Substantive Change Report

by Fundación para el Conocimiento Madridmasd

Decision of:	19/06/2019
Report received on:	20/03/2019
Agency registered since:	05/06/2015
Last external review report:	February/2015
Registration until:	29/02/2020
Absented themselves from decision-making:	none
Attachments:	1. Substantive Change Report

1. The Register Committee considered the Substantive Change Report of 20/03/2019.

2. The Register Committee noted that the new member of the regional government has been included in the Board of Trustees.

3. The Agency stated that 4 representatives of the public universities are now appointed by the head of the office of the Counsellor with competence in Research, at proposal of the CRUMA (Presidents of Publicly-Funded Universities in Madrid).

4. The Register Committee underlined that the upcoming external review should analyse the new composition of the Board of Trustees since this issue was flagged in the initial decision on the registration.

5. The Register Committee took note that the new procedure for election of the Director of the Foundation foresees an open concurrence selection process carried out by an external and independent commission, for a term of 4 years.

6. Nevertheless, the Register Committee noted that the selection and composition of the external and independent commission has not been addressed in the change report.

7. The Register Committee underlined that the upcoming external review should pay attention to the procedure for election of the director of the Foundation.

8. The Register Committee took note that the new SISCAL madri+d is certification of Internal Quality Assurance Systems of University Centre. It has been presented to all universities and to the Board of Trustees prior to its approval.

9. The Register Committee noted that SISCAL madri+d has started in 2018, but still has no any procedure finished with issued certificates.

10. The Register Committee noted that institutional accreditation is a procedure that recognises the competence of a university centre to provide quality higher education programmes.

11. The procedure follows the protocol set by the ministry and a workgroup composed of public and private universities, students and QA experts.

12. The Register Committee noted that this procedure was supposed to be approved in the weeks after the Substantive Change Report was submitted.

13. The Register Committee noted that fmid clarified cooperation agreements for sectoral accreditation as an optional possibility in regular programme reviews.

14. The Register Committee underlined that the upcoming external review procedure should analyse whether fmid ensures that the accreditations it takes into account were in general aligned with the ESG.

From: **calidad at madrimasd.org** form_engine@fs22.formsite.com
Subject: Substantive Change Report: Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd
Date: 20 March 2019 at 12:55
To: substantive-changes@eqar.eu

Reference #	15408630
Status	Complete
Login Username	fmid
Login Email	calidad@madrimasd.org
Agency #1	Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd
Expiry date #1	29/02/2020
Contact #1	Raúl de Andrés
Phone #1	+34 917816580
Email #1	calidad@madrimasd.org
Other organisations?	No
A. Has the organisational identity of the registered agency changed?	No
B. Has the organisational structure changed?	Yes
Description	Due to the Spanish legal framework, that requires that institutions with a major funding from public administrations must have a majority of members appointed by the public administration in their governing bodies, the nomination of members of the Board of Trustees described in the articles of Association has been changed.

One new member of the regional government has been included.

Also the responsability of the appointment of up to 4 representatives of the public universities has changed. Now they are appointed by the head of the office of the Counceillor with competences in Research, at proposal of the conference of Presidents of Publicly-Funded Universities in Madrid (CRUMA), whereas in the previous version of the articles of association they were appointed directly by the CRUMA.

These changes have been done in order to fulfil the legal requirements, introducing the minimun changes and maintaining the representation of all the stakeholders in the body.

The current composition of the Board, described in the articlhe 16, is:
1. The board of patron shall be made up of the following natural patrons:
a) The head of the competent office of the Regional Government with responsibility for universities in Madrid Region.
b) The head of the competent Directorate General with responsibility for Universities in |

Madrid Region.
c) The head of the competent Directorate General with responsibility for Research in Madrid
Region.
d) The head of the competent Subdirectorate General with responsibility for Universities in
Madrid Region.
e) The head of the competent Subdirectorate General with responsibility for Research in
Madrid Region.
f) A representative of the office of the competent Deputy Regional Councillor for Employment in the Madrid Regional Government to be designated by the said Deputy
Regional Councillor.
1 bis. The head of the office of the competent Regional Councillor with responsibility for
Research in Madrid Region may elect up to 4 patrons, who must be Presidents of publiclyfunded
universities in Madrid Region. The appointment will be made at the proposal of the conference of Presidents of Publicly-Funded Universities in Madrid (CRUMA).
2. The Board of Patrons will also comprise the following patrons:
a) Two representatives of privately-funded universities in Madrid Region, designated by the
representatives of privately-funded universities in Madrid Region.
b) One member designated by the Madrid CEOE Business Confederation (CEIM) in accordance with its internal regulations.
c) The Director of one of the IMDEA Foundations, designated by the directors of the IMDEA Foundations.
d) One student, designated by the Council of Students in Madrid Region.
e) One representative of the Social Councils, designated from among their members by the
Conference of Social Councils in Madrid Region.
f) One trade union representative, a member of the teaching and research personnel (PDI)
of the publicly-funded universities in Madrid, designated by the most representative trade
union with the majority among the PDI of Madrid's publicly-funded universities.
g) One representative of the Superior Scientific Research Council (CSIC), designated by
this body.
3. In addition to the patrons mentioned in the two preceding sections, the Board of Patrons may
appoint up to a maximum of three patrons, all experts of renowned prestige in University -
related matters. These expert patrons must come from regions other than Madrid Region.

At the same time the procedure for the election of the Director of the Foundation has changed. Previously the Director was a designated directly by the Board. The new procedure foresees an open concurrence selection process, carried out by an external and independent commission, and the designation of the Director for a term of 4 years.

This procedure has been applied late in 2018, and the selection of the Director of the Foundation with this procedure was finished on 19th december 2018, with the selection of the current director.

C.i. Are there new types of activities?	Yes
C.ii. Are there changes in existing activities?	No

C.iii. Have some or all existing activities been discontinued?	Yes

Description new/changed	i The RD 420/2015 set Institutional Accreditation, as a procedure that recognises the competence of an university centre to provide quality Higher Education programes. Centres with this institutional accreditations are not required to undergo the program accreditation renewal for their bachelor and master programmes. This Institutional Accreditation is based on two main criteria: The certification of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) of the centre, and having more than 50% of the bachelor and master programmes with their accreditation renewed (by the standard programme accreditation renewal). RD 420/2015 and a subsequent Resolution of the Spanish ministry set the criteria for the Institutional Accreditation procedure, and the ones for the IQAS certification. fmid has adjusted the criteria set by the ministry to its way of operating. IQAS certification procedure has been stablished based on the ESG, the protocol set by the ministry (which is also based on ESG part 1) and following a workgroup composed of representatives of public and private universities, students, and quality assurance experts. The name chosen for this procedure is "SISCAL madri+d". SISCAL madri+d has been presented to all universities prior to its approval, and also to the Board of Trustees. This activity has started in 2018, but still has not any certification procedure finished. The Institutional Accreditation procedure will be approved in the coming weeks. Its implementation will be fast, as this procedure, despite the word "evaluation" appears, is almost automatic. Just checking some facts on the Accreditation Renewal of programmes and the certification of an IQAS. It doesn't evaluate any of the ESG directly. ii The criteria of SISCAL are: 1 Quality Assurance policy 2 Management of the programmes offered 3 Management of the programmes 4 Management of the teaching staff 5 Managemente of the learning resources and support services 6 Results 7 Public information, tranparency and accountability 8 Organization of the continuous improvement iii, iv, v, vi, vii The evaluation bodies are Review Panels and the Certification Commision Review paneles are composed of a secretary, expert in quality assurance,which conducts the review, two experts in quality assurance in university, who can be part of the faculty or the quality assurance support services, and an student. The Certification Commision is composed by a secretary, staff of the Foundation, the Director of the Foundation, two experts in quality assurance in universities that don't belong to any Madrid university and an student. All of them are selected by the staff of fmid from the pool of experts of the Foundation, trained and brieffed properly and it is checked that they don't have any conflict of interest. The evaluation procedure consist of an desk documentation evaluation, site visit, certification report and follow up on a yearly basis. Reports are to be published in fmid web page and university web page. Appeals are included in the decission procedure and universities can present a claim after decission if they consider the has been any inconsistency in the decission process. viii

The evaluation procedure is included in the Internal Quality System of fmid. The implementation of the procedure is checked periodically in order to assure the proper performance at all stages. It is foreseen that when a significant number of evaluations is performed, and analysis of the outcomes is done, in order to provide useful information to both general audiences and universities.

List discontinued	Cooperation agreements for sectorial accreditation. This is not an evaluation activity as such, but some kind of agreements to cooperate that madri+d had signed with some thematic agencies. The impact in the evaluation came from the point that for the evaluations performed by some agencies that we had cooperation agreements signed with, we considered that evaluation report to be enough to prove that the programme fullfilled the criterio of the accreditation renewal process. To the light of the external review report and comments from both ENQA and EQAR we decided to clarify the way we operate with other agencies reports. In the Accreditation Renewal process, when requested by the university, and under certain conditions (as the participation of an observer of madri+d), we accept other agencies' accreditations as an input, which has (after checking the correspondence between criteria) to be completed with some other evidences, and could lead to the skip of the visit by fmid in order to not duplicate workload on the university. This and other inputs are taken into account by the Evaluation and Accreditation Commision, which is the body that issues the Accreditation Renewal reports. This simplified process is applied in very few cases (less than 1% of our accreditations) Therefore, we consider Cooperation agreements... is not an evaluation activity, and is not included in our external evaluation. And this is just a specific case of the Accreditation Renewal process.
Last Update	2019-03-20 12:55:57
Start Time	2019-03-20 11:06:42
Finish Time	2019-03-20 12:55:57

Referrer	https://fs22.formsite.com/res/formLoginReturn