, course by course, as the still photo showing the difficulty/facility with which students pass the subjects in which they are enrolled.</p> <p>The further away from 100% the values are, the greater the difficulty of the modules or subjects or the need for greater monitoring of the students during the enrolment process, or it could be an indication that the sequence of modules/subjects in the curriculum is inappropriate.</p> <p>How this indicator fluctuates during the implementation period could prove particularly helpful in defining and implementing measures for improvement.</p>	

Name	Qualification Success Rate	
Description	For an academic year X, the percentage ratio between the number of ordinary credits passed in Qualification T and the total number of ordinary credits presented for examination in Qualification T examination.	
Justification	This indicator provides annual information on the proportion of ordinary credits passed by students with respect to ordinary credits presented for examination, in the different Qualifications taught.	
Calculation method	$(\Sigma \text{ No. of ordinary credits passed in Qualification T at the Complutense University in academic year X} / \Sigma \text{ N}^\circ \text{ of ordinary credits presented for examination in Qualification at the Complutense University in academic year X}) \times 100.$	
Features	Periodicity	Academic Year
	Information source	University
	History log	
	Type of representation	Percentage with one decimal place
Aggregation/disaggregation level	By University, Centre, Qualification and academic year.	
Example	<p>The number of ordinary credits examined in academic year 2013-14 in Qualification T was 2200, and the number of credits passed in academic year 2013-14 by these students was 2,000.</p> <p>So, the Degree Evaluation Fee would be: $IUCM-9 = (2000/2200) \times 100 = 90.9\%$. That is, 90.9% of enrolled credits finally examined in academic year 2013-14 in Qualification T were passed.</p>	
Specifications	Recognised and transferred credits are not included in credits earned or enrolled.	
Interpretation	<p>This indicator can be interpreted, course by course, as the still photo showing the difficulty/facility with which students pass the subjects in which they are examined. The further away from 100% the values are, the greater the difficulty of the modules or subjects or the need for greater monitoring of the students by their tutors.</p> <p>How this indicator fluctuates during the implementation period could prove particularly helpful in defining and implementing measures for improvement.</p>	

Name	Qualification assessment rate	
Description	For an academic year X, the percentage ratio between the number of ordinary credits passed in a Qualification T and the total number of ordinary credits enrolled in a Qualification T.	
Justification	This indicator provides annual information on the proportion of ordinary credits passed by students with respect to ordinary credits enrolled in the different Qualifications taught.	
Calculation method	$(\sum \text{No. of ordinary credits passed in a Qualification T at the Complutense University in academic year X} / \sum \text{N}^\circ \text{ of ordinary credits enrolled in a Qualification at the Complutense University in academic year X}) \times 100.$	
Features	Periodicity	Academic Year
	Information source	University
	History log	
	Type of representation	Percentage with one decimal place
Aggregation/disaggregation level	By University, Centre, Qualification and academic year.	
Example	<p>The number of ordinary credits examined in academic year 2013-14 in Qualification T was 2,200, and the number of credits enrolled in academic year 2013-14 by these students was 2,500.</p> <p>So, the Degree Evaluation Fee would be: $IUCM-23 = (2200/2500) \times 100 = 88\%$</p> <p>That is, 88% of enrolled credits finally assessed in academic year 2013-14 in Qualification T were passed.</p>	
Specifications	<p>Recognised and transferred credits are not included in credits earned or enrolled.</p> <p>In those subjects that were not examined, it will be counted if the student appears in the records of that subject in situations other than Not Presented.</p>	
Interpretation	<p>This indicator can be interpreted, course by course, as the still photo showing the difficulty/facility with which students expect to pass the subjects in which they are examined. The further above or below 100% the values are, the lower is the expectation of passing the studies and therefore, it can provide an indirect measurement of the difficulty of the modules or subjects or the need of a greater monitoring of the students by the tutors.</p> <p>To reach valid conclusions, it is very important to analyse this Rate in relation to the Success Rate and the Performance Rate.</p> <p>How this indicator fluctuates during the implementation period could prove particularly helpful in defining and implementing measures for improvement.</p>	

Name	Occupation rate of the qualification (labour insertion)
------	---------------------------------------------------------

Description	Percentage of employed persons over the total number of persons graduating from a given course of official university education. Occupation is identified by the graduate's declaration to that effect in a survey carried out in some 24 months after the year of completion of their studies.
Justification	This indicator provides information on the situation regarding the entry into the labour market of university graduates at a given time. It must be contextualized with other indicators such as unemployment and/or inactivity rate to show a proper perspective of the specific situation of the graduates.



ANNEX V. IMPROVEMENT ACTION SHEET

IMPROVEMENT ACTION Nº ___	
CRITERIA...	
Name of improvement action	
Weakness detected/cause analysis	
Scope of Application	
Person responsible for application	
Specific objectives	
Actions to be taken	
Execution period	
Resources/financing	
Responsible for follow-up and date	
Execution indicators	
Documentary evidence and/or records that are/will be presented as evidence of their implementation	
Remarks	
Revision/Assessment	
Level of compliance (total or partial)	
Person responsible for revision and date	
Results Obtained	
Level of satisfaction	
Corrective actions to be developed	

ANNEX VI: ACADEMIC STAFF CHART²

DEGREE:							
TEACHER	AREA OF KNOWLEDGE	ACADEMIC BACKGROUND	DOCTOR Yes/No	CONTRACT TYPE	DEDICATION³	YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE	SUBJECT(S) TAUGHT⁴

² A table must be completed for each of the Centre’s degrees.

³ (Full-time/part-time) - State the number of hours per semester.

If the person is a coordinator or is responsible for any of the subjects, please state it.



ANNEX VII: EXAMPLE OF THE VISIT PROGRAMME

PROGRAMME FOR THE VISIT RENEWAL OF ACCREDITATION OF OFFICIAL QUALIFICATIONS

VISIT DATES:

CENTRE:

UNIVERSITY:

DEGREE(S):

INDEX

- 1.- VISIT EVALUATION COMMITTEE
- 2.- GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE VISIT
- 3.- VISIT PROGRAMME

1.- VISIT EVALUATION COMMITTEE

(Appointed by CGIACA on)

Subcommission for the visit

Chairman: academic member

Academic 1: academic member

Academic 2: academic member

Student: student member

Secretary: ACSUG technician

2.- GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE VISIT

- The centre will provide the Evaluation Committee with **a room** for holding hearings with the various stakeholders, which will also be used for the internal working meetings of the Evaluation Committee. A room will be available where the committee can hold an internal working meeting, if necessary, the afternoon before the day of the visit.
- The centre will select the persons who are to take part in the meetings, seeking to provide the widest representation of all the qualifications to be accredited. The general characteristics of the various stakeholders taking part in the hearings are:
 - **Teaching and research staff (PDI):** representatives from different courses, different levels (civil servants, hired, etc.), coordinators/people responsible for TFG/TFM, internship tutors.
 - **Students:** representatives from different courses, who have experienced external internships (if any), participated in a mobility program, student representatives, who applied for credit recognition, part-time students (if any).
 - **Support staff:** support staff (laboratories, IT rooms of the centre), head of secretariat.

- **Graduates:** representation of different cohorts of graduates, including some studying for doctorates.
 - **Employers:** representatives from various sectors.
- It is recommended that the number of participants in the various hearings should not exceed 10, unless previously agreed with the Evaluation Committee.
 - Each person must attend only one hearing (excepting the Management Team and Quality Assurance Committee).
 - Before the visit, the centre will send a list of those attending the hearings.
 - Before the visit, the centre will send a list of the TFG/TFM including the qualification, evaluation and tutor, from which the Evaluation Committee will choose at least two to have available as evidence at the time of the visit.
 - Out of the subjects indicated to the centre previously, it must have prepared the following evidence:
 - Teaching guide.
 - Student evaluation dossiers (exams, exercises, evaluation tests, etc.), of the last course.
 - Distribution of the last three years' grades.
 - Examples of the subject teaching material: books, slides, access to the virtual environment, etc. (of the last year).
 - Specific detail of teaching planning and development (distribution of contents, distribution of time, etc.) for the last year.
 - Information on teachers who teach the subject: lines of research, teaching and research experience, category.
 - The centre will inform the different stakeholders as it sees best on the procedure of renewing accreditation of qualifications. The Evaluation Committee will deal with any observations or suggestions made on the process during the time set for the public hearing in the visit programme.

3.- VISIT PROGRAMME

EXAMPLE OF THE VISIT PROGRAMME

Centre:.....

Days:.....

DAY	SCHEDULE	ACTIVITY
First day of visit	08:50-09:00	Reception of the Evaluation Committee
	09:00-09:15	Meeting with the Faculty Management Team
	09:30-11:30	Meeting with the Quality Assurance Committee
	11:45-12:45	Internal meeting of the Evaluation Committee. Evidence Analysis (1)/Coffee
	13:00-13:45	Meeting with a representative sample of degree students
	14:00-15:30	Lunch
	15:30-16:15	Meeting with a representative sample of the academic staff of the qualification
	16.30-17:15	Meeting with a representative sample of graduates
	17:15-18:00	Meeting with a representative sample of employers
	18:15	Leave centre

DAY	SCHEDULE	ACTIVITY
Second day of visit	09:00-10:30	Guided tour of the installations
	10:45-11:30	Meeting with a representative sample of support staff
	11:30-12:00	Coffee break
	12:00-12:45	Public Hearing
	13:00-14:30	Internal meeting of the Evaluation Committee. Evidence Analysis (2)
	14:30-16:00	Lunch
	16:00-17:30	Internal meeting of the Evaluation Committee
	17:30-18:30	Final meeting of the Committee with the management team/CGC. (Oral report)
	19:00	Vote of thanks to the Committee



ANNEX VIII: SAMPLE INTERIM ACCREDITATION REPORT

**PROVISIONAL EVALUATION REPORT
FOR
ACCREDITATION**

NAME OF THE DEGREE	
UNIVERSITY	
CENTRE WHERE COURSE IS TAUGHT	
TOTAL NUMBER OF CREDITS/SEMESTERS OF DURATION	
IMPLEMENTATION COURSE	

1. Objective and scope of evaluation made

According to the Collaboration Agreement between the University of..... and ACSUG, the following qualification has been evaluated....

2. Composition of the External Evaluation Committee

The evaluation has been carried out by an Evaluation Committee of the branch of knowledge made up of national and international experts from the academic field, professionals and students. The members of this committee were selected and appointed in accordance with the procedure set out on the ACSUG website.

The External Evaluation Committee set up to evaluate the qualification is made up of the following members:

- Chairman:
- Academic member:
- Professional member:
- Student member
- Secretary

3. Description of the external evaluation process

Description of the work plan followed by the External Evaluation Committee.

4. EVALUATION PROCESS

4.1. Outcome of the evaluation process

This report is the result of the evaluation of the set of documentary evidence on the qualification and the visit of the Evaluation Committee to the centre where it is given.

The Evaluation Committee has collectively evaluated all available information on this qualification and, according to the criteria set out in the evaluation guide, issues an **interim** evaluation report of:

- Favourable
- Valuation conditioned to the drawing up of an Improvement Plan.

Considering the following evaluation by criterion:

DIMENSIONS AND CRITERIA	EVALUATION (A/B/C/D)
DIMENSION 1. DEGREE MANAGEMENT	
Criterion 1. Organisation and development	
Criterion 2. Information and transparency	
Criterion 3. Quality assurance system	
DIMENSION 2. RESOURCES	
Criterion 4. Human resources	
Criterion 5. Material resources and services	
DIMENSION 3. RESULTS	
Criterion 6. Results of learning	
Criterion 7. Satisfaction and performance indicators	

4.2. Evaluation of dimensions and criteria. Analysis of strengths, weaknesses and proposals for improvement:

4.2.1. MAIN STRENGTHS

4.2.2. ASPECTS THAT SHOULD BE PART OF AN IMPROVEMENTS PLAN (by dimension and criterion)

4.2.3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT (by dimension and criterion)

The provisions of this report may be appealed within 30 calendar days.

Santiago de Compostela, XX XX 201X

Signed: ACSUG Director

CGIACA Secretary



ANNEX IX: EXAMPLE OF AN INTERIM ACCREDITATION RENEWAL REPORT

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR ACCREDITATION

NAME OF THE DEGREE	
UNIVERSITY	
CENTRE WHERE COURSE IS TAUGHT	
TOTAL NUMBER OF CREDITS/SEMESTERS OF DURATION	
IMPLEMENTATION COURSE	

1. Objective and scope of evaluation made

According to the Collaboration Agreement between the University of..... and ACSUG, the following qualification has been evaluated....

2. Composition of the External Evaluation Committee

The evaluation has been carried out by an Evaluation Committee of the.....branch of knowledge made up of national and international experts from the academic field, professionals and students. The members of this committee were selected and appointed in accordance with the procedure set out on the ACSUG website.

The External Evaluation Committee set up to evaluate the qualification is made up of the following members:

- Chairman:
- Academic member:
- Professional member:
- Student member
- Secretary

3. Description of the external evaluation process

Description of the work plan followed by the External Evaluation Committee.

4. EVALUATION PROCESS

4.1. Overall outcome of the evaluation process

This report is the result of evaluating the set of documentary evidence on the qualification, of the visit to the centre where the qualification is taught, and of the revision of the Improvement Plan submitted by the centre once the provisional evaluation report has been received.

Once each of the evaluation criteria has been evaluated according to these four levels:

- **Exceeded with excellence (A)**. The standard corresponding to the criterion is fully achieved and it is also an example that exceeds the basic requirements.
- **Achieved (B)**. The standard corresponding to the criterion is fully achieved.
- **Partially achieved (C)**. The standard is achieved at the minimum level, but there are some aspects that should be improved.
- **Not achieved (D)**. The criterion has not achieved the minimum level required for reaching the corresponding standard.

ACSUG issues a **final evaluation report** as:

- Favourable
- Unfavourable

Considering the following evaluation by criterion:

DIMENSIONS AND CRITERIA	EVALUATION
DIMENSION 1. DEGREE MANAGEMENT	
Criterion 1. Organisation and development	
Criterion 2. Information and transparency	
Criterion 3. Quality assurance system	
DIMENSION 2. RESOURCES	
Criterion 4. Human resources	
Criterion 5. Material resources and services	
DIMENSION 3. RESULTS	
Criterion 6. Results of learning	
Criterion 7. Satisfaction and performance indicators	

4.2. EXPLANATION OF THE RESULT**4.3. MAIN STRENGTHS****4.4. IMPROVEMENT PLAN. The improvement actions in response to the interim evaluation report are:**

*ACSUG, within **3 years**, will evaluate the qualification monitoring report together with the evidence substantiating compliance with the actions of the Improvement Plan and will send the university a monitoring report on compliance with said Plan.*

Santiago de Compostela, XX XX 201X

Signed: ACSUG Director

CGIACA Secretary



ANNEX XX.- GLOSSARY

Accreditation: the process by which an agency guarantees that the education leading to obtaining the official qualifications complies with the pre-established quality requirements included in the evaluation guide.

Self-Evaluation Committee: a body comprising members of the evaluated unit responsible for conducting and drafting the self-evaluation report.

External evaluation committee: a body made up of expert evaluators from outside the institution and the unit under evaluation that carries out the external evaluation.

ECTS credit: The European ECTS credit is the acronym for European Credit Transfer System, and is the standard adopted by all EHEA universities to ensure the standardisation and quality of the studies they offer. The ECTS credit is the unit used to account for all the activities carried out by students during the educational process: class hours, theory and practice, study hours, seminars, tasks, work experience and projects, preparation and performance of examinations or other evaluation tests. Each ECTS credit is equivalent to 25-30 hours of work.

Criterion: reference or set of elements that help understand an aspect of a model or system.

Strategy: set of actions and behaviours of the people, team and responsible entity, co-ordinated and guided to achieve the established objectives.

Quality Guarantee: all activities aimed at ensuring internal/external quality. In this case it includes actions aimed at ensuring the quality of the education provided by the centre, as well as generating and maintaining the trust of the students, professors and society.

Stakeholder: any person, group or institution that has an interest in the centre, in its teachings or in the results obtained. They include students, professors, parents, public administrations, employers and society at large.

Subject: Academic unit that includes one or more subjects that can be conceived as a whole, in such a way that they constitute coherent units from the academic point of view.

Continuous Improvement: concept used in management models that implies a constant effort by the organisation to advance in quality.

Module/Curricular Unit: An academic unit that includes one or more subjects that constitute an organisational unit within a curriculum.

Mobility: possibility or action by students, professors or administrative staff to spend a certain amount of time studying or working at another higher education institution in their own country or abroad. In the case of students, the mobility programme includes the associated demand for academic recognition of the subjects given during their stay.

Quality Objectives: list of aspects, proposals and intentions to achieve for the purpose of improving the institution, training offer, unit or services evaluated.

Academic Staff: personnel from the university teaching staffs who carry out a teaching or research activity.

Administrative Personnel: non-teaching civil service or labour personnel who make up the administrative, management and services structure of the University.

Planning: Process by which the team, people or entities responsible for education design the strategies for achieving the objectives of the same (it must be systematic and periodic).

Quality Policy: global intentions and orientation of an organisation regarding its commitment to service quality for users and for stakeholders.

External Internships: set of training activities undertaken by students at businesses or institutions that aim to develop the practical and professional side of the training programme. They may be either required or voluntary and recognised or not in the syllabus.

Process: set of mutually related activities that interact and transform input into output.

Procedure: mode of executing certain actions that tend to be done in the same way, with a common series of steps defined in advance.

Labour insertion Programme: regulated project aimed at guiding students in their final year to access their first job.

Outcome: consequences of the processes related to the activities carried out by the centre.

Internal Quality Assurance System: integrated set of activities carried out by the centre to guarantee the quality of the education, as well as the relationship existing among those activities.

End-of-Degree /Master's Project (TFG/TFM): this is a subject that the student must pass in order to obtain a degree. It consists of an original piece of work that the student, with the help of a tutor, must carry out at the end of his studies and in which he must demonstrate that

he has acquired the skills, knowledge, abilities and aptitudes provided for in the curriculum of the qualification.