

**External review of the Agency for Quality Assurance in
Higher Education and Research of Andalusia (AAC-DEVA)
Report of the review panel**

June 2014

Content

- 1. Executive summary 3
- 2. Glossary 5
- 3. Introduction 6
 - 3.1. Background of the review and outline of the review process 6
 - 3.1.1. Background of the review 6
 - 3.1.2. Outline of the review..... 6
 - 3.2. Higher Education and the quality assurance system in Andalusia 8
 - 3.2.1 Higher Education in Andalusia..... 8
 - 3.2.2. Quality assurance in Andalusia 9
- 4. Findings: DEVA's compliance with ENQA membership criteria..... 12
 - 4.1. ENQA Criterion 1 / ESG 3.1. / ESG Part 2: Use of external quality assurance processes 12
 - 4.1.1. ESG 2.1.: Use of internal quality assurance procedures 12
 - 4.1.2. ESG 2.2: Development of external quality assurance procedures..... 14
 - 4.1.3. ESG 2.3: Criteria for decisions 15
 - 4.1.4. ESG 2.4.: Processes fit for purpose 17
 - 4.1.5. ESG 2.5.: Reporting 20
 - 4.1.6. ESG 2.6.: Follow-up procedures 21
 - 4.1.7. ESG 2.7.: Periodic reviews..... 22
 - 4.1.8. ESG 2.8.: System-wide analyses 23
 - ENQA Criterion 1 / ESG 3.1: Summary of findings 24
 - 4.2. ENQA Criterion 1 / ESG 3.3.: Activities 25
 - 4.3. ENQA criterion 2 / ESG 3.2: Official status 25
 - 4.4. ENQA criterion 3 / ESG 3.4: Resources 26
 - 4.5. ENQA criterion 4 / ESG 3.5: Mission statement 28
 - 4.6. ENQA criterion 5 / ESG 3.6: Independence 28
 - 4.7. ENQA Criterion 6 / ESG 3.7: External quality assurance criteria and processes used by the members..... 30
 - 4.8. ENQA Criterion 7 / ESG 3.8: Accountability procedures..... 32
 - 4.9. ENQA criterion 8: Consistency of judgements, appeals system and contributions to aims of ENQA..... 34
- 5. Conclusion and development..... 36
- 6. Annexes..... 39
 - 6.1. Terms of reference of the review 39
 - 6.2. Agenda of the site visit 43
 - 6.3. Documentary evidence..... 45

1. Executive summary

This report analyses the compliance of DEVA (Dirección de Evaluación y Acreditación- *Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education and Research of Andalusia*) with the criteria for Full Membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). It is based on the findings of an external review conducted in March 2014.

In the light of the documentary and oral evidence, the panel's overall appreciation regarding the compliance of DEVA with ENQA membership criteria is positive. All stakeholders were unanimous as to their satisfaction with the way DEVA operates.

As usual, in order to elaborate a fair evaluation it is essential to be aware of the particular context of the Agency. Two contextual facts were particularly relevant in this case:

- The programme accreditation process (one of the key processes that have been analyzed in order to judge compliance) is heavily regulated at the Spanish level. The main features of the procedure as well as the items that should be taken into consideration are given. In consequence, the degree of independence of DEVA is somehow limited. This is a common feature of all Spanish agencies. However, the panel was confident that, to the extent they are allowed by the regulations in force, DEVA is acting in a professional and independent way.
- At the moment of conducting this external evaluation, the complete ex-ante accreditation/follow up/ex-post accreditation cycle had not yet been fully implemented at the Spanish and Andalusian level. The ex-ante accreditation and follow-up stages were fully implemented but no programme accreditation processes (and consequently, no site visits) had yet been conducted. The panel could judge on the compliance with ESG 2.7 (periodic reviews) and ESG 3.7 (external quality assurance criteria and processes used by the agencies) thanks to the detailed information provided by DEVA on the way the first site visits will take place.

The criteria where full compliance has been achieved are:

ENQA membership criterion 1 / Activities / ESG 3.3 (Activities), **2 / ESG 3.2** (Official status), **3 / ESG 3.4** (Resources), **4/ ESG 3.5** (Mission Statement) **5 / ESG 3.6** (Independence), **6/ ESG 3.7** (External quality assurance processes used by the members) and **8 / Miscellaneous**,

Substantial compliance has been achieved in the following criteria:

ENQA membership criterion 1 / Activities / ESG Part 2 / ESG 3.1 (Use of external quality assurance procedures).

Finally, the panel considers that the agency is partially compliant regarding **ENQA membership criterion 7/ ESG 3.8** (Accountability procedures).

In the light of this assessment, the panel **recommends to the Board of ENQA that Full Membership of ENQA is confirmed for a further period of five years.**

In the last section of the report, the panel has wished to address a number of suggestions for improvement and further development concerning the selection and recruitment of experts (particularly student and international experts), system-wide analysis and the deployment of DEVA's internal quality system. Moreover, the expert panel encourages DEVA to critically reflect on the fitness for purpose of the newly implemented programme accreditation cycle and the capacity of the system to foster real enhancement and contribute to the goals set for the Andalusian region: employability and enhanced institutional accountability.

2. Glossary

AAC- Agencia Andaluza del Conocimiento- Andalusian Agency of Knowledge

ACSUCYL - Quality Assurance Agency for the University System in Castilla y León, Valladolid

ACSUG - Agency for Quality Assurance in the Galician University System, Santiago de Compostela

ANECA - National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation of Spain, Madrid

AQU Catalunya - Catalan University Quality Assurance Agency, Barcelona

DEVA- Dirección de Evaluación y Acreditación- Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education and Research of Andalusia

EHEA- European Higher Education Area

ENQA- European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education

EQA- External Quality Assurance

ESG- European Standards and Guidelines

HEI- Higher Education Institution

IQA- Internal Quality Assurance

PDCA- Plan-Do-Check-Act

REACU- Spanish Network of Quality Assurance Agencies

SER- Self Evaluation Report

SER- Self-Evaluation Report

SWOT- Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threads

3. Introduction

This report analyses the compliance of DEVA (Dirección de Evaluación y Acreditación- *Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education and Research of Andalusia*) with the criteria for Full Membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). It is based on the findings of an external review conducted in March 2014.

3.1. Background of the review and outline of the review process

3.1.1. Background of the review

ENQA's regulations require all full member agencies to undergo an external cyclical review, at least once every five years, in order to verify that they fulfill the membership provisions.

In November 2004, the General Assembly of ENQA agreed that the third part of the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) should be incorporated into the membership provisions of its regulations. Substantial compliance with the ESG thus became the principal criterion for full membership of ENQA. The ESG were subsequently adopted at the Bergen ministerial meeting of the Bologna Process in 2005.

External reviews may be coordinated nationally or by ENQA and be of type A or B. Type A reviews are intended solely to assess the extent of the agency's compliance with ENQA's membership criteria / ESG, while type B reviews also cover other aspects of the agency's work or organization.

DEVA (former AGAE) became a full member of ENQA in 2009 after a successful first external evaluation in 2008. A progress report was sent to ENQA in March 2011. The current external review of DEVA is a type A review. It has been conducted according to the process described in the third edition of the ESG and in the *Guidelines for external reviews of quality assurance agencies in the European Higher Education Area*.

3.1.2. Outline of the review

The process was conducted according to a timeline which differed from what was established in *Terms of Reference of the Review* (see Annex 1). The panel was appointed in January 2014, the visit took place the 19th and 20th of March and the draft report was sent in May 2014. The final report has been submitted to the ENQA board in June 2014.

The members of the panel appointed by ENQA to undertake the review were:

- Jon Haakstad, Senior Advisor, Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education (NOKUT), Norway - Chair
- Teresa Sánchez Chaparro, Executive Director, Commission des Titres d'Ingénieur (CTI), France - Secretary
- Ivan Milentijević, Full professor, Faculty of Electronic Engineering, University of Nis, Serbia
- Marcel Crochet, Emeritus Honorary Rector, Université Catholique de Louvain, Belgium – EUA nomination

- Alina Gavra, BA student in International Affairs at West University Timișoara, Project Officer at Timiș County Youth Foundation, Romania – ESU nomination

In order to fulfil the purposes of the review and to prepare this report the panel has considered the following sources of information:

- The self-evaluation report prepared by DEVA and a number of documents submitted before and during the site visit (see Annex 3)
- The information gathered during a two days' site visit conducted the 19th and 20th of March (see Annex 2, which contains the complete agenda of the visit). A range of stakeholders were met during this visit, including :
 - The staff and the management team of the agency
 - The different governing boards
 - Experts who participate in the different evaluation and accreditation procedures
 - Student representatives
 - Representatives of the HEIs at various levels (rectors, vice-rectors, teaching staff)

Previously to the meeting with the stakeholders, and at the request of the review panel, a meeting with two senior members of the agency was organized. In particular, this meeting provided some clarification concerning how the self-evaluation and the SWOT analysis of DEVA (last section of the SER) were conducted. It also provided some additional information regarding the organization structure of the agency (specifically, on the hierarchical and functional relationship between DEVA and the AAC) as well as some details concerning the programme accreditation process.

Finally, the panel has considered the broad political and academic context in which the agency operates.

The attitude of all DEVA agents during the whole process was extremely open and straightforward. The panel confirms that it was given access to all documents and people it wished to consult before and throughout the review. The SER was clearly written and provided a sound base of information regarding DEVA's compliance with ENQA membership criteria before the site visit. The report did not contain any information about the self-evaluation process conducted by DEVA as part of the external review, but this issue was clarified during the site visit. Overall, the site visit took place in excellent logistic conditions in terms of facilities, support, equipment and language interpretation services provided; the agenda set for the different meetings was strictly respected throughout the visit.

Despite the fact that some of DEVA's QA processes were beyond the scope of the ESG (as it is the case, for example, of the teaching staff evaluation processes) the activity of DEVA as a whole has been considered by the panel (see section 3.2.2. for a description of DEVA activities). However, the main focus of the review has been on the activities in line with the ESG; this is to say, those related to institutional and programme evaluation and accreditation and, specifically, the different processes which compose the programme accreditation cycle (VERIFICA-ex-ante accreditation; MONITORING -follow-up; ACREDITA-ex-post accreditation).

Mention should be made of the fact that, at the moment of conducting this external evaluation, the complete ex-ante accreditation/follow up/ex-post accreditation cycle had not yet been fully implemented at the Spanish and Andalusian level. The ex-ante accreditation and follow-up stages were fully implemented but no programme accreditation processes (and consequently, no site visits) had yet been conducted. In spite of this fact, the panel had access to detailed information regarding how the accreditation phase would be conducted during the year 2014-2015 (when some pilot experiences will take place). This information enabled the panel to judge DEVA's compliance with all ENQA membership criteria and particularly with ESG 2-7 (periodic reviews) and ESG 3-7 (external quality assurance criteria and processes used by the agencies).

3.2. Higher Education and the quality assurance system in Andalusia

3.2.1 Higher Education in Andalusia

The Andalusian University System is composed of 10 public and 1 private university. Currently, 234.000 students are enrolled in Andalusian universities, which represents 16% of the total student population in Spain. 55% of students are women. 62.5 % of graduates are women; just 2.6% of the students come from outside Spain.

Concerning the structure of degrees, since 2010, in Andalusia, as in the rest of Spain and according to the EHEA prescriptions, University education is structured in three cycles: Bachelor (240 ECTS), Master (between 60 and 120 ECTS) and Doctoral cycle (60 ECTS plus doctoral Thesis).

Spain, in accordance with its 1978 Constitution, is organized in Autonomous Communities whose competences are pronounced in the *Autonomy Statute*. The model of education in Spain is decentralized, which means that competences in education are distributed among the State, the Regional Autonomous Communities and the Higher Education Institutions. The Andalusian Statutes in force state that "the regulation and management of education, at all levels, grades, forms and specialties, is the responsibility of the Autonomous Community".

Universities are autonomous but their quality is controlled by DEVA (see section 3.2.2). Financial resources are allocated by the Regional Government according to a system of distribution that links financing to performance. 30% of the budget is assigned on the basis of results and objectives met in three areas: teaching, research and innovation. Evaluation of these aspects is monitored through "program contracts" signed by each Andalusian university.

Access to the Bachelor level is regulated at the national level through an entry test (known as "Selectividad"). In the case of Master and Doctoral studies, admission is managed at the level of each particular HEI.

In the academic year 2013/2014, 16,000 faculty members are engaged at the Andalusian System of Universities, out of which 40% are tenured Professors, 40% are contracted Professors and 14% are Full Professors.

A particularity of the Andalusian and Spanish system is the fact that university professors (both tenured and contracted) must undergo several compulsory evaluation processes at the national or regional level throughout their careers in order to access the different available positions (see section 3.2.2).

Finally, concerning research, the Regional Government is in charge of the establishment of strategic lines of research, follow-up and evaluation of projects, management and control of research centers in Andalusia, funding of study scholarships and support of knowledge transference.

Support to research is channeled through projects, incentives and actions for the improvement of infrastructures, equipment and other operations in higher education institutions. Investment in research in Andalusia is above 1,600 million (1.10% of regional GDP).

3.2.2. Quality assurance in Andalusia

The QA system in Andalusia

In Spain, several quality assurance agencies operate at the national and regional level. Currently, the Spanish national agency, ANECA, and 4 regional agencies (DEVA, ACSUCYL, AQU-Catalunya and ACSUG) are full members of ENQA. The different agencies operating in Spain are part of the REACU network (*Spanish Network of Quality Assurance Agencies*). This network enables the exchange of information regarding the different common quality assurance processes in place.

In the case of Andalusia, it is established by law that the Andalusian Autonomous Community should share with the Spanish State: “The evaluation and assurance of quality and excellence of university teaching as well as of teaching and research staff”.

Since April 2011 this competence was assigned to the *Andalusian Agency of Knowledge (AAC)*, which assumed through its *Direction of Evaluation and Accreditation (DEVA)* the functions that till then had been carried out by the *Andalusian Agency of University Evaluation and Accreditation (former AGAE)*.

In particular, DEVA has competences in two main areas:

- Evaluation and accreditation of universities and teaching staff
- Evaluation of Research, Development and Innovation (RDI)

DEVA QA activities

DEVA operates a wide range of quality assurance processes. As mentioned in section 3.1.2, this external review has focused on the processes which are inside the scope of the ESG and in particular on the official university programmes accreditation cycle. The full list of QA processes handled by DEVA is provided below. This list is followed by a detailed description of the programme accreditation cycle.

QA processes in the field of institutional evaluation¹

- Accreditation of official university programmes. This process is composed of three sub-processes:
 - Ex-ante accreditation of official university programmes (VERIFICA)
 - Follow-up of official university programmes (MONITORING)
 - Ex-post accreditation of official university programmes (ACREDITA)
- Evaluation of Innovation projects and Andalusian universities
- Accreditation of Foreign Languages Domain
- Evaluation of the procedure to evaluate the teaching activity of university staff (DOCENTIA)
- Entry to the labor-market program
- Program to recognize private universities

QA processes in the field of evaluation of teaching staff

- Evaluation of contractual figures
- Evaluation of emeritus professor candidates

QA processes in the field of evaluation or research

- Evaluation of research projects and incentives
- Evaluation of research groups
- Evaluation of research institutes

Accreditation of official university programmes

The accreditation of official university programmes is regulated by means of the Royal Decree 1393/2007, October 29th. The process is composed of three stages:

Ex-ante accreditation of official university programmes (VERIFICA)

The first step is an ex-ante paper-based accreditation before implementing the proposed degree programme. The objectives are to guarantee the quality of study plans, the feasibility in terms of human and material resources and the adequacy of the programmes to the interests and needs of the university community and society in general. The verification programme is in place since 2008 in all Spain.

In the case of DEVA, the verification process is conducted by a number of commissions specialized by study field. Each programme proposal is initially assigned to two evaluators. The commissions meet on a regular basis and all cases are revised. The reports produced by the field (discipline area) commissions are sent to an overarching commission in charge of

¹ Although the term 'institutional evaluation' – in its technical sense – may be said to apply only to the recognition of private universities in the list below, the term is used by DEVA, also in the SER, to cover what also is called 'programme evaluation'.

producing all accreditation decisions (*Reports Production Commission*). The presidents of all field commissions take part in this commission and its main mission is to ensure the consistent application of all criteria across the field commissions. All reports are signed by the director of DEVA.

During the implementation of official degrees some aspects may require modification so as to improve the learning outcomes and results of the programme. Universities can propose that the programmes verified are modified and submit demands for modifications to the National Ministry of Education. If the modification demanded affect to the nature of the programme (i.e. expected learning outcomes of the programme), universities will have to restart the verification process for that proposal.

The Evaluation Commissions appointed by DEVA evaluate these proposals according to a pre-established protocol.

Follow-up of official university programmes (MONITORING)

With the follow-up program, three main purposes are pursued: a) to ensure that the information relevant to the different internal and external stakeholders is made public, b) to check that the title has been implemented according to the initial verification report issued by the university and c) to analyze the programme's outcomes and results.

The follow-up is conducted each year. Two parallel procedures have been established in order to carry out this process. In the first place, the analysis of publicly available information by the commissions set up by DEVA; in the second place, the analysis of a self-evaluation report produced by the university on an annual basis. The follow-up reports are transmitted to DEVA through a web platform.

Ex-post accreditation of official university programmes (ACREDITA)

Before 6 years have passed since the implementation of Bachelor's and Doctoral degrees and 4 years after the implementation of Master's degrees, official programmes must undergo a process of accreditation. This process ensures that study plans are being carried out in accordance with the initial project description (and the modifications demanded, if appropriate).

In March 2014, at the moment of conducting the site visit, the accreditation phase had not yet started. A pilot project will be conducted in 2014-2015. The criteria and procedure are currently being developed by DEVA's technical bodies based upon some pre-established principles agreed by all Spanish agencies in the context of the Spanish Network of Quality Assurance Agencies (REACU).

The panel had access to the planning of the accreditation between 2014 and 2017 (see annex 6.3).

4. Findings: DEVA's compliance with ENQA membership criteria

4.1. ENQA Criterion 1 / ESG 3.1. / ESG Part 2: Use of external quality assurance processes

Standard: The external quality assurance of agencies should take into account the presence and effectiveness of the external quality assurance procedures described in Part 2 of the European Standards and Guidelines.

Compliance with each standard of Part 2 of the ESG is discussed in the following sections. A summary of findings as well as the panel conclusion on the overall compliance of Part 2 ESG is provided at the end of this section.

4.1.1. ESG 2.1.: Use of internal quality assurance procedures

Standard: External quality assurance procedures should take into account the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance processes described in Part 1 of the European Standards and Guidelines)

Evidence

The panel has verified that the different processes considered in part 1 of the ESG are taken into account in the various sections of the programme accreditation criteria. In particular, there is a specific section which is devoted to the internal quality management system of the HEI (section 9 of the verification criteria).

Apart from the compulsory programme accreditation procedure, various voluntary procedures have been put in place at the national and regional level in order to foster the enhancement of quality management systems; namely, AUDIT (accreditation of internal quality management system of HEIs and which covers all processes in ESG1) and DOCENTIA (quality assurance of teaching staff; ESG1-4).

During the site visit and, in particular, during the meeting with the vice-rectors in charge of quality management, the panel tried to understand how the Andalusian Universities were organized in terms of IQA and, in particular, how the approval, monitoring and periodic review of programmes and awards (ESG1-2) was organized. The panel also sought to understand DEVA's contribution to the development of internal quality systems. In brief, the panel looked for evidence in order to assess whether DEVA's approach to quality was really leading to quality enhancement of the institutions.

The panel found that Spanish universities are quite homogeneous with regard to their internal quality management systems. Each study programme has a Quality Assurance Commission which counts with the participation of several faculty members, students and administrative

services members and occasionally, an employer. At the institutional level, there is an *Internal Quality Commission*, which is in close contact with DEVA and which coordinates from a technical point of view all different quality processes associated to the different study programmes in that university.

The internal quality management system operates according to an annual PDCA cycle. The programme commissions prepare an annual report. All programme reports are used to build a self-evaluation report at the faculty level. An improvement plan is developed on the basis of this report which is the starting point for a new self-evaluation. This improvement plan is public and is revised by DEVA as part of the follow-up process (see section 4.1.6). However, since the accreditation cycle has not yet reached the stage of ACREDITA, DEVA's efforts in the field of IQA has mainly consisted in assisting institutions and then evaluating their improvement plans in the follow-up stage; their actual practice in internal quality assurance has not yet been evaluated by DEVA

The panel found out that there is an extensive network of exchanges at the national and regional level which integrates all actors involved with quality management. Stakeholders agreed that DEVA has contributed to develop these exchanges and to create a quality culture through various procedures.

Regarding the impact of the recently implemented programme accreditation process, stakeholders declared that this programme is conducted according to a more control and normative approach; however, a number of positive effects coming from programme accreditation which are consistent with ESG part 1 were pointed out, such as the improvement of public information and the control over programme results.

Overall, all stakeholders agreed that a common external quality framework exists at the national and regional level, with common rules for all higher education institutions.

Analysis

The panel confirms that the external quality assurance procedures applied by DEVA (the voluntary programmes such as DOCENTIA, as well as the recently implemented programme accreditation cycle) take into account the effectiveness of the processes described in part 1 of the ESG.

The panel got the impression that internal quality management systems at the institutional level in Spain are more homogenous than in other countries in Europe, with a number of common structures and processes in place in all universities. In any case, the panel got evidence that a true internal quality management structure exists at the level of each Andalusian university, although the practical operation of internal quality assurance has not yet been evaluated by DEVA in site visits.

The contribution of DEVA to the development of these systems in the Andalusian region, specifically through the implementation of various voluntary evaluation procedures, seems to have been significant.

Panel conclusion

Fully compliant

4.1.2. ESG 2.2: Development of external quality assurance procedures

Standard: The aims and objectives of quality assurance processes should be determined before the processes themselves are developed, by all those responsible (including higher education institutions) and should be published with a description of the procedures to be used.

Evidence

The panel sought evidence during the visit that the procedures were clear and their description accessible to stakeholders. The meeting with the agents evaluated (representatives of evaluated programmes, university teaching staff evaluated, etc.) and the stakeholders enabled the panel to gather information regarding the evaluation of teaching staff, the programme accreditation programme and the language service evaluation. All stakeholders agreed that the criteria were clear and their description easy to find.

Concerning the development of the different protocols and procedures, DEVA has put in place a technical body (the Technical Commission) which is in charge of developing the evaluation and accreditation criteria as well as the corresponding methodologies.

Given the fact that, specifically in the programme accreditation procedure, the objectives and main features of the procedures are given by law, the degree of freedom of DEVA to set its own procedures is limited. Some other EQA procedures, such as the evaluation of research or the evaluation of language services, are less regulated.

Further evidence concerning this ESG standard was found in connection with the pilot project for the accreditation phase of the programme accreditation process, which was being implemented at the moment when the panel's visit took place (see section 3.2.2). The meetings with the different stakeholders and with the management group, as well as the documents consulted during the visit (specifically the calendar of the pilot project, see annex 6.3) showed that DEVA was carrying out a cooperative design process. The stakeholders were asked to give their opinion on the accreditation criteria and processes and could give input in order to establish the calendar of the visits.

DEVA carries out satisfaction surveys addressed to HEIs and experts which serve to conduct a periodic self-evaluation of all its EQA processes (see section 4.7). These satisfaction surveys, which are available through DEVA's website, provide valuable feedback on key aspects such as the information published, the delays, the information meetings held, etc.

In the case of the ex-ante programme accreditation process (VERIFICA), it is worth noticing that the overall satisfaction concerning the documentation on procedures and criteria published on DEVA's website is 4,13 out of 5 in the case of the Doctoral programmes and just 2,53 in the case of the verification of Bachelor and Master programmes. The satisfaction with the documentation was 3,93 in the case of the evaluation of teaching staff programme.

Analysis

The objectives of some key procedures, specifically programme accreditation and evaluation of teaching staff, are fixed by law and the main criteria are given. The degree of freedom of DEVA is somehow restricted. That said, the various meetings with the different stakeholder representatives (specifically, the meeting with the rectors, vice-rectors and agents evaluated) provided evidence that, within DEVA's perimeter of freedom, a permanent dialogue was maintained concerning the significance and clarity of accreditation criteria.

The fact that an independent Technical Commission composed by highly experienced QA and university professionals is in place in DEVA, provides guarantee that DEVA's procedures and protocols are developed according to rigorous technical standards.

During the site visit, all stakeholders agreed that all criteria and procedures were clear and easily available to the experts and the higher education institutions. They declared that their input was taken into account when developing these procedures. Overall, the satisfaction surveys consulted by the panel seem to confirm this opinion. The panel couldn't help noticing that the satisfaction concerning the accreditation of bachelor and master programmes was significantly lower than in other QA procedures, which seems to indicate that this process still needs some consolidation.

Panel conclusion

Fully compliant

4.1.3. ESG 2.3: Criteria for decisions

Standard: Any formal decisions made as a result of an external quality assurance activity should be based on explicit published criteria that are applied consistently.

Evidence

DEVA has elaborated a number of documents which contain a detailed description of all procedures run by the agency, including the corresponding criteria. These documents are public and accessible through its website. They include:

- Guidelines of evaluation processes
- Principles and guidelines handbook for the evaluation process of hired teaching staff
- Procedure for the verification of official university degrees, bachelor's and master's
- Procedure for the verification of official doctoral degrees
- Evaluation criteria for projects of excellence
- Evaluation criteria for incentives to scientific and technical activities
- Evaluation criteria for research groups
- Evaluation criteria for research centers

In the case of programme accreditation, in order to achieve consistency of decisions, a two level-decision structure has been put in place:

- Commissions by field: the different study programmes are evaluated in several commissions according to their field. In order to assure intra-field consistency, even though each case is assigned to two evaluators, all cases are discussed by the whole commission.
- Reports Production Commission: the presidents of the field commissions take part in an overarching commission which issues the final accreditation reports. The main mission of this commission is to ensure that the criteria are applied consistently along the different fields and within a given institution.

During the meetings with the stakeholders, DEVA's published procedures and criteria were judged to be clear and "fair". Stakeholders declared that the set of EQA processes developed by DEVA provided a common and clear playground for all Andalusian universities and that they felt that the procedures were applied in a consistent and fair manner.

The panel also found evidence that the experts were appropriately trained and assisted in order to ensure a sufficient knowledge of the criteria. DEVA organizes periodic training sessions and provides a number of protocols for assisting the experts in the evaluation. Additionally, DEVA staff provides support to the different evaluation commissions and ensures that methodological guidelines are respected and that criteria are applied consistently. In particular, one of the missions of the staff is to point out any possible discrepancies between the judgment and appreciation of the different evaluators assigned to each specific case. If discrepancies are detected, the evaluators are asked to engage in a discussion and try to clarify the reasons for their differences of judgment.

Finally, the panel looked at the satisfaction surveys corresponding to the different processes public in the DEVA's website particularly, the stakeholder's view regarding the consistency and transparency of the decisions, as well as the expert's opinion on the training and the support documents provided by DEVA (see annex 6.3 and section 4.7).

Analysis

It is the panel's appreciation that the presented evidence, including the meeting with stakeholders, confirms that the criteria are public and easily accessible to stakeholders. The experts seem to be satisfied with the training activities undergone and with the support protocols in place.

The two-level decision structure seems to be an effective way to ensure intra and inter field consistency in the programme accreditation procedure, but it is not obvious how consistency among reports related to the same higher education institution is achieved over time. The panel considered that, with current procedures in place, there is a risk of losing perspective concerning the overall capacity of a higher education institution to ensure quality.

Concerning other DEVA EQA procedures that are in place, in the case of teaching evaluation, procedures seem to be clear and to leave small room for interpretation. Stakeholders declared that they could even easily anticipate the result of the evaluation by their self-evaluation.

In the case of the evaluation of research projects, it is the appreciation of the panel that there are no major problems, even though the criteria seem to be less straightforward and, consequently, stakeholders require a more extensive justification.

The stakeholders' view on the consistency and fairness of the different processes was very positive during the meetings. The satisfaction surveys show a moderate satisfaction concerning the programme accreditation process. "Transparency" is given an assessment of 2,59 out of 5, whereas "validity" receives an assessment of 2,52 points. Free comments from the HEIs seem to suggest that this negative impression partly derives from the fact that the process is judged to be bureaucratic and excessively focused on formal aspects. The panel noted that the appreciation of the stakeholders is not homogeneous. The teaching and research professionals were more critical, whereas administrative services personnel and the people in management positions expressed more positive opinions. The fact that faculty members hold a critical position is not an exclusive feature of the Andalusian community, as the panel acknowledges that a similar situation is found in other countries and territories regarding EQA and particularly control-based processes such as programme accreditation.

Conclusion

Fully compliant

4.1.4. ESG 2.4.: Processes fit for purpose

Standard: All external quality assurance processes should be designed specifically to ensure their fitness to achieve the aims and objectives set for them.

Evidence

The main goals and objectives of the EQA system in Andalusia are established by the national and regional governments. As explained during the meeting with the representatives of the Regional Government, in the case of the Andalusian Community, two main political goals are to improve employability and to increase the overall efficiency of the system in an environment which is, in the Regional Government's opinion, highly atomized (11 universities are currently operating in the Andalusia region).

The programme accreditation process should serve these goals by increasing HEIs accountability; specifically, HEIs should be able to better control the results of their study programmes. These results are expressed in terms of expected learning outcomes, employability and also in terms of certain success and efficiency rates set by the government. The regional government perceived that another important instrument to achieve their goals was the implementation of joint programmes between Andalusian universities. DEVA should thus provide support in achieving this objective.

The meetings with DEVA's management group established that the main challenge of the agency at the moment of conducting this external evaluation was the deployment of the last phase of the study programme accreditation process. Up until the present moment, all study

programmes have undergone an on-paper ex-ante accreditation and a follow up of the implementation of these programmes is in place by DEVA. The next step is the ex-post accreditation of the study programmes which includes the organization of site visits.

A calendar of site visits is currently being negotiated with the different Andalusian Universities. According to the operational plan of DEVA 2014, between 45 and 60 visits will be conducted during 2014-2015. The number of visits will increase in subsequent years. The panels will be composed of at least two academic experts, one employer representative, one student, an expert in quality management. A member of DEVA staff will be present during the visits and will act as secretary of the panel.

Concerning the selection of experts, DEVA operates a data base of more than 11600 experts. The Director of DEVA takes the final decision in their selection and appoints evaluators having heard the opinion of the persons responsible for the 2 areas of Evaluation (University accreditation and R+D+I). Given the number of evaluations that DEVA is planning to conduct in the following years, the management team of the agency considered the selection and training of experts as a major challenge.

Evidence was gathered during the site visit that expert training is conducted systematically in the case of the programme accreditation process. Training is not systematic in the teaching and research evaluation processes. The expert satisfaction surveys conducted by DEVA showed that the experts of the programme accreditation process were satisfied with the training activities (note: 4,21 out of 5).

In order to avoid possible conflicts of interest, experts engaged by DEVA are from outside the Andalusian region, but mainly of Spanish nationality. DEVA rarely engages international experts even though some developments are expected in the near future. DEVA has developed an ethical code which must be known and respected by all experts and staff members.

With regard to the selection of student experts, it is currently an open process. DEVA has set up an open on-line platform and any student enrolled at an Andalusian university can go through registration. DEVA makes a selection among the students registered on-line. The whole selection process is managed without the participation of any student association or student body.

The meeting with students experts revealed that students participate as equals in the panel, but their role is somehow limited, as they are requested to pay attention to specific aspects, such as the public information of the programme.

Regarding the participation of students in DEVA's government organs, there is one representative sent by the Andalusian Council of Students to the advisory council to AAC and one in the technical committee for DEVA.

As part of the analysis concerning this criterion, the panel also tried to determine whether the processes were relevant and meaningful for the HEIs and, especially, whether they were successful in fostering quality enhancement. Evidence was gathered from the satisfaction surveys present in DEVA's website and the meetings with the different stakeholders regarding

this issue. The evidence gathered suggests that the initial rounds of the verification and follow up processes have turned out to be quite bureaucratic and control-based, focusing more on formal aspects than to true quality enhancement.

The panel also analyzed the fitness for purpose of the accreditation reports produced by DEVA. Several examples of accreditation reports were examined (from the verification and follow-up processes). In these reports, each section of the criteria is analyzed separately. The different remarks and recommendations are thoroughly justified and reference is made to various types of evidence found in the self-evaluation report of the university and of other publicly available information (web-page).

Analysis

Concerning expert selection and training, after analyzing the evidence, the panel judged that the expert training mechanisms put in place in the case of the programme accreditation procedure were sufficient and appropriate. The selection of experts came up as a more problematic issue.

On the one hand, handling a data base with more than 11000 experts seems like a major challenge. The procedures according to which the selection of experts is done and the registers of this data base are updated so as to capitalize on this extensive knowledge were not clear to the panel.

On the other hand, the fact that the student expert selection procedure is completely open could lead to some problems (i.e. students could be pointed out in advance and be encouraged to apply, which would pervert the selection process). Additionally, the panel considered that the Council of Students could provide some support to the agency in order to improve the selection and training of student experts.

The panel welcomes the fact that students are represented in DEVA's governing bodies (AAC advisory board and DEVA's Technical Commission). It is also aware of the fact that the Technical Commission is not yet fully functional and encourages DEVA to remain vigilant and ensure that the student representative is really treated as an equal.

Regarding the use of international experts, the panel acknowledges the practical difficulties associated with recruiting and training this kind of experts. However, it considers that additional efforts should be invested to this regard, as introducing international expertise brings in important benefits in terms of introduction of an international perspective, exchange of practices and avoidance of conflict of interest.

The panel has examined the information provided regarding the implementation of the accreditation stage in the programme accreditation cycle. The current calendar involves an impressive number of site visits and the panel wonders whether this planning is feasible in terms of delays and resources. The panel noted that universities will be visited several times per year (e. g. the University of Seville will receive between 42 and 55 visits in the period 2014-2017) which will certainly impose a tough workload on the HEIs. An additional challenge associated with this scheme is to avoid losing the global view of a given institution and to ensure consistency along the different site visits.

Overall, the panel got the impression that the first round of the verification and follow-up processes had come up as a rather bureaucratic and control-based exercise. DEVA should make sure that the programme accreditation process and specifically, the new accreditation stage are able to foster real enhancement and contribute to the goals set for the Andalusian region: employability and enhanced institutional accountability.

Conclusion

Substantially compliant

4.1.5. ESG 2.5.: Reporting

Standard: Reports should be published and should be written in a style which is clear and readily accessible to its intended readership. Any decisions, commendations or recommendations contained in reports should be easy for a reader to find.

Evidence

All programme accreditation reports are made public in DEVA's website. A search engine is in place in order to facilitate the search to the general public.

DEVA has established a procedure for the standardization of reports, which sets a number of general requirements with regard to the style used and main items covered.

The panel has examined several examples of accreditation reports (verification and follow-up processes). In these reports, each section of the criteria is analyzed in a separate section. The different remarks and recommendations are thoroughly justified making reference to various evidences found in the self-evaluation report of the university or other information publicly available (web-page).

The accreditation reports are structured as follows:

- Basic information on the institution and the programme under accreditation
- Brief introduction of the context
- Final decision
- Justification of the final decision (analysis of the different accreditation criteria and recommendations)
- Signature of the Administrative responsible of the agency

Evidence was collected during the site visit that the reports were clear and easy to find for the different stakeholders.

Analysis

As explained in the fitness for purpose criteria, the panel noted that the information of the reports was often of an administrative and formal nature, and the links to quality enhancement were not always straightforward.

The different reports analyzed varied quite a bit in terms of length and thoroughness. Another mention can be made about the different levels of depth reached especially in the justification part. As teams differ and as there is no one-fits-all approach for the reports, we believe that these various styles do not pose a problem per-se, however DEVA needs to find ways to ensuring that all evaluation outcomes are useful not only to tick the evaluation criteria and standards, but also to providing a fruitful descriptive feedback for the HEIs. In this sense, evaluators' trainings could place more emphasis on the enhancement role of the EQA processes have.

An accreditation report is established per programme. There is not a global report concerning each institution. The panel was afraid this fact might lead to a loss of global perspective regarding the HEIs.

However, the panel confirms that the structure of the reports is consistent with the recommendations of the ESG, clear and easy for a reader to find.

Conclusion

Fully compliant

4.1.6. ESG 2.6.: Follow-up procedures

Standard: Quality assurance processes which contain recommendations for action or which require a subsequent action plan, should have a predetermined follow-up procedure which is implemented consistently.

Evidence

The study programme accreditation cycle includes a compulsory follow up between the ex ante accreditation (verification) phase and the ex post accreditation. The follow up process has two main functions. The first objective is to check the proper implementation of the study programme according to the initial draft presented by the University and recognised in the verification phase; the second objective is to check up the main results obtained up to that moment.

According to the process description published on DEVA's webpage, the follow-up process is conducted each year. Two parallel procedures have been established in order to carry out this process. First, the analysis of publicly available information by the commissions set up by DEVA; second, the analysis of a self-evaluation report produced by the university on an annual basis. The follow-up self-evaluation reports are transmitted to DEVA through a web platform.

The meeting with the vice-rectors in charge of internal quality provided information regarding how this follow-up phase is organized inside each HEI. An annual PDCA cycle is conducted regarding each study programme which results in an action plan. A report is prepared with

the information regarding each programme. This report is transmitted to DEVA as part of the follow-up process.

Concerning the other programmes in the Area of University Evaluation and Accreditation, all of them also include follow-up procedures.

Analysis

The panel considered that the annual follow up procedure implemented by DEVA enables the agency to control in an efficient way the state of implementation of the programmes, the achieved results and the actions taken in order to address the recommendations of the verification process.

As the whole cycle is not implemented yet, it was not clear to the panel whether a follow up after the first accreditation cycle is intended.

Conclusion

Fully compliant

4.1.7. ESG 2.7.: Periodic reviews

Standard: External quality assurances of institutions and/or programmes should be undertaken on a cyclical basis. The length of the cycle and the review procedures to be used should be clearly defined and published in advance.

Evidence

The Spanish regulations establish that all programmes leading to official degrees must be periodically accredited. The periodicity is 6 years for the bachelor degrees and 4 years in the case of master and doctoral degrees.

The panel has verified that all review procedures are made public on DEVA's web site (see section 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 for further information).

As explained in previous sections, the complete ex-ante accreditation/follow-up/ex-post accreditation cycle had not yet been implemented at the Spanish and Andalusian level. The ex-ante accreditation and follow-up stages were fully implemented but no programme accreditation processes (and consequently, no site visits) had yet been conducted. In spite of this fact, the panel had access to detailed information regarding how the accreditation phase would be conducted during the years 2014-2015 (DEVA's operational plan 2014). More information on the organization of this pilot process is provided in section 4.1.4.

Analysis

Even though the full accreditation cycle has not yet been implemented, there was no doubt to the panel regarding the periodic nature of the process. The phases and the periodicity of the process are established by law and the first site-visits will be conducted in 2014-2015 according to a pre-established calendar (DEVA's operational plan 2014).

The panel has already expressed its views on the fitness for purpose and feasibility of the accreditation phase in section 4.1.4. The panel wishes to stress its impression that this process is likely to involve a high amount of resources for both DEVA and the HEIs (i.e. University of Seville will receive between 42 and 55 visits in the period 2014-2015).

Subsequent accreditation cycles should take into account the results of this first cycle and the possibilities for simplifying this process should be analyzed. Once the formal aspects related to the implementation of the Bologna process, public information and control of results of the programme have been achieved, the accreditation process should evolve to adapt to the new challenges and goals defined at the system level (quality enhancement, excellence in specific areas, etc.)

Conclusion

Fully compliant

4.1.8. ESG 2.8.: System-wide analyses

Standard: Quality assurance agencies should produce from time to time summary reports describing and analysing the general findings of their reviews, evaluations, assessments, etc.

Evidence

The panel has examined the different documents produced by the agency.

Apart from the documents directly linked to DEVA's activity (DEVA's guides, procedures, criteria and protocols), DEVA publishes a number of documents of a more analytic nature.

DEVA produces meta-evaluation reports based on stakeholder satisfaction surveys. The agency also produces annual activity reports. In addition, since 2006, DEVA participates in the elaboration of a report on the development of accreditation and evaluation processes in Spain, which is developed jointly with the rest of Spanish quality agencies (Report on the quality of Spanish Universities). This report is addressed to the Spanish Higher Education Minister and is meant to be a source of information for policy development.

Analysis

The panel appreciates the efforts made by the agency in order to produce annual reports and meta-analysis of its multiple activities. The collaboration between DEVA and the rest of the Spanish agencies to produce analysis at the national level has resulted in a comprehensive

report which contains not only statistical information on the different processes but also deep analysis on the impact of the different EQA processes. It also identifies various problems and difficulties encountered as well as possible improvement opportunities. The panel appreciates the value of this document as a basis for policy development.

However, the panel considers that more work could be done in order to increase DEVA's contribution to system-wide analysis. In particular, DEVA has not produced any publications devoted to the current state and trends of the quality assurance system in Andalusia. DEVA could profit from the rich and abundant information gathered after the first verification and follow-up rounds. Such a publication, which is of course subject to provision of adequate resources, could be used to highlight good practices at an institutional level and thus contribute to the enhancement of the system.

In consistency with the results of 2009 review of DEVA, the panel believes that further opportunities for cross-regional studies in collaboration with other Spanish quality assurance agencies could be explored.

At an international level, participation in international forums or conferences is also a good opportunity to conduct collective reflection and benchmarking. The panel has not been made aware of any scientific contributions or case-studies published by DEVA at an international level and considers this could be another improvement opportunity to develop DEVA's analytical capacities.

Conclusion

Substantially compliant

ENQA Criterion 1 / ESG 3.1: Summary of findings

DEVA's compliance with each of the ESG Part 2 Standards is discussed in sections 4.1.1-4.1.8 above. The panel found DEVA to be fully compliant with ESG2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and substantially compliant with ESG 2.4, 2.8. The overall judgment of the panel regarding section 2 of the ESG is that DEVA is substantially – or close to fully – in compliance with the standards.

With regard to the fitness for purpose of the processes (ESG 2.4), the panel pointed out some issues related to the selection and training of experts. In particular, it referred to the interest of increasing the presence of international experts in the evaluation panels and some potential problems linked to the current methods of selecting student experts.

Overall, the panel got the impression that the first round of the verification and follow-up processes were rather bureaucratic and control based. Regarding the following stage (the accreditation phase and the organization of site visits), a number of challenges have been pointed out, namely, the great number of visits involved according to the current calendar (which will certainly suppose a considerable workload for both the HEIs and the agency) and the risk of losing institutional perspective.

As for the criteria concerning system-wide analysis (ESG 2.8), the panel considers that more work could be done to this regard. In particular, a publication concerning the current state and trends of the quality assurance system in Andalusia would be appreciated.

4.2. ENQA Criterion 1 / ESG 3.3.: Activities

Standard: Agencies should undertake external quality assurance activities (at institutional or programme level) on a regular basis.

Evidence

DEVA's mission is established in AAC statutes (see section 4.5); DEVA's activities include the accreditation and evaluation of institutions and university programmes as well as the evaluation of teaching staff and research projects (see section 3.2.2 for a full description of DEVA's activities).

These external quality assurance activities are conducted on a regular basis. In the case of the programme accreditation process, the Spanish law establishes a periodic cycle for the accreditation of university programmes (6 years for bachelor programmes and 4 years for master and doctorate programmes).

Analysis

There is no doubt that DEVA is undertaking external quality assurance activities on a regular basis.

Conclusion

Fully compliant

4.3. ENQA criterion 2 / ESG 3.2: Official status

Standard: Agencies should be formally recognized by competent public authorities in the European Higher Education Area as agencies with responsibilities for external quality assurance and should have an established legal basis. They should comply with any requirements of the legislative jurisdictions within which they operate.

Evidence

DEVA is part of the Andalusian Agency of Knowledge. AAC is a public entity at the regional level which has been set up by law (Order 92/2011). According to the legal statutory texts, it corresponds to the Agency of Knowledge "the competences of evaluation and accreditation of university activities; develop, manage, evaluate and accredit research activities." It is the agency's objective to "help in the process and execution of programs and actions related to higher education, development of innovation and programs for the education of university students in other regions and countries." In the exercise of its competences, the agency must abide by "the principles of public interest, publicity, transparency, healthy administration, social profitability and responsibility."

Analysis

It was evident to the panel that DEVA is operating in a formal and clear legal context. The corresponding legal texts clearly define AAC's and DEVA's competences and responsibilities

including the evaluation and accreditation of university activities. As part of the public sector, AAC-DEVA is subject to a number of standard control procedures in order to verify its compliance with the law and the way public resources are used.

Conclusion

Fully compliant

4.4. ENQA criterion 3 / ESG 3.4: Resources

Standard: Agencies should have adequate and proportional resources, both human and financial, to enable them to organise and run their external quality assurance process(es) in an effective manner, with appropriate provision for the development of their processes and procedures and staff.

Evidence

In order to fulfill its missions, DEVA counts with the following human resources:

- DEVA full time staff
It is composed of 15 people, who have a civil servant status. 66% of them have a university degree and 53% are under 40 years of age. They perform activities of three kinds: general, technical and administrative. They are under the responsibility of DEVA's management team and, as established in chapter 43 of AAC's statutes, they receive regular training in order to perform their activities.
- Experts
The Agency has an Evaluators' Bank with 11,600 evaluators who can register online. There are a number of permanent evaluation commissions. In the case of the verification process, there are 7 commissions with a number of members that varies between 7 and 12. The PhD Commission, in charge of the Program of Evaluation for the Verification of Doctoral Programs is composed of 44 members. The Follow-Up Commission in charge of the Follow-Up Program of Titles is composed of 31 members. For the evaluation of teaching staff there are 7 Commissions. These same commissions are used for the Program evaluating Emeritus Professors. In the Area of Research there are 16 Field Commissions. The number of members forming these Commissions varies according to the type and number of incentives (in the case of Projects of Excellence they reach up to 100 members).

Concerning the financial resources, AAC statutes establish that they might come from a variety of sources (financial allocations provided by the Autonomous Community and the Regional Government, financial contributions or donations coming from other Public Administrations, the revenue generated by the course of its activities, loans or credits, etc.). In practice, AAC is mainly funded by the Regional Andalusian Government. AAC assigns part of its budget to the activities of its DEVA unit: 26% of the 2013 regulated budget is destined to activities of evaluation, accreditation and promotion of the Andalusian University System. The total budget allocated to these activities in 2013 was 1,113,330 euros. The budget assigned to the

evaluation and accreditation of universities (institutions and programmes) was over 154,000 euros (14% of the total DEVA budget).

The meeting with DEVA's management team as well as the meeting with the representatives of the regional government made it clear that the budget is allocated according to the program of activities established each year by DEVA and that an increase in DEVA's evaluation activities will be followed by a corresponding increase in the budget. In 2014, the increase in DEVA's budget has been 1%.

With regard to the equipment and physical facilities, DEVA is currently located in a modern and convenient new building close to Cordoba's train station, with 15 work areas and offices, 5 conference rooms, 1 room for processing data and 250m² for archives.

The agency is adequately equipped with software and hardware resources and maintains a library with more than 800 references. In particular, DEVA relies on a number of software internet platforms which seem to enable an agile and efficient management of the various evaluation and accreditation processes.

Analysis

The meeting with DEVA staff as well as the different interactions between the panel and various DEVA personnel during the visit made it clear that DEVA's team is composed of an experienced, dynamic and motivated group of people.

The panel also appreciated the commodity and convenience of the physical facilities and the functionality and adequacy of the meetings rooms and available equipment.

Despite an unfavorable economic situation, the agency has managed to increase its budget by 1%. During the site visit, the regional government representatives expressed their will to support the agency in the fulfillment of their missions, which were considered strategically important for the Andalusian Region.

The panel considers that the available resources are sufficient and adequate to the current activities of the agency. However, the new programme accreditation stage (ACREDITA) which is currently starting to operate will, according to current plans (DEVA's operational plan 2014) demand a substantial increase of resources, particularly an increase of technical staff who will act as secretaries during the site visits. This issue should be carefully considered by DEVA at this initial stage (more information on the organization of the accreditation process is provided in section 4.1.4).

Conclusion

Fully compliant

4.5. ENQA criterion 4 / ESG 3.5: Mission statement

Standard: Agencies should have clear and explicit goals and objectives for their work, contained in a publicly available statement.

Evidence

In the statutes of the AAC, the mission, vision and values of DEVA are established as follows:

Mission: Give service to the Andalusian University System (SAU) in all actions related to the evaluation and accreditation of activities conducted in the areas of University Education, Development and Research, according to social demands and in agreement with the quality assurance requirements of the EHEA.

Vision: Become a reference institution at the national and international levels in matters of evaluation, certification and accreditation of quality in universities and research institutes.

Values: Abide by the principles of transparency, objectivity, independence, equality, confidentiality, public service, social compromise, efficiency, environmental engagement, security and labor health.

DEVA has produced a strategic plan for the 2014-2017 period which is available through its website. Five strategic axes have been defined which are subsequently declined in different strategic objectives (see section 4.8). According to this strategic plan, each of the areas and units draws up an annual work plan in order to address the targets. The actions and indicators included in the work plans constitute an action plan.

The panel had access to the annual work plan of the Institutional Evaluation Unit.

Analysis

The panel considers that DEVA's mission is expressed in clear terms. It has verified that DEVA's mission statement is public and accessible through its website (specifically, it appears in the Strategic Plan of DEVA).

The panel has found that there is a systematic approach in order to transform the mission statement into a strategic plan and, subsequently, into an action plan.

Conclusion

Fully compliant

4.6. ENQA criterion 5 / ESG 3.6: Independence

Standard: Agencies should be independent to the extent both that they have autonomous responsibility for their operations and that the conclusions and recommendations made in their reports cannot be influenced by third parties such as higher education institutions, ministries or other stakeholders.

Evidence

The independence of DEVA is acknowledged in Title 1, Article 2.6 of the AAC statutes which establishes that: “The Direction of Evaluation and Accreditation will enjoy full independence from the other organs of the Andalusian Agency of Knowledge in the operation of the functions of evaluation and accreditation of university institutions, lecturers and their activities.”

From an organic point of view, as established in AAC statutes, the highest body within the entity and the executive managing body is the Governing board. It governs the agency and establishes the operational guidelines. The governing board is headed by the president and the vice-president of the agency, who both belong to the Regional Ministry. The president is the head of the competent Regional Ministry to which the Agency is assigned; whereas the vice-president is the person holding the position of the corresponding governing body with responsibilities for Universities, Research and Technology of the corresponding Regional Ministry.

The agency has a management structure headed by the director of evaluation and accreditation. The director of evaluation and accreditation is appointed by the Regional Government upon advice of the governing board.

The agency has delegated the establishing of its methods and criteria to a technical committee which is directly dependent on the governing body. The technical committee is composed of the head of the Evaluation and Accreditation unit, who acts as the president of the committee, the heads of the University Evaluation and Research, Development and Innovation Evaluation (RDI) and fifteen personalities appointed by the director of the agency.

Regardless of the organic structure, during its site visit meetings, the panel tried to get an insight into the degree of independence in the agency’s daily operations.

During the meeting with the governing body, it became clear to the panel that the technical committee is independent in establishing the agency’s protocols and methods. In practice, the role of the government body is limited to a number of formal duties, such as ensuring compliance with the regulations in place or the formal approval of the annual accounts.

The meetings also clarified that:

- To the extent allowed by the regional and national regulations, DEVA acts in full independence in establishing its protocols and criteria.
- Judgments are made in a consistent way according to pre-established criteria (see section 4.1.3).
- Experts are appointed by the director of the agency according to pre-defined and clear criteria. They are all renowned at national and international level and work outside the community of Andalusia.
- Stakeholders are consulted by DEVA (as an example, see the satisfaction surveys listed in annex 6.3), but the evaluation and accreditation processes remain the responsibility of the Agency. In particular, in the programme accreditation process, all judgments are

made by an ad-hoc commission (Reports Production Commission) which is headed by the director of DEVA.

Independence is also conditioned by the funding structure of the Agency. According to the statutes, a diversity of sources can contribute to DEVA's finances (see section 4.3).

Analysis

From an organic point of view, the independence of DEVA is limited, as the members of the Governing body and its director are directly appointed by the regional government. The panel is aware of the fact that it is customary in Spain for public autonomous organizations to be nominally headed by the highest authority of the Ministry to which they relate. As a publicly funded body, the agency is subject to the standard financial control procedures of the public sector.

The appreciation of the panel is that this limited structural independence does not hinder the effective operational independence of DEVA. The panel found evidence of DEVA's independence in terms of the definition and operation of its procedures and methods, the nomination of external experts and the outcomes of its quality assurance processes.

However, DEVA is rather constrained by the national and regional context, specifically as regards the programme accreditation cycle, which is heavily regulated at the national level. This is the case for all Spanish quality assurance agencies.

It was also evident to the panel that stakeholders are consulted along the life-cycle of quality assurance processes, but that DEVA remained in control of the outcomes of the different processes, while respecting the regulations in force.

The panel noted that the funding structure of AAC includes a variety of funding sources but, in practice, the agency is basically maintained through public funding.

Conclusion

Fully compliant

4.7. ENQA Criterion 6 / ESG 3.7: External quality assurance criteria and processes used by the members

Standard: The processes, criteria and procedures used by agencies should be pre-defined and publicly available. These processes will normally be expected to include:

- a self-assessment or equivalent procedure by the subject of the quality assurance process;
- an external assessment by a group of experts, including, as appropriate, (a) student member(s), and site visits as decided by the agency;
- publication of a report, including any decisions, recommendations or other formal outcomes;
- a follow-up procedure to review actions taken by the subject of the quality assurance process in the light of any recommendations contained in the report.

Analysis

DEVA is running various voluntary and compulsory quality assurance processes which are consistent with ESG 3.7; this is to say, they follow the self-assessment-external assessment-publication of the report-follow up scheme (see section 3.2.2 for a description of DEVA activities and section 4.1.5 concerning DEVA's reporting practices).

As explained in section 4.1.4 (fitness for purpose), all programmes are evaluated by Commissions formed by members outside the Andalusian regional community. Commissions in charge of institutional and programme evaluation include students. Not so the Commissions in charge of evaluating teaching staff and research activities. The presence of international experts is however not very frequent.

The protocol of the evaluation programs conducted by the DEVA includes a follow-up procedure between the verification (ex-ante accreditation) and the ex-post accreditation stages (see section 4.1.6).

DEVA has implemented a number of structural and functional measures in order to ensure that decisions are made in a consistent manner (see section 4.1.3).

Finally, there is an appeals procedure in place as well as an appeals Committee. In the case of the programme accreditation process, in the case of favorable reviews the title is verified and inscribed in the Register of Universities, Centers and Titles of the Ministry of Education. In the case of an unfavorable review the university can file an appeal to the President of the Council who in turn will send it to the DEVA so that the Appeals Committee can proceed with its re-evaluation. All the reports are published online.

As to the teaching staff evaluation process, in case of disagreement with the resolution of the evaluation Commission, the applicant can file an appeal which will be evaluated by the Appeals Committee, independent of the Commission that first evaluated the applicant. The Committee studies the allegations set forth and dictates a resolution.

The Appeals Committee is assisted by a legal advisor who is a full time employee of the agency.

Analysis

The panel was convinced that DEVA is operating its various processes according to the scheme established at ESG 3.7. As explained in previous sections, although the full accreditation cycle has not yet been implemented, there was no doubt regarding the periodic nature of the process, as the panel had access to the 2014-2015 action plan which includes a calendar of site-visits.

Various issues regarding student participation were discussed in section 4.1.4. , however, there is no doubt as to the effective presence of students in the evaluation panels. As explained also in section 4.1.4, the panel considers that it would be worth increasing the presence of international experts.

A follow-up procedure is in place between the verification and the accreditation stage, but, as explained in section 4.1.6 it was not clear to the panel whether a follow up phase is intended after the first ex-post accreditation.

Finally, the appeals procedures in place seem to provide all necessary guarantees to the general public.

Conclusion

Fully compliant

4.8. ENQA Criterion 7 / ESG 3.8: Accountability procedures

Standard: Agencies should have in place procedures for their own accountability.

Evidences

DEVA has established a quality manual which is available on DEVA's website. The quality manual establishes DEVA's quality policy, describes the internal organization of DEVA in terms of quality management and sets a process cartography. It is established that the director of the Agency is responsible for the IQA system and that they are assisted in this task by the Internal Quality Commission. This commission is composed of the heads of the different functional areas and some additional people designated by the director of DEVA.

There are no written records or minutes as documentation of the meetings of this Internal Quality Commission.

Apart from the Quality Manual, DEVA has established a strategic plan that is built on the basis of the EFQM model. Five strategic axes have been defined at the various levels defined by the EFQM model:

Processes:

A1: To contribute to the improvement of the Andalusian Knowledge System by means of the evaluation and accreditation of universities, teaching staff and the research and development projects.

People:

A2: To ensure staff engagement through their development and involvement.

Resources:

A3: To maximize the management of the resources used in the development of the various processes run by DEVA.

A4: To strengthen institutional relationships in order to position the agency as a reference at the national and international level.

Results:

A5: To develop a focus on results and on the communication towards the different stakeholders.

As explained in section 4.5, the strategic axes are subsequently declined into different strategic objectives. According to this strategic plan, each of the areas and units draws up an annual work plan in order to address the targets. The actions and indicators included in the work plans constitute an action plan.

Concerning the avoidance of conflict-of-interest, as explained in previous sections, DEVA has developed a Code of Ethics, which must be known by all people who participate in DEVA's procedures (experts and staff). Additionally, DEVA has established a procedure for the standardization of reports (Report Format for Document Standardization), which clearly defines the situations in which a conflict of interest might exist:

- Being PdD director of the applicant (viva voce within the last 10 years)
- Having collaborated with any of the applicants in publications or patents in the last 5 years.
- Maintaining a contractual relationship or having shared funds or research projects in the last 3 years.
- Similar situations in other economic or scientific and technological activities.
- Participating in the proposal.

A number of standard reasons for abstention set by the Spanish law are added to this list (having a personal interest in the matter, being a relative of the applicant, etc.).

DEVA uses experts from outside Andalusia in order to minimize the risk of conflict-of interest.

With regard to the external feedback mechanisms, the panel has verified that DEVA puts in place various periodic surveys addressed to the agents evaluated and experts as well as periodic information meetings addressed to the agents evaluated. DEVA also conducts surveys addressed to the experts in the different commissions.

These surveys are used to prepare a meta-analysis of the different processes. The following analyses are available at DEVA's webpage:

Verification

Report regarding the assessment results of the verification process of doctoral degrees in the Andalusian universities. 2013

Report regarding the assessment results of the verification process and modifications of official master and bachelor degrees in the Andalusian universities. 2013

Report regarding the assessment results of the verification process and modifications of official master and bachelor degrees in the Andalusian universities. 2012

Report regarding the assessment results of the verification process and official master and bachelor degrees in the Andalusian universities. 2009-2010

Follow-up (monitoring)

Report on the satisfaction with the follow-up process of official master and bachelor degrees. 2010-2011

Evaluation of teaching staff

User satisfaction on the evaluation of teaching staff. 2009-2012

Expert satisfaction on the evaluation of teaching staff. 2013

User satisfaction on the evaluation of teaching staff. 2013

These analyses lead to various improvement opportunities. However, there is no documentary evidence on how (or if) these improvement opportunities are taken into account by the agency.

The panel did not find any evidence regarding a formal procedure to get feedback from the staff of the agency.

Analysis

The evidence analyzed by the panel proves that DEVA has formally established an internal quality management system and counts on an internal quality management organization. The external feedback mechanisms and the feedback coming from the experts of the commissions seem to provide rich and valuable information.

However, this IQA system seems to be operating in an informal way, as there are no written records which prove how the “quality loop” is actually implemented, and what action is taken on the information that the system produces. The nature and degree of participation of the staff in this IQA system was not clear to the panel, as there are no formal feedback mechanisms specifically addressed to them.

Conclusion

Partially compliant

4.9. ENQA criterion 8: Consistency of judgements, appeals system and contributions to aims of ENQA

Standard

I. The agency pays careful attention to its declared principles at all times, and ensures both that its requirements and processes are managed professionally and that its judgements and decisions are reached in consistent manner, even if the judgements are formed by different groups;

II. If the agency makes formal quality assurance decisions, or conclusions which have formal consequences, it should have an appeals procedure. The nature and form of the appeals procedure should be determined in the light of the constitution of each agency.

III. The agency is willing to contribute actively to the aims of ENQA.

(I) Consistency of judgments

DEVA has put in place various mechanisms in order to ensure that all people involved in its evaluation and accreditation processes respect the declared principles and the Agency’s mission established in various documents (namely, the Ethical Code, the Quality Manual and

the Strategic Plan). The procedures and criteria are pre-established and made public in various documents. A number of structural and functional elements enable the agency to ensure consistency of decisions (see sections 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.7 and 4.8 for further information).

(II) Appeals system

As explained in section 4.6, there is an appeals procedure in place as well as an appeals Committee. In the case of the programme accreditation process, in the case of favorable reviews the title is verified and inscribed in the Register of Universities, Centers and Titles of the Ministry of Education. In the case of an unfavorable review the university can file an appeal to the President of the Council who in turn will send it to the DEVA so that the Appeals Committee can proceed with its re-evaluation. All the reports are published online.

As to the teaching staff evaluation process, in case of disagreement with the resolution of the evaluation Commission, the applicant can file an appeal which will be evaluated by the Appeals Committee, independent of the Commission that first evaluated the applicant. The Committee studies the allegations exposed and dictates a resolution.

The Appeals Committee is assisted by a legal advisor who is a full time employee of the agency.

(III) Contribution to the aims of ENQA

DEVA (former AGAE) became a full member of ENQA in 2009 after a successful first external evaluation in 2008. There is one person in charge of international affairs who is regularly present at the different ENQA meetings. Other than that, the international strategy of DEVA is still under development and has not been made explicit.

Conclusion

Fully compliant

5. Conclusion and development

In the light of the documentary and oral evidence, the panel's overall appreciation regarding the compliance of DEVA with ENQA membership criteria is positive. All stakeholders were unanimous as to their satisfaction with the way DEVA operates.

As usual, in order to elaborate a fair evaluation it is essential to be aware of the particular context of the Agency. Two contextual facts were particularly relevant in this case:

- The programme accreditation process (one of the key processes that have been analyzed in order to judge compliance) is heavily regulated at the Spanish level. The main features of the procedure as well as the items that should be taken into consideration are given. In consequence, the degree of independence of DEVA is somehow limited. This is a common feature of all Spanish agencies. However, the panel was confident that, to the extent they are allowed by the regulations in force, DEVA is acting in a professional and independent way.
- At the moment of conducting this external evaluation, the complete ex-ante accreditation/follow up/ex-post accreditation cycle had not yet been fully implemented at the Spanish and Andalusian level. The ex-ante accreditation and follow-up stages were fully implemented but no programme accreditation processes (and consequently, no site visits) had yet been conducted. The panel could judge on the compliance with ESG 2.7 (periodic reviews) and ESG 3.7 (external quality assurance criteria and processes used by the agencies) thanks to the detailed information provided by DEVA on the way the first site visits will take place.

The criteria where full compliance has been achieved are:

ENQA membership criterion 1 / Activities / ESG 3.3 (Activities), 2 / ESG 3.2 (Official status), 3 / ESG 3.4 (Resources), 4/ ESG 3.5 (Mission Statement) 5 / ESG 3.6 (Independence), 6/ ESG 3.7 (External quality assurance processes used by the members) and 8 / Miscellaneous,

Substantial compliance has been achieved in the following criteria:

ENQA membership criterion 1 / Activities / ESG Part 2 / ESG 3.1 (Use of external quality assurance procedures).

Finally, the panel considers that the agency is partially compliant regarding **ENQA membership criterion 7/ ESG 3.8 (Accountability procedures).**

In the light of this assessment, the panel **recommends to the Board of ENQA that Full Membership of ENQA is confirmed for a further period of five years.** The panel wishes to address the following recommendations to the Agency:

- Overall, the panel got the impression that the first round of the verification and follow-up processes had come up as a significantly bureaucratic and control-based exercise. DEVA should make sure that the programme accreditation process and specifically, the

new accreditation stage are able to **foster real enhancement** and contribute to the goals set for the Andalusian region: employability and enhanced institutional accountability.

- The current calendar involves an important number of site visits and the panel wonders whether this planning is **feasible in terms of delays and resources**. The panel noted that universities will be visited several times per year (i.e University of Seville will receive between 42 and 55 visits in the period 2014-2017) which will certainly impose a heavy burden on the HEIs. An additional challenge associated to this scheme is avoid losing the **global view of a given institution** and to ensure consistency along the different site visits. DEVA should carefully consider these issues.
- The panel encourages DEVA to reflect on the way the **selection of experts** is done and the registers of DEVA's expert data base are updated so as to capitalize on its full potential.
- The panel recommends that the process of **selection of student experts** is revised. The fact that the student expert selection procedure is completely open could lead to some problems (i.e. students could be pointed out in advanced and be encouraged to apply, which would pervert the selection process). Additionally, the panel considered that the Council of Students could provide some support to the agency in order to improve the selection and training of student experts.
- The panel welcomes the fact that students are represented in DEVA's government bodies (AAC advisory board and DEVA's Technical Commission). It is also aware of the fact that the Technical Commission is not yet fully functional and encourages DEVA to remain vigilant and **ensure that the student representative is really treated as an equal**.
- Regarding the **use of international experts**, the panel acknowledges the practical difficulties associated with recruiting and training this kind of experts. However, it considers that additional efforts should be invested to this regard, as introducing international expertise brings in important benefits in terms of introduction of an international perspective, exchange of practices and avoidance of conflict of interest.
- As the whole accreditation cycle is not yet implemented, it was not clear to the panel whether a **follow-up after the first accreditation phase** is intended. Introducing such a follow-up phase would be consistent with the spirit of the ESG. The panel recommends to DEVA to consider this issue in consultation with the rest of Spanish agencies and the National and Regional Governments.
- The panel appreciates the efforts made by the agency in order to produce annual reports and **meta-analysis** of its multiple activities. However, the panel considers that more work could be done in order to increase DEVA's contribution to system-wide

analysis. In particular, the panel recommends the preparation of a publication devoted to the current state and trends of the quality assurance system in Andalusia which will enable DEVA to profit from the rich and abundant information gathered after the first verification and follow-up rounds. In consistency with the results of the 2009 DEVA review, the panel believes that further opportunities for cross-regional studies in collaboration with other Spanish quality assurance agencies could be explored.

- DEVA should operate its **Internal Quality Assurance_system** in a more formal and documented way in order to ensure that continuous improvement is actually implemented. The results of the different satisfaction surveys should be formally considered. The impact of the improvement initiatives adopted should be assessed in order to ensure that continuous improvement is actually taking place. The panel understands and appreciates the value of lean quality approaches, however, some written records should be found on this improvement process, based on an annual SWOT assessment of the agency's practice. Additionally, the panel recommends the introduction of formal feedback mechanisms addressed to the staff of the Agency.

- Concerning the international activities of DEVA, the panel recommends that an **international strategy** is clearly defined which is consistent with DEVA's mission and available resources.

In view of the considerable resources that are allotted annually to programme accreditation and various other evaluation schemes, the panel finds it somewhat disappointing that AGAE/DEVA has not yet, after so many years of agency activity, been able to complete a full-wheel cyclic review, including site visits, of the Andalusian HE sector. With 11 universities making up the sector, some kind of institutional approach would certainly have made this possible, if only at the expense of some of the voluntary schemes that are currently in operation. As it now is, the external quality assurance regime presents itself as rather fragmented. The panel is aware that DEVA is hardly to blame for this, as the agency simply follows the regulations and plans that are set at the national or inter-agency level, but would still like to recommend that DEVA uses its influence to make the system more coherent and holistic in its totality, and less detail-oriented.

6. Annexes

6.1. Terms of reference of the review

1. Background and context

The Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education and Research of Andalusia is an administrative autonomous organism from the Regional Ministry of Finance, Innovation and Science (Government of Andalusia).

The National Organic University Law 6/2001, December 21st (Title V) and the Regional Andalusian University Law established the legislative and legal framework for the activities that AAC-DEVA may carry out. The objective of AAC-DEVA is being the assessment, accreditation and certification of quality within the terms of reference of the universities and higher education institutions in Andalusia. In doing so, the Agency promotes and guarantees the quality of the Andalusian Knowledge System bearing in mind its adequacy to the social demands and to the European Higher Education Area.

Since its foundation in 2005, the Agency has become the main instrument for the promotion and the evaluation of quality in the Andalusian Higher Education and Research System. AAC-DEVA evaluates requests of teaching staff accreditation; it has also assessed the teaching, research and management activities of teaching staff members of Public Universities - permanent and/or under long-term contracts- to assign additional salary supplements based on productivity; and has evaluated proposals for research grants with the participation of panel experts from outside Andalusia.

AAC-DEVA has been Full member of ENQA since 2000 and underwent a first review in 2008. AACDEVA is applying for reconfirmation of its Full membership in ENQA.

2. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

This is a type A review, as defined in the *Guidelines for external reviews of quality assurance agencies in the European Higher Education Area*. It will evaluate the way in which and to what extent AACDEVA fulfils the criteria for the ENQA membership and thus the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)*. Consequently, the review will also provide information to the ENQA Board to aid its consideration of whether Full membership should be reconfirmed. The review panel is not expected, however, to make any judgments as regards confirming AAC-DEVA Full membership in ENQA.

3. The review process

The process is designed in the light of the *Guidelines for external reviews of quality assurance agencies in the European Higher Education Area*.

The evaluation procedure consists of the following steps:

- Formulation of the contract and Terms of Reference for the review;
- Nomination and appointment of the review panel;
- Self-evaluation by AAC-DEVA including the preparation of a self-evaluation report;
- A site visit by the review panel to AAC-DEVA;

- Preparation and completion of the final evaluation report by the review panel;
- Scrutiny of the final evaluation report by the Review Committee of the ENQA Board;
- Analysis of the scrutiny by the ENQA Board and their decision regarding ENQA membership;
- Follow-up of the panel's and/or ENQA Board's recommendations by the agency.

3.1 Nomination and appointment of the review team members

The review panel consists of five members: Four external reviewers (one or two quality assurance experts, representative(s) of higher education institutions, student member) and a review secretary.

Three of the reviewers (including the review secretary) are nominated by the ENQA Board on the basis of proposals submitted to ENQA by member agencies. The fourth external reviewer is drawn from a nomination provided by the European University Association (EUA). The nomination of the student member is asked from the European Students' Union (ESU). One of the panel members serves as the chair of the review.

Current members of the ENQA Board are not eligible to serve as reviewers.

ENQA will provide AAC-DEVA with the list of suggested experts with their respective curriculum vitae to establish that there are no known conflicts of interest. The experts will have to sign a non-conflict of interest statement as regards AAC-DEVA review.

3.2 Self-evaluation by AAC-DEVA, including the preparation of a self-evaluation report

AAC-DEVA is responsible for the execution and organisation of its own self-evaluation process and shall take into account the following guidance:

- Self-evaluation is organised as a project with a clearly defined schedule and includes all relevant internal and external stakeholders;
- The self-evaluation report is broken down by the topics of the evaluation: background description of the current situation of the Agency; analysis and appraisal of the current situation; proposals for improvement and measures already planned; a SWOT analysis.
- The report is well-structured, concise and comprehensively prepared. It clearly demonstrates the extent to which AAC-DEVA fulfils its tasks of external quality assurance and meets the criteria for the ENQA membership and thus the ESG. The report is submitted to the review panel a minimum of eight weeks prior to the site visit.

3.3 Site visit by the review panel

AAC-DEVA will draw up a draft proposal of schedule of the site visit to be submitted to the review panel at least three months before the planned dates of the visit. The schedule includes an indicative timetable of the meetings and other exercises to be undertaken by the review panel during the site visit, the duration of which is 2 days. The approved schedule shall be given to AAC-DEVA at least two months before the dates of the visit, in order to properly organise the requested interviews.

The review panel will be assisted by AAC-DEVA in arriving to Córdoba.

The site visit will close with an oral presentation and discussion of the major issues of the evaluation between the review panel and AAC-DEVA.

3.4 Preparation and completion of the final evaluation report

The main outcome of the review process is the report. On the basis of the self-evaluation report, site visit and review panel's findings, the review secretary will draft the report, in collaboration with the chair and the rest of the panel members.

The report will take into account the purpose and scope of the evaluation as defined under article 2.

It will also provide a clear rationale for its findings with regards to each ENQA membership criteria. A draft will be submitted for comment to AAC-DEVA within two months of the site visit for comment on factual accuracy. If AAC-DEVA chooses to provide a statement in reference to the draft report it will be submitted to the chair of the review panel within two weeks after the receipt of the draft report. Thereafter the review panel will take into account the statement by AAC-DEVA, finalise the document and submit it to AAC-DEVA and ENQA.

The report is to be finalised within three months of the site visit and will not exceed 40 pages in length.

4. Follow-up process and publication of the report

AAC-DEVA will consider the expert panel's report and inform ENQA of its plans to implement any recommendations contained in the report.

Subsequent to the discussion of the evaluation results and any planned implementation measures with ENQA, the review report and the follow-up plans agreed upon will be published on AAC-DEVA website.

The final review report will be published on the ENQA website, regardless of the review outcome and decision by the Board.

5. Use of the report

ENQA shall retain ownership of the report. The intellectual property of all works created by the expert panel in connection with the review contract, including specifically any written reports, shall be vested in ENQA.

The review report is to be used by the Board of ENQA for the purpose of reaching a conclusion on whether AAC-DEVA has or has not met the membership criteria/ESG.

Once the report is submitted to AAC-DEVA and ENQA and until the decision by the Board is made, the report may not be used or relied upon by AAC, the panel and any third party and may not be disclosed without the prior written consent of ENQA.

6. Budget

AAC-DEVA shall pay the following review related fees:

Fee of the Chair 4,750 EUR

Fee of the Secretary 4,750 EUR

Fee of the 3 other panel members 8,250 EUR (2,750 EUR each)

Administrative overhead for ENQA Secretariat 5,000 EUR

Experts Training fund 1,250 EUR

Travel and subsistence expenses (approximate) 6,000 EUR

This gives a total indicative cost of 30,000 EUR for a review team of 5 members. In the case that the allowance for travel and subsistence expenses is exceeded, AAC-DEVA will cover any additional costs after the completion of the review. However, the ENQA Secretariat will endeavour to keep the travel and subsistence expenses in the limits of the planned budget, and will refund the difference to AACDEVA if the travel and subsistence expenses go under budget.

In the event of a second site visit required by the Board and aiming at completing the assessment of compliance, and should the agency accept a second visit, an additional fee of 500 EUR per expert, as well as travel and subsistence costs are recoverable from the agency.

7. Duration of the review and indicative schedule

- Agreement on terms of reference and protocol for review: June 2013
- Appointment of review panel members: June 2013
- AAC-DEVA self-evaluation completed: December 2013
- Preparation of site visit schedule and indicative timetable: Dec 2013-January 2014
- Briefing of review panel members: January 2014
- Review panel site visit: February 2014
- Draft of evaluation report to AAC-DEVA: April 2014
- Statement of AAC-DEVA to review panel if necessary: April 2014
- Submission of final report to AAC-DEVA and ENQA: May 2014
- Consideration of the report by ENQA and response of AAC-DEVA: June 2014
- Publication of report and implementation plan: July 2014

6.2. Agenda of the site visit

SITE VISIT TO DEVA (CORDOBA)

March 19-20, 2014

Wednesday, March 19

8:30-9:30	Panel meeting
8:45-9:20	<u>Meeting with Senior members for clarification on the verification-follow-up-accreditation process and SER elaboration:</u> José Gutiérrez Pérez; Nieves Pascual Soler
9:30-10:30	<u>Board of Andalusian Agency of Knowledge:</u> Eva María Vazquez Sánchez; Pedro Bisbal Aróztegui
10:45-11:30	<u>Direction of Evaluation and Accreditation:</u> Juan Antonio Devesa Alcaraz, Soledad Rubio Bravo, José Gutiérrez Pérez, Nieves Pascual Soler, María Pérez García
11:45-12:30	<u>Technical Management Committee for Evaluation and Accreditation:</u> Fernando Pliego Alfaro; Eduardo García Jimenez; Nieves Pascual Soler; Teresa Bajo Molina; José Luis Gómez Ariza; Juan José Toledo Aral; Inmaculada García Fernández
12:45-13:30	<u>Teams for the evaluation of University Programs and Professors (Permanent Commission members, external evaluators, students):</u> Carmen Pérez-Llantada; Francisco Hernández Olivares; Cristina Segura Graiño; José Luis Fernández-Cavada; Alejandra López de Sagredo; Alejandro García Abad
13:30-14:30	LUNCH: Catering at DEVA headquarters
14:30-15.15	<u>Teams for the evaluation of Research (Permanent Commission members and external evaluators):</u> Francisco Miguel Cánovas; Rosario Fernández Fernández; Francisco Collado Rodríguez; Elena Domínguez Caña; Francisco Murillo Araujo; Lidia Fuentes Fernández
15:30-16:15	<u>Students:</u> Raúl Moreno Gutiérrez (CARE); Alejandro García Orta (UHU); Ramón Ricardo Rosas Romera (UGR); Ana Belen González Luna (UCO); Isabel López Cobo (UCO) Rosa M ^a Magdalena Franco (UPO) ; Alejandro García Abad (UNIZAR)
16:30-17.15	<u>Appeals Committee:</u> Jordi Mañes i Vinuesa; María Pérez García (Legal adviser of DEVA)
17:30-18:15	<u>Rectors:</u> José Manuel Roldán Noguerras (UCO) Manuel Parras Rosa (UJAÉN) Vicente Guzmán Fluja (UPO) Antonio Ramírez de Arellano López (US) Gabriel Pérez Alcalá (ULOYOLA)
18:15-19:15	Panel meeting

Thursday, March 20

08:30-09:00	Panel meeting
09:00-10:00	<u>Representatives of the Regional Council of Economy, Innovation, Science and Employment</u> : Secretary General of Universities, Research and Technology; General Director of Research, Technology and Business; General Director of Universities. Francisco Andrés Triguero Ruiz; Eva María Vazquez Sánchez; Manuel Torralbo Rodríguez
10:15-11:15	<u>DEVA staff</u> : Samaly Santa Cardona; Esther Megía Serrano; Pilar Romero Godoy; J. Rafael Maroto Escobar; Juan Carlos Fernández Luque; Seferina Palacios García
11:30-12:15	<u>Vice Rectors of Academic Planning and Organization, Quality, Undersgraduate and Graduate Studies</u> : Jorge Delgado García; M ^a José León Guerrero; Julio Terrados Cepeda; Alicia Troncoso Lora; Justo P. Castaño Fuentes;
12:30-13:15	<u>Agents evaluated and stakeholders</u> : Aurora Salvatierra Ossorio; Juan Carlos Tojar Hurtado; Francisco José Bellido Outeiriño; Feliciano Priego Capote; Eugenio M. Fedriani Martel; Alberto Sánchez Martínez
13:15-14:15	LUNCH: Catering at DEVA headquarters
14:15-15:00	<u>Rectors' Council</u> Felipe Romera Lubias; Manuel Pérez Yruela; Carmen Galán Soldevilla; Pilar Aranda Ramírez Federico París Carballo; Raquel Barco Moreno; Gaspar J. Llanes Díaz-Salazar
15:15-16:00	<u>Remaining questions to Board</u> : Juan Antonio Devesa Alcaraz; Pedro Bisbal Aróztegui; José Gutiérrez Pérez; Soledad Rubio Bravo; Nieves Pascual Soler
16:15-17:45	Review Panel meeting, summarizing conclusions
17:45-18:05	<u>Final meeting with members of Board</u> : Juan Antonio Devesa Alcaraz, Pedro Bisbal Aróztegui, José Gutiérrez Pérez, Soledad Rubio Bravo, Nieves Pascual Soler

6.3. Documentary evidence

Evidence requested before the visit

- Examples of reports in English (verification and follow up report)
- Progress report
- Previous ENQA evaluation reports

Additional documents made available during the visit

- Planning 2014 from the university evaluation and accreditation unit
- Criteria for the verification, follow-up and accreditation of university degrees

Documents present at DEVA's website

- DEVA's annual reports
- Strategic plan
- Quality manual
- Report on the quality of Spanish Universities
- Report regarding the assessment results of the verification process of doctoral degrees in the Andalusian universities. 2013
- Report regarding the assessment results of the verification process and modifications of official master and bachelor degrees in the Andalusian universities. 2013
- Report regarding the assessment results of the verification process and modifications of official master and bachelor degrees in the Andalusian universities. 2012
- Report regarding the assessment results of the verification process and official master and bachelor degrees in the Andalusian universities. 2009-2010
- Report on the satisfaction with the follow-up process of official master and bachelor degrees. 2010-2011
- User satisfaction on the evaluation of teaching staff. 2009-2012
- Expert satisfaction on the evaluation of teaching staff. 2013
- User satisfaction on the evaluation of teaching staff. 2013