AQ UA

Agència de Qualitat de l'Ensenyament Superior d'Andorra

Evaluation guide for ex-post programme accreditations

1_19-084

JUNE 2022

EVALUATION GUIDE FOR EX-POST PROGRAMME ACCREDITATIONS

· June 2022[1] ·

---

1. Presentation

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education in Andorra (AQUA) ensures the quality of higher education in Andorra with a constant demand for quality and rigour based on different social and labour demands. The evaluation system is the tool that enables us to adapt higher education to the framework of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) while guaranteeing continuous improvement in the higher education processes. In this respect, AQUA's objectives are to evaluate, accredit and certify quality in higher education according to the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ESG) in the European Higher Education Area, in coordination with higher education institutions.

The Higher Education Evaluation Framework establishes the quality dimensions for higher education in Andorra, as well as the study programme evaluation processes (ex-ante programme accreditation, programme modification and ex-post programme accreditation). Its content is the result of discussions held within the Working Group for Quality in Higher Education.

The evaluation of study programmes for renewal consists of an ex-post programme accreditation or a substantial modification. This evaluation focuses on the implementation of the study programmes, taking the approval commitments as a reference and, if applicable, any modifications carried out to that date.

The external evaluation process is summarised in a binding reasoned report with a favourable or unfavourable result, establishing strengths, binding improvement actions and improvement proposals to progress towards excellence.

In *Table 1*, the basic details of the evaluation process for renewing study programmes are presented: the scope, timing, mandatory status and process stages. Each stage relates to the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ESG) in the European Higher Education Area.

Table 1. Basic details of the evaluation for renewing study programmes

Scope	Study programme field
Timing	Ex-post
Mandatory	Yes
Participation of stakeholders in the design and improvement of the guide (ESG 2.2)	Yes
Self-assessment prepared by the HEI (ESG 2.1, 2.3)	Yes
Participation of a panel of external experts (ESG 2.4)	Yes
Visit and interviews with stakeholders (ESG 2.3)	Yes

Evaluation report (ESG 2.6)	Yes
Process result (ESG 2.5)	Favourable/Unfavourable
Possibility of appeal (ESG 2.7)	Yes

The study programme evaluation is geared towards developing a quality culture in higher education in Andorra, through a collaboration between internal and external quality management. This evaluation process has the following objectives:

- To assure the quality of the higher education programme proposals through a process that is geared towards improvement.
- To ensure that the programme accreditation process correlates with the AQUA Higher Education Evaluation Framework.
- To evaluate proposals considering the context of Andorra and its higher education system.
- To evaluate the proposals according to the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ESG) in the European Higher Education Area.
- To promote the evaluation of study programmes considering the Sustainable Development Goals.
- To ensure that evaluations are efficient and consistent, encouraging those who develop the proposals for new degrees and those who evaluate them to share the same references.

2. Process

The evaluation process of a study programme for an ex-post programme accreditation follows the steps below:

1) Request

The higher education institution (HEI) requests AQUA to evaluate one or several study programmes for an ex-post programme accreditation and submits the self-assessment(s)

2) Acceptance of the request

AQUA has fifteen days to analyse and accept the request. Once accepted, the HEI proceeds to pay the fee, which will be attached to the acceptance document. Until the fee is paid, the submitted request cannot be processed.

3) Review of formal aspects

Once the fee has been paid, AQUA reviews the formal aspects of the self-assessments and if any deficiencies are identified, notifies the HEI, which has ten days to resolve them.

AQUA informs the competent ministry of the start of the ex-post programme accreditation process.

4) Composition of the panel of experts

AQUA proposes the composition of the panel of experts, in accordance with the criteria established in the agency's regulations.

The HEI has five working days to refuse the members of the panel of experts, with justification, and confirm the timeline. If refused, AQUA has ten working days to propose a different panel of experts.

5) Timetable of visits and interviews

AQUA proposes a timetable of visits and interviews. This proposal will be agreed upon and completed by the HEI.

6) Evaluation

6.1) Preliminary evaluation

The panel of experts analyses the information from the self-assessments, the visit and the interviews, and other complementary or public information, and drafts a preliminary expert report for each study programme, with binding improvement actions and recommendations. This report is delivered to the AQUA Evaluations Commission.

The Evaluations Commission issues the preliminary evaluation report for each study programme within a maximum period of two months from payment of the fee.

The HEI has ten working days to present any arguments, amendments or additional information related to the preliminary evaluation report.

6.2) Final evaluation

The panel of experts analyses the arguments, amendments or additional information related to the preliminary evaluation report(s) and drafts a final expert report for each study programme. These reports are submitted to the AQUA Evaluations Commission.

The Evaluations Commission issues the evaluation report for each study programme within two months from receipt of the arguments, amendments or additional information.

During the evaluation process, the following points will be considered:

- AQUA may issue a request for information to complete any of the previous stages. The HEI has ten working days to provide the requested information.
- From the payment of the fee, AQUA should resolve the evaluation within a maximum period of six months.
- Within any of these deadlines, both AQUA and the HEI can notify an extension of no more than half of the established period.
- No reply from the authority means a positive response for ongoing study programmes.
- The HEI, if it deems necessary, can appeal to the AQUA Appeals Commission, as described in the "Regulations of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education in Andorra" (www.aqua.ad).

3. Request for an Ex-post Programme Accreditation

An ex-post programme accreditation can be requested for one or several programmes, preferably in the same disciplinary area. The evaluation of several programmes in the same disciplinary area makes the evaluation process easier for both the HEI and AQUA.

It is the responsibility of each HEI to request an ex-post programme accreditation before it expires, taking into account the duration of the evaluation process.

To request the evaluation, the HEI must submit a request and the self-assessment report of the study programme to AQUA.

4. Self-assessment Report

The self-assessment report belongs to the HEI and should be published once the evaluation has ended, if it is favourable. This documentation must be clear, accurate, up-to-date, reusable and easily accessible, at least on the HEI's website. Additionally, it should comply with the data protection regulations and, if necessary, omit any sections with sensitive information.

It has a dual purpose:

- On the one hand, it is an opportunity for the internal quality assurance body of each institution to reflect on and summarise how the study programme is working, in order to detect any challenges and improvement opportunities.

- On the other hand, it is a reference document for the ex-post programme accreditation.

The minimum information that the self-assessment should contain is:

- Presentation and development of the study programme, including any modifications made during the evaluated period.
- Presentation of the institution and the centre delivering the study programme.
- Description of the process followed to prepare the self-assessment, specifying which stakeholders were involved and in what way.
- Assessment of quality criteria. For each criterion, it is necessary to:
    - **Describe** the situation during the evaluated period, using evidence and indicators.
    - **Evaluate** the level of achievement of the criterion, identifying strengths and weaknesses.
    - **Explain** any detected challenges or difficulties that prevent the study programme from working well in relation to this criterion and the intended improvement actions. *This explanation is an opportunity to address doubts to the experts. As far as possible, the evaluation report will attempt to provide an answer.*
- Overall assessment of the study programme and description of the improvement plan.

5. Visit, Interviews and Presentation of the Study Programme

Within the evaluation process, a visit is envisaged to the HEI where the programme is delivered and interviews with stakeholders are planned. The objective of the visit and interviews is to get to know the place where the programme is delivered, gather new evidence and resolve any doubts that arise from the analysis of the documentation.

The visit and interviews should be seen as an opportunity for dialogue between stakeholders, the institution and external experts, aimed towards improvement. In no case will the panel of experts or AQUA make judgements regarding how the study programme is functioning during the visit and interviews.

During the visit and interviews, the HEI will have the opportunity to give a presentation of the programme and its implementation throughout the evaluated period.

The total duration of the visits and interviews will meet the requirements of each case. at the internal quality assurance body of each HEI, in coordination with AQUA, is responsible for organising the visits and interviews.

Visit to the facilities

The panel of experts will visit the HEI's facilities in order to evaluate their suitability for teaching the programme. Examples of facilities to be visited include classrooms, laboratories, computer rooms, auditoriums, libraries, student advice offices, teachers' offices and any other area of importance to the programme. The areas and facilities will be assessed according to the criteria established in this document.

The HEI will be responsible for organising the visit to its facilities.

Interviews with stakeholders

External experts, together with AQUA, will engage in group interviews with stakeholders involved in the development of the study programme through group interviews (one interview per group) of approximately 45 minutes (see *Table 2*). Interviews will preferably be conducted in person, but may also be virtual.

Table 2. Groups for interviewing

Programme management team and leaders
Students   A diverse representation of students should be encouraged, including different courses, specialities, modalities, participation in representative bodies or not, etc.
Teaching staff   A diverse representation of teaching staff should be encouraged, including permanent and collaborative staff, those involved in research or not, those teaching different courses and/or modalities and those participating in representative bodies or not, etc.
Graduates   As far as possible, a diverse representation of the graduates should be encouraged, including those who continue to have a connection with the HEI or not, those who work or not, etc.
Employers   Employers are individuals who employ graduates or serve as external internship supervisors. As far as possible, a diverse representation of employers with different profiles should be encouraged.
Administrative and service staff involved in the programme management

In the case of evaluating several programmes in the same disciplinary field, a single interview can be conducted for the same groups (for example, the management team and leaders if they are the same).

One person representing more than one group should be avoided. If this situation occurs, it should be anticipated and agreed upon with AQUA.

Regarding the organisation of the interviews, the HEI is in charge of:

- Contacting the interviewees and guaranteeing that at least three people from each group attend the interviews at the agreed time. Prior to the interviews, the HEI should send the list of confirmed attendees for each interview to AQUA, indicating their characteristics (position, course, mode, etc.). In exceptional cases where it is impossible to comply with this requirement, AQUA should be informed so it can seek an alternative.

- Preparing an interview room:
  - ○ In the case of in-person interviews, it is necessary to provide:
    - ▪ A workspace with the capacity to accommodate up to eight interviewees plus external experts and a technical secretary from AQUA. The room should have a computer, internet access and a projector screen connected to the computer and may be used for all the commission's private discussions during the visit. The ideal interview format is a "round table", in which both the external experts and the interviewees have an equal position around a table. Conference rooms and two-level court-style rooms are not recommended.
    - ▪ Water for the attendees and a minimal breakfast service for the experts, agreed upon and financed by AQUA.
  - ○ In the case of online interviews, it is important to:
    - ▪ Ensure that all interviewees are informed of the time and characteristics of the interviews, know how the platform works and have the necessary means to use it correctly.
    - ▪ AQUA will be responsible for providing a platform for holding the interviews. This platform must allow two-way, simultaneous sound and image communication and visual and verbal interaction between members who are not physically in the same place. The platform must have at least the basic functions for holding group meetings correctly. During the interviews, the platform will be managed by the AQUA person acting as secretary.

- Ensuring that the entire university community is informed of the existence and operation of the public hearing so that any member who wishes can take part. AQUA can also advertise this space, as well as the entire evaluation process.

Important:

- **Public hearing**: the interviews must include a public hearing, which can be presential or virtual, addressing anyone from the university community who wishes to give their

opinion about the evaluated programmes. Confirmation of attendance is not required to take part in a public hearing.

- In all cases, the experts will have the option to ask the interviewees to provide documentation justifying their contributions, if they deem fit.

Presentation of the study programme

The HEI will have the opportunity to give a presentation of the programme before the panel of experts (10 min.) to explain the decisions made during its design.

After the presentation, the panel of experts can ask the HEI questions to clarify any doubts and specific aspects of the programme (10 min.), which should not be construed as a value judgement.

6. Evaluation

AQUA groups the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) and the European Higher Education Area directives into five quality dimensions, which are further divided into criteria grouped into key aspects. The criteria are described in *Table 3*.

Table 3. Key aspects, dimensions and criteria for evaluation

Key aspect	Criteria
DIMENSION I. QUALITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	
Key aspect I.1. Monitoring and continuous improvement	Criterion I.1.a. The structure in charge of internal quality is public, involves the participation of all stakeholders and has fit-for-purpose processes to enable periodic monitoring of the study programme resulting in improvement actions.
	Criterion I.1.b. Improvements are proposed for the study programme that add value and are consistent with the analysis of strengths and weaknesses.
	Criterion I.1.c. The main academic indicators of the study programme are adequate.
DIMENSION II. ACTIVITIES – STUDY PROGRAMMES	
Key aspect II.1. Study programme description and definition	Criterion II.1.a. The teaching modality is specified and the approach is suitable and consistent with the type of education presented.
	Criterion II.1.b. The linguistic approach is consistent with the characteristics of the study programme.
Key aspect II.2. Study programme relevance and interest	Criterion II.2.a. The study programme is still relevant and up to date within its academic and/or professional field.
Key aspect II.3. Professional opportunities and purposes of the official degree	Criterion II.3.a. The mechanisms for promoting graduate employability are adequate.

Key aspect II.4. Study programme design, planning and organisation	Criterion II.4.a. All the teaching units and their design and evaluation enable the achievement of competencies and learning outcomes.
	Criterion II.4.b. The internships are consistent with the study programme characteristics, add educational value and are organised and managed so that all students can complete them correctly.
	Criterion II.4.c. Mobility, if envisaged, is correctly organised and managed.
	Criterion II.4.d. Student-centred learning is promoted.
	Criterion II.4.e. In the case of a doctorate, the following procedures are considered appropriate: assignment of a thesis supervisor and/or tutor and tutoring, the monitoring process of each doctoral student and the quality of the doctoral theses presented.
DIMENSION III. ACADEMIC STAFF	
Key aspect III.1. Training, professional and research experience and sufficiency of the teaching staff	Criterion III.1.a. The training, professional and/or research experience and language skills of the teaching staff guarantee that they are competent to carry out their teaching activities.
	Criterion III.1.b. The teaching staff is familiar with the educational model of the programmes, engages in continuous training, conducts research and is also competent in the various teaching methodologies.
	Criterion III.1.c. The commitment model and sufficiency of the teaching staff are adequate for the number of student places to ensure teaching, student support and coordination and management of the study programme.
DIMENSION IV. RESOURCES AND SUPPORT PROCESSES	
Key aspect IV.1. Student access and admission	Criterion IV.1.a. The entry profile, access routes and requirements, number of places, complementary studies and admission tests, if applicable, are consistent with the subject and characteristics of the study programme.
	Criterion IV.1.b. The study programme validations and recognitions are adequate.
Key aspect IV.2. Learning support resources	Criterion IV.2.a. The material resources and services allocated to the development of the study programme are adequate for the teaching mode, the number of enrolled students and the competencies to be achieved.
DIMENSION V. PUBLIC INFORMATION	
Key aspect V. 1. Public information	Criterion V.1.a. The HEI adequately informs all stakeholders about the characteristics of the study programme.

Each criterion is evaluated according to the following levels of achievement:

- **Not applicable**: evaluation of the criterion is unnecessary or irrelevant in the case of the ongoing evaluation.
- **Insufficient information**: the evidence collected throughout the process does not allow for the evaluation of this criterion.
- **Inadequate**: the evidence shows that the criterion has not been satisfactorily met and therefore further work is required in this aspect.

- **Adequate**: the evidence shows that the criterion has been satisfactorily met.
- **Very adequate**: the evidence shows that the criterion has been exceeded and other complementary actions are being taken to improve it.

To evaluate each criterion, the parameters will be used that are grouped in **Annex 1 – EVALUATION DIMENSIONS, KEY ASPECTS AND CRITERIA**. Different indicators will be evaluated for each criterion based on each achievement level.

Annex 2 – GLOSSARY describes the indicators used to evaluate each criterion.

7. Process Results and Effects

The result of the evaluation is summarised in an evaluation report that includes at least:

- The identification data of the official degree.
- The description of the evaluation process.
- The evaluation result: favourable or unfavourable, proposing that the HEI maintains, modifies or eliminates the study programme. By issuing a favourable report, AQUA renews the accreditation of the study programme.
- The evaluation of each of the quality dimensions and criteria.
- A summary of best practices.
- The binding improvement actions and improvement proposals.

To obtain a favourable result, all criteria should have an achievement level of at least an adequate. The Evaluations Commission can also issue a favourable report if it considers that any criterion evaluated as "not adequate" or "insufficient information" does not substantially affect the quality of the study programme or can be resolved in the short term.

Once a favourable evaluation report and corresponding accreditation are obtained, the HEI sends the study programme renewal, modification or elimination proposal and the AQUA evaluation report to the ministry in charge of higher education.

8. Contact

Any questions, comments or suggestions relating this process can be addressed to:

Agència de Qualitat de l'Ensenyament Superior d'Andorra
Edifici del Consell General, plaça Lídia Armengol
C. Dr. Vilanova, 15-17, planta -3
AD500 Andorra la Vella
Tel.: + 376 877 951
Email: info@aqua.ad

9. Document Reviews

Document Reviews		
Version	**Description of programme modification**	**Date of approval**

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION DIMENSIONS, KEY ASPECTS AND CRITERIA

DIMENSION I. QUALITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

This dimension refers to the capacity of the higher education institution (HEI) to manage quality in a strategic and coordinated way, through information management, monitoring and decision-making, in order to ensure continuous improvement in the performance of its tasks. Table A1.1 presents the key aspects and criteria considered for this dimension.

Table A1.1. Key aspects and criteria for Dimension I. Quality and Continuous Improvement

Key aspect	Criteria
DIMENSION I. QUALITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	
I.1. Monitoring and continuous improvement	Criterion I.1.a. The structure in charge of internal quality is public, involves the participation of all stakeholders and has adequate processes to enable periodic monitoring of the study programme resulting in improvement actions.
	Criterion I.1.b. Improvements are proposed for the study programme that add value and are consistent with the analysis of strengths and weaknesses.
	Criterion I.1.c. The main academic indicators of the study programme are adequate.

The main legislative framework for Dimension I. Quality and Continuous Improvement is presented in *Table A1.2.* Furthermore, this dimension relates to the following **ESGs**:

- ESG 1.1. Quality Assurance Policy.
- ESG 1.7. Information Management.
- ESG 1.9. On-going Monitoring and Periodic Review of the Programmes.

Table A1.2. Legislative Framework for Dimension I. Quality and Continuous Improvement

Law/Regulations	Related articles
Law 14/2018, of 21 June, on Higher Education	• Article 3. Objectives • Article 12. Inspection and evaluation competencies • Article 21. Rights and obligations of the students • Article 23. Rights and obligations of the teaching and research staff • Article 25. Rights of the technical and administrative staff
Statutory Regulation for Official Higher Education Degrees	• Article 22. Quality and continuous improvement

Key aspect I.1. Monitoring and continuous improvement

*Criterion I.1.a. **The structure in charge of internal quality** is public, involves the **participation of all stakeholders** and has **appropriate processes** to enable **periodic monitoring** of the study programme resulting in **improvement actions.***

The HEI should ensure mechanisms and structures to guarantee the quality and continuous improvement of each of dimension affecting the study programme.

To evaluate this criterion the HEI will need to reflect on the composition of the structure in charge of quality during the last period, the implication of stakeholders and the effectiveness of the processes and periodic monitoring.

This criterion will assess:

- If the structure in charge of internal quality has provided for the participation of all the stakeholders involved in the programme: students, teaching staff, internship tutors, etc. It will also assess whether this structure is efficient and adds value to quality management.
- If the processes are clear and effective, whether they detail the information for each of the dimensions affecting the programme and whether they are used for improvement plans.[2]
- How the self-assessment report was prepared and which stakeholders were involved or consulted.
- If the quality management is public, and whether the published information is accurate, complete and up to date.

Evidence

The HEI can provide all documentation related to its internal quality management processes, the web links to the information published on internal quality and any other information that helps evaluate this criterion. It is recommended to provide at least:

- Manual of internal quality management or similar document.
- Description of ongoing internal quality processes during the last period.
- Documentation related to the structure in charge of internal quality management, such as bylaws, a selection of the minutes of meetings held in the evaluated period, etc.
- Website of the HEI dedicated to internal quality management or other means of publication.

Indicators

---

[2] The internal quality management should be focused towards continuous improvement in all significant areas of the study programme, such as: teaching unit design and update; workload suitability; assessment effectiveness; study programme performance; satisfaction of involved groups (students, teachers, internship centres, etc.); the quality of the academic staff; entry, progression and finalisation of studies; the quality of external internships and mobility; the suitability of the learning environment and services. The processes that form part of the internal quality management should be clear and effective to enable continuous improvement in each of the areas. The following elements should be defined and related coherently: objectives, the process manager, stakeholders involved, period in which it is implemented, objectives, indicators, evidence, documentation and other associated processes, resources used and intended improvement actions.

- The improvement actions and their implementation.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion I.1.a will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.3.

Table A1.3. Evaluation rubric for Criterion I.1.a

Criterion I.1.a. *The structure in charge of internal quality is public, involves the participation of all stakeholders and has adequate processes to enable periodic monitoring of the study programme which leads to improvement actions*.	
Not applicable	-
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • No information is provided about the structure in charge of internal quality or the information provided is not sufficient to evaluate the participation of stakeholders involved in the study programme. Additionally, no information is provided about the operation of this structure and the evidence does not allow assessing the efficiency and added value in the quality of the study programme. • No information is provided about the processes or the provided information is insufficient to evaluate whether they are clear and effective for monitoring each of the dimensions affecting the study programme. • No information is provided about how the self-assessment report was prepared and/or how the main stakeholders were involved. • No information is provided to verify that the quality management is public and that the information is accurate, complete and up to date. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • There is no structure in charge of internal quality or it does not provide for the participation of the main stakeholders involved in the study programme. The structure does not allow for periodic monitoring of the study programme and does not add value to the quality management. • The presented processes do not cover the most important dimensions affecting the study programme or are not well planned, are incoherent, confusing and ineffective for collecting and analysing the necessary information and turning it into improvement actions. • The main stakeholders in the study programme have not been involved in preparing the self-assessment or their involvement has not enabled proper participation. • The quality management is not public or the information is not accurate, complete or up to date. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following points are fulfilled: • The structure in charge of internal quality provides for the participation of the main stakeholders involved in the study programme. This structure allows for periodic monitoring of the study programme to detect problems and solve them. • The presented processes are complete, clear and effective, relate to each of the dimensions affecting the study programme and allow for collection and analysis of the information and turning it into improvement actions. • The main stakeholders in the study programme have been involved in the preparation of the self-assessment report. • The quality management is public, complete and up to date. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.

	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The structure in charge of internal quality provides for the participation of all the stakeholders involved in the study programme: students, teaching staff, graduates, placement tutors, etc. This structure allows for periodic monitoring of the study programme, not only to detect and solve problems but also to improve and add value to the study programme. • The structure in charge of internal quality management adds value to the study programme and improves it. • The presented processes are complete, clear and effective, relate to each of the dimensions affecting the study programme and are used for improvement plans that not only detect and solve problems but also improve and add value to the study programme. • The presented processes improve and add value to the study programme. • External actors have been consulted in preparing the self-assessment report to guide the improvement actions. • An effort is made for the quality management to reach all stakeholders in an accessible, comprehensible way.
Very adequate	

Criterion I.1.b. Improvements are proposed for the study programme that add value and are consistent with the *analysis of strengths and weaknesses.*

The internal quality management should allow for an analysis of how the implementation of the study programme is working, detecting the strengths and weaknesses and proposing solutions for improvement.

The assessment of this criterion will consider:

- If the HEI has coherently detected strengths and weaknesses and areas of special attention for each of the dimensions affecting the study programme.
- If necessary and coherent measures have been taken in cases where deficiencies or weaknesses have been detected and whether improvement actions have been implemented and their level of achievement.

Evidence

The HEI should provide monitoring reports and improvement plans for the study programme for the entire evaluated period and any other information it deems relevant for evaluating whether the criterion has been successfully met.

Indicators

- Modifications requested since the implementation of the study programme.
- Internal evaluations of the programme (internal monitoring) carried out since the implementation or last modification.
- Actions implemented to improve the programme (internal monitoring) since the implementation or last modification.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion I.1.b will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.4.

Table A1.4. Evaluation rubric for Criterion I.1.b

Criterion I.1.b. *Improvements are proposed for the study programme that add value and are consistent with the **analysis of strengths and weaknesses**.*	
Not applicable	-
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • Insufficient information is provided to evaluate whether the HEI monitors the study programme and analyses the strong and weak points affecting the programme. • Insufficient information is provided to evaluate whether the HEI takes the necessary measures in cases where deficiencies or weaknesses are detected and whether it implements improvement actions and monitors its level of achievement. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • No monitoring of the strengths and weaknesses is carried out or it is partial or not rigorous. • The necessary measures are not taken in cases where deficiencies or weaknesses are detected or they are partial and incoherent. Additionally, there is no monitoring of its level of achievement. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is incoherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following points are met: • The strengths and weaknesses and the areas for special attention for each of the dimensions affecting the study programme are detected. • The necessary measures are taken when deficiencies or weaknesses are detected and the level of achievement is monitored. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The strengths and weaknesses are detected to improve the dimensions affecting the official degree. • The HEI assesses the impact and adds the value of the measures that have been taken to improve the shortcomings and weak points of the study programme.

Criterion I.1.c. The *main academic indicators* of the study programme *are adequate*.

The evaluation of this criterion will consider:

- If the trend in the main data and indicators of the programme (number of students per academic year, study programme rate, drop-out rate, efficiency rate, performance rate and success rate) is adequate.
- If the satisfaction of the students, teaching staff, graduates and other stakeholder groups regarding the programme is adequate.

Evidence

- HEI website dedicated to the internal quality management where the indicators are published.

- Mechanism for evaluating the level of satisfaction of the students, teaching staff, graduates and other stakeholder groups regarding the programme with the overall educational experience of the official degree.

Indicators

- Level of satisfaction of the students regarding the teaching mode in the last period.
- Level of satisfaction of the teaching staff regarding the teaching mode in the last period.
- Trend in the following indicators during the evaluated period:
  - Performance rate of the study programme.
  - Drop-out rate of the study programme.
  - Graduate efficiency rate.
  - Graduation rate of the study programme.
  - Success rate of the study programme.
  - In the case of a doctorate, the number of publications deriving from theses.
  - In the case of a doctorate, the impact of publications deriving from theses.
  - Time dedicated by the student to achieving an official degree.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion I.1.c will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.5.

Table A1.5. Evaluation rubric for Criterion I.1.c

Criterion I.1.c. *The **main academic indicators** of the study programme **are adequate**.*	
Not applicable	-
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information about the trend in the main data and indicators of the programme is insufficient. • The provided information on the satisfaction of students, teaching staff, graduates and other stakeholders regarding the programme is insufficient. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The trend in the main data and indicators indicates some problems in the implementation of the study programme. • The satisfaction of students, teaching staff, graduates and other stakeholders indicates some problems in the implementation of the study programme. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following points are fulfilled: • The trend in the main data and indicators does not indicate any problem in the implementation of the study programme.

	• The satisfaction of students, teaching staff, graduates and other stakeholder groups regarding the study programme is above average and does not indicate problems in the implementation of the programme. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The trend in the majority of the main data and indicators for the programme resembles the results obtained in other national and international HEIs in the same field and does not indicate problems in the implementation of the study programme. • The satisfaction of students, teaching staff, graduates and other stakeholders regarding the programme is excellent and indicates that implementation of the programme is working magnificently.

DIMENSION II. ACTIVITIES – STUDY PROGRAMMES

This dimension refers to the academic activity (official degrees). It includes the design of study programmes and promotion of student-centred teaching, learning and assessment. *Table A1.6* presents the key aspects and criteria considered for this dimension.

Table A1.6. Key aspects and criteria of Dimension II. Activities – Study programmes

Key aspect	Criteria
DIMENSION II. ACTIVITIES – STUDY PROGRAMMES	
II.1. Official degree description and definition	Criterion II.1.a. The teaching mode is specified and the approach is suitable and consistent with the type of education presented.
	Criterion II.1.b. The linguistic approach is consistent with the characteristics of the study programme.
II.2. Official degree relevance and interest	Criterion II.2.a. The study programme is still relevant and is up to date within its academic and/or professional field.
II.3. Professional opportunities and purposes of the official degree	Criterion II.3.a. The mechanisms for promoting graduate employability are adequate.
II.4. Official degree design, planning and organisation	Criterion II.4.a. All the teaching units and their design enable the achievement of the intended competencies and learning outcomes.
	Criterion II.4.b. The internships are consistent with the study programme characteristics, add educational value and are organised and managed so that all students can complete them successfully.
	Criterion II.4.c. Mobility, if envisaged, is effectively organised and managed.
	Criterion II.4.d. Student-centred learning is promoted.
	Criterion II.4.e. In the case of a doctorate, the following procedures are considered appropriate: assignment of a thesis supervisor and/or tutor and tutoring, the monitoring process of each doctoral student and the quality of the doctoral theses presented.

The main legislative framework of Dimension II. Activities – Study Programmes is presented in *Table A1.7*. Furthermore, the dimension relates to the following **ESG**:

- ESG 1.2. Design and Approval of Programmes.
- ESG 1.3. Student-centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment.

Table A1.7. Legislative framework of Dimension II. Activities – Study Programmes

Law/Regulations	Related articles
Law 14/2018, of 21 June, on Higher Education	• Article 6. Access • Article 8. European Credits (ECTS) • Article 11. Languages • Article 21. Students' Rights and Obligations
Statutory Regulation for Official Higher Education Degrees	• Article 3. Definitions • Article 4. European Credits • Article 5. Academic Results • Article 6. Teaching Programmes • Article 13. Acknowledgement of Official Degrees • Article 14. Double, Multiple and Joint Official Degrees Awarded in Andorra • Article 15. Short Cycle: Advanced Professional Diploma (APD) Degrees • Article 16. First Cycle: Bachelor and Specialization Degrees • Article 17. Second Cycle: Master's Degrees • Article 18. Third Cycle: Doctoral Degrees • Article 24. Request for Approval of a Study Programme to the Ministry in Charge of Higher Education
Decree of 27.01.2010 establishing the Andorran Higher Education Degree's Framework	• All articles

Key aspect II.1. Study programme description and definition

*Criterion II.1.a. The **instructional model**[3] is specified and the approach is suitable and consistent with the type of education presented.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

---

[3] The degree aligns with the instructional model according to these cases:
- Presential learning whenever more than two-thirds of the total teaching require students to be present at the higher education institution. The presential mode can also be supported by an online platform or virtual campus.
- Blended learning when between one-third and two-thirds of the total teaching requires the students to be present.
- Distance learning when the teaching does not require students to be present. In this model, the qualifications offered via online platforms are considered to be virtual or online degrees. See "Considerations for quality assurance of e-learning provision" (2018). *ENQA occasional papers*, 26. Available at <https://enqa.eu/index.php/publications/papers-reports/occasional-papers/>.

- If the official degree is being taught in the instructional model specified in the accreditation of the study programme.
- If the instructional model enables adequate achievement of the competencies, considering the objective and approach of the study programme.
- If students and teaching staff are satisfied with the instructional model.
- If the HEI is monitoring the effective implementation of the instructional model.

Evidence

- Any explanatory document about the approach and functioning of the mode, and the mechanisms for monitoring it.
- Mechanism to evaluate the level of satisfaction of the students and teaching staff regarding the teaching mode in the last period.

Indicators

- Number of teaching modes.
- Performance rate for each teaching mode since implementation of the study programme.
- Drop-out rate for each teaching mode since implementation of the study programme.
- Level of satisfaction of the students regarding the teaching mode in the evaluated period.
- Level of satisfaction of the teaching staff regarding the teaching mode in the evaluated period of the study programme.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion II.1.a will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.8.

Table A1.8. Evaluation rubric for Criterion II.1.a

Criterion II.1.a. The **teaching mode** is specified and the approach is suitable and consistent with the type of education presented.	
Not applicable	-
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating the proposal and functioning of the teaching mode. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The teaching mode diverges from the one specified in the approval of the programme. • The percentage of presential teaching, in the case of semi-presential degrees, and the criterion followed to allocate it, considering the internships, assessment activities, laboratory activities, etc. do not enable appropriate acquisition of the competencies. • The mode approach and functioning do not enable appropriate acquisition of the competencies, considering the objective and approach of the programme.

	• The satisfaction of the students and the teaching staff indicate some problems regarding the teaching mode. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion, or the provided information is not coherent with its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following circumstances are fulfilled: • The degree is taught in the teaching mode specified in the approval of the programme. • The mode allows for the appropriate acquisition of the competencies. • The satisfaction of the students and the teaching staff regarding the teaching mode does not indicate problems. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The mode adds value to the programme beyond the minimum competencies. • The satisfaction of the students and the teaching staff regarding the teaching mode indicate that the mode adds value to the programme.

Criterion II.1.b. *The **linguistic approach** is consistent with the characteristics of the study programme.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

• If the required or recommended level of proficiency in different languages enables students to effectively pursue the qualification and acquire the competencies.

• If the HEI offers support activities to improve language skills and whether they are adequate.

• If the linguistic approach impedes interaction between students and teachers (whether the HEI establishes mechanisms such as language-specific groups or has multilingual classrooms).

• If the students and teaching staff are satisfied with the linguistic approach and support activities.

• If the HEI monitors whether the linguistic approach works well.

Evidence

• Mechanism to evaluate the level of satisfaction of students and teaching staff regarding the linguistic approach in the evaluated period.

• Mechanism to evaluate the level of satisfaction of students regarding support activities intended to improve the acquisition of the different languages in the evaluated period.

• Evidence of acquisition of expected language levels by the students of the official degree.

• Any document that explains the operation, evaluation and monitoring of the linguistic approach.

Indicators

- Number of languages in which the study programme is taught.
- Performance rate of the language courses in the evaluated period.
- Percentage of students registered for the support classes to improve language skills in the evaluated period.
- In cases of degrees that are offered in more than one language:
    o Percentage of ECTS of the study programme that are taught in each language.
    o Percentage of students registered for each language in the evaluated period.
    o Performance rate for each language in the evaluated period.
    o Drop-out rate for each language in the evaluated period.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion II.1.b will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.9.

Table A1.9. Evaluation rubric for Criterion II.1.b

Criterion II.1.b. The **linguistic approach** is consistent with the characteristics of the study programme.	
Not applicable	-
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating the linguistic approach. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The level required or recommended for the students of the different languages does not enable them to follow the degree successfully and acquire the competencies. • It is observed that support activities are needed to improve language skills, but these are not offered or do not enable improvement of the language skills. • The linguistic approach impedes interaction between students and teachers. • The satisfaction of students and teaching staff regarding the linguistic approach and support activities indicates significant problems. • The provided information about the assessment of achievement of the criterion is not coherent with its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following points are fulfilled: • The level required or recommended for the students of the different languages enables them to follow the degree successfully and acquire the competencies. • Support activities to improve language skills are offered when necessary and these activities enable an improvement in the language level. • The linguistic approach enables interaction between students and teachers. • The satisfaction of students and teaching staff regarding the linguistic approach and support activities indicates no significant problems. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met:

	• The level required or recommended for the students of the different languages adds value to the graduate profile. • The support activities to improve language skills enable the acquisition of an excellent level. • The satisfaction of students and teaching staff regarding the linguistic approach and support activities indicates that the linguistic approach adds clear value to the study programme. • The HEI, through assessment of achievement of the criterion and being aware of its challenges and opportunities, proposes actions that enable improvement of the linguistic approach.

Key aspect II.2. Study programme relevance and interest

*Criterion II.2.a. The study programme is still **relevant** and **up to date** within its academic and/or professional field.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

- If the study programme is still academically relevant based on the current knowledge and the main lines of research in its field.
- If the study programme is still in line with the main external references.
- If the study programme continues, aligns with or adds value to the context of Andorra.

Evidence

- Reference bibliography justifying the relevance and updating of the study programme within the academic and professional field.
- External references that justify the relevance and updating of the study programme within the academic and professional field.

Indicators

- Alignment of the HEI's study programme with the current knowledge.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion II.2.a will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.10.

Table A1.10. Evaluation rubric for Criterion II.2.a

Criterion II.2.a. The study programme is still **relevant** and **up to date** within its **academic and/or professional field.**	
Not applicable	-
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating relevance and updates. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The study programme is no longer relevant to the current knowledge and the main lines of research in its field or is not updated.

	• The external references contradict the study programme's approach or the provided external references are not suitable to the academic and professional field. • The study programme approach is not aligned with the context of Andorra. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following points are fulfilled: • The study programme is still academically relevant and is updated considering the current knowledge and the main lines of research in its field. • External references are provided with a major national impact that justifies the official degree. • The programme's approach aligns with the context of Andorra. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The programme is academically relevant and is updated considering the latest tendencies and innovations of the current knowledge and the main lines of research in its field. • External references are provided with a major national and international impact in the official degree's field that justifies it. • The programme's approach aligns with the context of Andorra and adds clear value.

Key aspect II.3. Professional opportunities and impact of the official degree

*Criterion II.3.a. The **mechanisms for promoting graduate employability** are adequate.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

• If the mechanisms for promoting graduate employability (job pool, graduate follow-up, contact with internship centres, etc.) are adequate and promote graduate employment.

Evaluation of this criterion will be especially relevant in advanced professional diplomas and postgraduate specialisations, as well as official degrees with a professionalising approach.

Evidence

• Analysis of employability of the official degree.
• Information regarding the mechanisms to promote employment are working.

Indicators

o Number of employed graduates.
o Average time before employment.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion II.3.a will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.11.

Table A1.11. Evaluation rubric for Criterion II.3.a

Criterion II.3.a. The mechanisms for promoting graduate employability are adequate.	
Not applicable	-
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating the mechanisms for promoting graduate employability. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • No mechanisms for promoting graduate employability are proposed or they do not help graduates access employment opportunities. • The level of employment indicates that employability is low and the mechanisms for promoting it do not work. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following points are fulfilled: • The mechanisms for promoting graduate employability help graduates access employment opportunities. • The level of employment indicates that the mechanisms for promoting employability work correctly. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The mechanisms for promoting graduate employability ensure that graduates access employment opportunities. • The level of employment indicates that the mechanisms favouring employability work correctly and add clear value.

Key aspect II.4. Study programme design, planning and organisation

*Criterion II.4.a. All the **teaching units**, their **workloads** and their **design and assessment** enable **achievement of the competencies and learning outcomes.***

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

• If all the teaching units and their design and assessment are consistent with the competency profile and objectives defined in the approval report or subsequent programme modifications.

• If the distribution of the teaching units facilitates the achievement of the competencies and learning outcomes, avoiding duplication.

• If the educational activities, teaching methodology and assessment system enable achievement of the competencies and learning outcomes.

- If the student workload is suitable and consistent with the European credit definition considering the design of the teaching units (educational activities, content and assessment systems).
- If the assessment criteria and methods are published in advance and allow students to demonstrate their level of achievement and to progress in learning.
- If the final project or dissertation is effectively organised and managed, promoting the use of knowledge acquired throughout the official degree while promoting the acquisition of skills such as reflective thinking, critical thinking and problem-solving.

Evidence

- Teaching programmes of all the teaching units in a selection of courses within the evaluated period.
- Mechanism for assessing student satisfaction with each of the teaching units regarding the teaching-learning model, educational activities, resources and materials assessment methods and workload.
- A selection of teaching units and courses in the evaluated period:
  - Examples of evaluated educational activities.
  - Resources and teaching materials used.
  - Academic qualifications.
  - Examples of evaluated theses.
  - List of academic qualifications and summary of defended theses.

Indicators

- Performance rate of each teaching unit.
- Success rate of each teaching unit.
- Level of satisfaction of the students with each of the teaching units regarding the teaching-learning model, educational activities, resources and materials, assessment methods and workload.
- Performance rate of the theses.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion II.4.a will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.12.

Table A1.12. Evaluation rubric for Criterion II.4.a

Criterion II.4.a. All the **teaching units,** their **workloads** and their **design and assessment** enable **the achievement of the competencies and learning outcomes.**	
Not applicable	-
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating whether all the teaching units, their design and assessment enable the achievement of the competencies and learning outcomes.

	• The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The set of teaching units and their design and assessment are not consistent with the competence profile and the objectives specified in the approval report or subsequent modifications. • The distribution of teaching units impedes learning and/or leads to duplications. • The educational activities, teaching methodology and assessment system do not enable the achievement of the competencies and learning outcomes • The student workload is high and not consistent with the European credit definition. • The assessment criteria and methods are not published in advance or do not allow the students to demonstrate their level of achievement and to progress in learning. • The final thesis is inconsistent with the study programme approach and/or its organisation and management impede execution. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following points are fulfilled: • The set of teaching units and their design and assessment are consistent with the competence profile and the objectives specified in the approval report or in subsequent modifications. Any minor modifications have been made according to the approval, are coherent and add value. • The educational activities, teaching methodology and assessment system enable the achievement of the competencies and learning outcomes. • The student workload is consistent with the European credit definition. • The assessment criteria and methods are published in advance and allow the students to demonstrate their level of achievement and to progress in learning. • The final thesis is consistent with the study programme approach and/or its organisation and management facilitate execution. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The educational activities, teaching methodology and assessment system are especially innovative and enable the achievement of the competencies and learning outcomes. • The allocation of the teaching units facilitates learning and duplications are avoided. • The defended theses are innovative and bring new knowledge to the field of study.

*Criterion II.4.b. The **internships** are consistent with the study programme characteristics, add educational value and are organised and managed so that all students can complete them successfully.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

- If the internships are completed successfully and meet the expectations of the study programme approval.
- If the mechanisms of coordination between the HEI and the placement centres work effectively.

- If the internships enable achievement of the intended competencies.
- If all the students can access the internships and complete them successfully.
- If the HEI monitors whether the internships work well.

Evidence

For a selection of the internships and courses in the evaluated period:

- Examples of reports, projects or assessed productions.
- List and characteristics of the internship centres.
- Teaching programmes.
- Teaching resources and materials used.
- Academic qualifications.
- Mechanisms to assess student satisfaction.
- Mechanisms for monitoring the internships.

Indicators

- Performance rate of the internships.
- Level of satisfaction of the students regarding the management and implementation of the internships.
- Level of satisfaction of the tutors at the internship centres regarding the management and coordination with the HEI.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion II.4.b will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.13.

Table A1.13. Evaluation rubric for Criterion II.4.b

Criterion II.4.b. The **internships** are consistent with the study programme characteristics, add educational value and are organised and managed so that all students can complete them successfully.	
Not applicable	–
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating whether the internships are consistent, add educational value and are organised and managed so that all students can complete them successfully. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The internships are not implemented according to the programme accreditation. • The mechanisms of coordination between the HEI and the placement centres do not work effectively and problems can be seen regarding correct implementation of the internships. • The internships do not enable the achievement of the intended competencies. • Not all students can access the internships and complete them successfully. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.

	All the following circumstances are fulfilled:
Adequate	• The internships are implemented according to the programme accreditation. • The mechanisms of coordination between the HEI and the placement centres work effectively and no problems can be seen regarding the correct implementation of the internships. • The internships enable the achievement of the intended competencies. • All the students can access the internships and complete them successfully. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The internships add value to the study programme. • The mechanisms of coordination between the HEI and the placement centres enable improvements in their implementation. • The internships enable the achievement of other competencies that become added value.

Criterion II.4.c. Mobility *is effectively organised and managed.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

- If mobility is effectively organised and managed and whether it adds value to the programme. Its planning, monitoring, assessment and validation mechanisms will also be evaluated.

Evidence

- Cases of mobility implemented in the evaluated period (specifying course, destination institution and subjects studied).
- Mechanisms for the validation of subjects studied during mobility and a sample of equivalencies.
- Mechanisms to assess student satisfaction regarding mobility.

Indicators

- Percentage of students who have used mobility in relation to the total number of enrolled students in the last period.
- Mobility options offered by the HEI.
- Level of satisfaction of the students regarding the management and implementation of mobility.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion II.4.c will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.14.

Table A1.14. Evaluation rubric for Criterion II.4.c

Criterion II.4.c. Mobility is effectively organised and managed.	
Not applicable	-

Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating whether mobility is organised and managed effectively. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • Mobility is not effectively organised and managed and detracts value from the official degree. • The mobility that occurs is not planned or evaluated. • Validation of subjects resulting from mobility is Inadequate considering the competencies and learning outcomes, and the validation mechanisms and standards. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following circumstances are fulfilled: • Mobility is effectively organised and managed. • The mobility implemented is planned, evaluated and monitored, guaranteeing that it works effectively. • Recognition of the subjects resulting from mobility is adequate considering the competencies and learning outcomes, and the recognition mechanisms and standards. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • Mobility adds clear value to the programme. • The implemented mobility provides continuous improvement.

Criterion II.4.d. Student-centred learning *is promoted.*

Student-centred learning and teaching have an important role with regard to the stimulation, motivation, reflection and participation of students in the learning process. This entails paying special attention to the educational model used.

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

- If it promotes student autonomy in the learning process.
- If flexible learning pathways are respected.
- If critical thinking is promoted in students, helping them construct meaning from new information and prior experience.
- If students are active players in their learning and have opportunities to participate in their own assessment.
- If the educational model is reviewed and updated.

Evidence

- Description of the educational model.
- Any document related to the review, updating and monitoring of the education model's operation.

- Evidence provided in Criterion II.4.a. will be considered.

Indicators

Indicators provided in Criterion II.4.a. will be considered.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion II.4.d will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.15.

Table A1.15. Evaluation rubric for Criterion II.4.d

Criterion II.4.d. Student-centred learning is promoted.	
Not applicable	-
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating student-centred learning. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • Student autonomy is not promoted in the learning process. • Flexible learning journeys are not respected. • Critical thinking is not promoted in students when constructing meaning from new information and prior experience. • The students are not active players in their learning. • The educational model is not reviewed or updated or this is done incoherently. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following circumstances are fulfilled: • Student autonomy is promoted in the learning process. Flexible learning journeys are respected. • Critical thinking is promoted in students when constructing meaning from new information and prior experience • The students are active players in their learning. • The educational model is reviewed and updated coherently. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • Promoting student autonomy in the learning process adds clear value to the study programme. • Students have opportunities to participate in their own assessment. • The educational model is reviewed and updated to foster innovation.

*Criterion II.4.e. In the case of a **doctorate**, the following procedures are considered adequate: assignment of a thesis supervisor and/or tutor and tutoring, the monitoring process of each doctoral student and the quality of the doctoral theses presented.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

- If the number of supervisors and/or tutors is sufficient to manage the students enrolled in the doctoral programme.
- If the level of participation of foreign teaching staff and international doctors in the monitoring committees and thesis examination boards is appropriate for the scientific field of the doctoral programme.
- If the doctoral students develop a rigorous and autonomous research process.
- If the doctoral students acquire the appropriate research competencies in the doctoral programme.
- If the graduates and teaching staff are satisfied with the training provided by the doctoral programme.

Evidence

For a selection of academic years:

- Examples of doctoral students' progress reports.
- List of ongoing and defended theses with their summaries.
- List of published articles deriving from the theses.
- List of conference participations derived from the theses.

Indicators

- Trend in number of published theses.
- Number of students enrolled in the doctoral programme.
- Number of thesis supervisors and tutors.
- Level of satisfaction of the doctoral students regarding the doctoral programme.
- Level of satisfaction of the tutors and supervisors regarding the doctoral programme.
- Average length of the doctoral studies.
- Percentage of students in the doctoral programme who have done research internships.
- Drop-out rate for the doctoral programme.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion II.4.e will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.16.

Table A1.16. Evaluation rubric for Criterion II.4.e

Criterion II.4.e. In the case of a **doctorate**, the following procedures are considered adequate: the tutoring and monitoring process of each doctoral student.	
Not applicable	• In the evaluation of bachelor's and master's degree programmes.
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient to assess the tutoring and monitoring process of each doctoral student. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.

Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The number of teaching staff allocated to managing and/or tutoring the doctoral theses is limited (one thesis supervisor for more than five students) and restricts the students' performance. • There is no participation of foreign teaching staff and/or doctors in monitoring committees and/or thesis examination boards. • The doctoral students cannot develop a rigorous and autonomous research process. • The doctoral students drop out of the programme before finishing due to low motivation. • The doctoral students do not acquire the appropriate research competencies in the doctoral programme • The graduates and teaching staff are not satisfied with the training provided by the doctoral programme • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following circumstances are fulfilled: • The number of teaching staff allocated to managing and/or tutoring the doctoral theses is limited (one thesis supervisor for less than five students) without restricting the students' performance. • There is participation of foreign teaching staff and/or doctors by less than 20% in the monitoring committees and/or thesis examination boards • The doctoral students can develop an autonomous but not rigorous research process. • The doctoral students do not drop out of the programme before finishing due to low motivation. • The doctoral students acquire the appropriate research competencies in the doctoral programme. • The graduates and teaching staff are satisfied (above-average results) with the training provided by the doctoral programme. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The number of teaching staff allocated to managing and/or tutoring the doctoral theses is correct (one supervisor for less than three students) and improves the students' performance. • Participation of foreign teaching staff and/or doctors by more than 30%in the monitoring committees and/or thesis examination boards. • The doctoral students develop a rigorous and autonomous research process. • The doctoral students do not drop out of the programme before finishing due to low motivation. • The doctoral students not only acquire the appropriate research competencies in the doctoral programme but also add value to it. • The graduates and teaching staff are very satisfied (excellent results) with the training provided by the doctoral programme. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.

DIMENSION III. ACADEMIC STAFF

This dimension refers to assuring the competence, sufficiency and training opportunities of staff in charge of developing the study programmes and other activities related to the purposes of the higher education institution. *Table A1.17* presents the key aspects and criteria considered for this dimension.

Table A1.17. Key aspects and criteria of Dimension III. Academic Staff

Key aspect	Criteria
DIMENSION III. ACADEMIC STAFF	
III.1. Training, professional and research experience and sufficiency of the teaching staff	Criterion III.1.a. The training, professional and/or research experience and language skills of the teaching staff guarantee that they are competent to carry out their teaching activities.
	Criterion III.1.b. The teaching staff is familiar with the educational model, engages in continuous training, conducts research and is proficient in the various teaching methodologies.
	Criterion III.1.c. The commitment model and sufficiency of the teaching staff are adequate according to the number of student places to guarantee teaching quality, student support and coordinate and manage the study programme

The main legislative framework of Dimension III. Academic Staff is presented in *Table A1.18*. Furthermore, the dimension relates to the following **ESG**:

- ESG 1.5. Teaching Staff

Table A1.18. Legislative framework of Dimension III. Academic Staff

Law/Regulations	Related articles
Law 14/2018, of 21 June, on Higher Education	- Article 22. Teaching and research staff - Article 23. Rights and obligations of teaching and research staff

Key aspect III.1. Training, professional and research experience and sufficiency of the teaching staff

Criterion III.1.a. The training, professional and/or research experience and language skills of the teaching staff guarantee that they are competent to carry out their teaching activities.

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

- If the teaching staff of the official degree have the training, professional and/or research experience and language skills required for the study programme and have suitable teaching and/or research experience.
- If the HEI monitors the suitability of the teaching staff.
- If, in the case of a doctorate, the teaching staff have the accredited knowledge and experience required to tutor a thesis in the field of the doctoral programme.

In this criterion, the profile of the teaching staff allocated to theses and internships will be especially relevant.

Evidence

- CVs of the teachers employed in the evaluated period or in a selection of years of the evaluated period.
- CVs of the thesis supervisors and/or tutors, in the case of a doctorate.
- Profile of the teaching staff responsible for supervision/assessment of the final thesis.
- Profile of the teaching staff responsible for supervision/assessment of the internships.
- Mechanism to evaluate the level of satisfaction of the students regarding the teaching staff of the official degree.
- Any document on the monitoring of teaching staff suitability.

Indicators

- Percentage of teaching staff for each level of the Andorran Academic Qualifications Framework (MAQ) in the total teaching staff assigned to the official degree in the evaluated period.
- Percentage of ECTS taught per teaching staff at each level of MAQ in the evaluated period.
- Trend in the number of publications by teachers of the official degree.
- Level of satisfaction of the students regarding the teaching staff of the official degree.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion III.1.a will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.19.

Table A1.19. Evaluation rubric for Criterion III.1.a

Criterion III.1.a. The training, professional and/or research experience and language skills of the teaching staff guarantee that they are competent to carry out their teaching activities.	
Not applicable	–
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating whether the training, professional and/or research experience and language skills guarantee that they are competent to carry out their teaching activities. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • Teachers of the official degree are not in possession of a master's or doctorate or do not have the AQUA accreditation, in the case of an APD, bachelor's and master's degrees; or do not hold a doctorate in the case of the doctoral programme.

	• The CVs of the employed teachers do not show that the teaching staff has the knowledge or experience required to teach the teaching units. • The profile of the teaching staff responsible for the supervision/assessment of the final thesis does not show sufficient expertise considering the field of research. • The profile of the teaching staff responsible for supervision/assessment of the internships does not show sufficient experience in the field of the official degree. • The students show discontent regarding the teaching staff of the official degree. • The teaching staff in charge do not have the experience or knowledge required to tutor a thesis in the field of the doctoral programme. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following circumstances are fulfilled: • All the official degree teachers are in possession of a master's or doctorate or the AQUA accreditation, in the case of an APD, bachelor's and master's degrees; or hold a doctorate in the case of the doctoral programme. • The CVs of the employed teachers show that they have the knowledge or experience to teach the subjects. • The profile of the teaching staff responsible for the supervision/assessment of the final thesis shows sufficient expertise considering the field of research. • The profile of the teaching staff responsible for supervision/assessment of the internships shows sufficient experience in the field of the official degree. • The students show no discontent regarding the teaching staff of the official degree. • The teaching staff in charge have the knowledge required to tutor a thesis in the field of the doctoral programme. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • All the official degree teachers are in possession of a master's or doctorate or an AQUA accreditation, the group with doctoral degrees being the one that teaches most ECTS of the official degree. • The CVs of the majority of the employed teachers (more than 50%) show that they have training, professional and research experience that is relevant to the official degree and that they can therefore add value to the teaching units. • The profile of the teaching staff responsible for the supervision/assessment of the final thesis shows international expertise considering the field of research. • The profile of the teaching staff responsible for supervision/assessment of the internships shows broad experience in the field of the official degree. • The students show satisfaction with the teaching staff of the official degree. • The teaching staff in charge have the knowledge and experience required to tutor a thesis in the field of the doctoral programme. The CVs of the teaching staff accredit them internationally to carry out research. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.

*Criterion III.1.b. The **teaching staff is familiar with the educational model of the teaching, engages in continuous training, conducts research and is competent in the various teaching methodologies.***

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

• If the institution offers support and opportunities to improve the quality of teaching and research activities of the teaching staff.

- If the teaching staff updates their knowledge to respond adequately to the teaching-learning processes within the scope of the official degree.
- If the teaching staff has knowledge and experience in the HEI's educational model, in presential and non-presential teaching models.
- If the HEI monitors the mechanisms to ensure that the teaching staff is familiar with the educational model.

Evidence

- Training plan or other suitable document to evaluate the improvement in quality of the teaching and research activities of the teaching staff.
- Mechanism to evaluate the level of satisfaction of the students regarding the teaching staff.
- Any document about monitoring the teaching staff's knowledge of the educational model.

Indicators

- Percentage of teachers of the total teaching staff who have completed a training course in the last period.
- H-index of the teaching staff of the official degree in the last period.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion III.1.b will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.20.

Table A1.20. Evaluation rubric for Criterion III.1.b

Criterion III.1.b. The *teaching staff is familiar with the educational model, engages in continuous training, conducts research and is competent in the various teaching methodologies.*	
Not applicable	-
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating whether the teaching staff is familiar with the educational model, engages in continuous training, conducts research and is competent in the various teaching methodologies. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The institution does not offer support or opportunities to improve the quality of the teaching and research activities of the teaching staff. • The teaching staff does not update their knowledge to respond adequately to the teaching-learning processes within the scope of the official degree. • The teaching staff demonstrates a lack of knowledge and experience of the HEI's educational model. • The HEI does not monitor the mechanisms to ensure that the teaching staff is familiar with the educational model. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.

Adequate	All the following circumstances are fulfilled: • The institution offers support and opportunities to improve the quality of the teaching and research activities of the teaching staff • The teaching staff update their knowledge to respond adequately to the teaching-learning processes within the scope of the official degree. • The teaching staff has knowledge and experience of the HEI's educational model. • The HEI monitors (at least once per academic year) the mechanisms to ensure that the teaching staff is familiar with the educational model. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The institution offers support and opportunities to improve the quality of the teaching and research activities of the teaching staff. Furthermore, the HEI encourages the teaching staff to enhance quality. • The teaching staff update their knowledge to actively respond to the teaching-learning processes within the scope of the official degree programme, both nationally and internationally. This update adds value to the study programme. • The teaching staff has knowledge and experience of the HEI's educational model. The knowledge and experience are applied to the teaching practices. • The HEI carries out intensive monitoring (at least once per semester) of the mechanisms to ensure that the teaching staff is familiar with the educational model.

*Criterion III.1.c. The **commitment model** and **sufficiency of the teaching staff** are adequate according to the number of student places to guarantee teaching, student support and coordination and management of the study programme.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

• If the teaching staff is sufficient and their commitment is adequate to carry out their duties and support students.

Evidence

• Implementation of the study programme: assignment of teaching staff and field of knowledge.

• List of teaching staff per teaching units and time commitments.

Indicators

• Trend in total number of teachers assigned to the official degree.

• Trend in the student-teacher ratio.

• Percentage of collaborating teaching staff in the total teaching staff assigned to the degree in the last period.

• Percentage of ECTS taught by collaborating teaching staff in the last period.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion III.1.c will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.21.

Table A1.21. Evaluation rubric for Criterion III.1.c

Criterion III.1.c. *The* **commitment model** *and* **sufficiency of the teaching staff** *are adequate according to the number of student places to guarantee teaching, student support and coordination and management of the study programme.*	
Not applicable	–
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating whether the commitment model and sufficiency of the teaching staff are appropriate to the number of student places to guarantee teaching, student support and coordination and management of the study programme. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The teaching staff is insufficient and does not have enough time for teaching (defined by the taught ECTS) or to carry out their management and research duties. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following circumstances are fulfilled: • The teaching staff is sufficient and has enough time for teaching (defined by the taught ECTS) and to carry out their management duties, but not for research. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The teaching staff is sufficient and has enough time for teaching (defined by the taught ECTS) and to carry out their management and research duties.

DIMENSION IV. RESOURCES AND SUPPORT PROCESSES

This dimension refers to the material resources and services (such as libraries, classrooms, laboratories, guidance services, etc.) and technological resources (such as virtual platforms, etc.) needed to guarantee the academic activities of the HEI, as well as all the processes and decisions related to the student life cycle, such as admission, progress, recognition and certification. *Table A1.22* presents the key aspects and criteria considered for this dimension.

Table A1.22. Key aspects and criteria of Dimension IV. Resources and Support Processes

Key aspect	Criteria
DIMENSION IV. RESOURCES AND SUPPORT PROCESSES	
IV.1. Student access and admission	Criterion IV.1.a. The admission profile, access routes and requirements, number of places, complementary studies and admission tests, if applicable, are consistent with the theme and characteristics of the official degree.
	Criterion IV.1.b. The validations and recognitions are adequate.
IV.2. Learning support resources	Criterion IV.2.a. The material resources and services allocated to the programme are appropriate according to the teaching model, the number of registered students and the competencies to be achieved.

The main legislative framework of Dimension IV. Resources and Support Processes are presented in Table A1.23. Furthermore, the dimension relates to the following **ESG**:

- ESG 1.4. Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification
- ESG 1.6. Learning Resources and Student Support

Table A1.23. Legislative framework of Dimension IV. Resources and Support Processes

Law/Regulations	Related articles
Law 14/2018, of 21 June, on Higher Education	- Article 6. Access - Article 10. Official recognition of academic qualifications and validation of study periods - Article 21. Students' rights and obligations - Article 25. Rights of the administrative and technical staff
Statutory Regulation for Official Higher Education Degrees	- Article 3. Definitions - Article 7. Validation of study periods - Article 8. Recognition of European credits (ECTS) - Article 9. Short cycle: Advanced Professional Diploma (APD) - Article 10. First cycle: Bachelor's degrees and specialized Bachelor's degrees. - Article 11. Second cycle: Master's degrees - Article 12. Third cycle: Doctorate

Key aspect IV.1. Student access and admission

*Criterion IV.1.a. The **entry profile, access routes and requirements, number of places, complementary studies and admission tests**, if applicable, are consistent with the theme and characteristics of the official degree.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

- If the relation between supply and demand and its trend are adequate.
- If the content of the admission test evaluation criteria is consistent with the programme's scope and allows for a clear and fair selection of admitted students.
- If the complementary studies are suitable and efficient.

Evidence

- Examples of student admission tests, if applicable.
- Examples of complementary studies, contents and educational activities carried out by students, if applicable.

Indicators

- Percentage of enrolments out of the total number of preregistrations requested in the last period.
- Percentage of full-time enrolments in the last period.
- Percentage of part-time enrolments in the last period.
- Percentage of different access routes of the total number of enrolments in the last period.
- Percentage of suitable and unsuitable students out of the total number of students who took admission tests in the last period.
- Percentage of students who enrolled in complementary studies out of the total number of enrolments in the last period. The trend in enrolments in the last period.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion VI.1.a will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.24.

Table A1.24. Evaluation rubric for Criterion VI.1.a

Criterion IV.1.a. The **entry profile, access routes and requirements, number of places, complementary studies and admission tests**, if applicable, are consistent with the theme and characteristics of the official degree.	
Not applicable	—
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating the entry profile, access routes and requirements, number of places, complementary studies and admission tests.

	• The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The relation between supply and demand and its trend in the evaluated period presents some anomalies based on the supply and demand for the official degree in similar national and international HEIs. • The contents of the evaluation criteria of the admissions tests are not consistent with the official degree's field. • The complementary studies do not enable the students to resolve their shortcomings and follow the studies easily and efficiently. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following circumstances are fulfilled: • The relation between supply and demand and its trend in the evaluated period is suitable on the basis of supply and demand for the official degree in national and international HEIs. • The contents of the evaluation criteria of the admissions tests are consistent with the official degree's field. • The complementary studies meet the deficiencies of new students but no improvements in student performance are observed. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The relation between supply and demand and its trend in the evaluated period is suitable on the basis of supply and demand for the official degree in national and international HEIs. • The contents of the evaluation criteria of the admissions tests are innovative and consistent with the official degree's field. • The complementary studies meet the deficiencies of new registrations efficiently and add value to the study programme.

Criterion IV.1.b. *The **validations and recognitions** are adequate.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

• If the validation and recognition process follow the indications of the Decree of 8 July 2020, approving Official Higher Education Degrees.

• If the HEI monitors the validation and recognition process.

Evidence

• Examples of academic records of students who have had credits validated or recognised.

• Tables of equivalences of teaching units eligible for validation between degrees within the same HEI or a HEI with an agreement. Any document about monitoring the validation and recognition process.

Indicators

• Recognised credits.

• Validated credits.

- Graduates who have recognised credits.
- Graduates who have validated credits.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion VI.1.b will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.25.

Table A1.25. Evaluation rubric for Criterion VI.1.b

Criterion IV.1.b. The **validations and recognitions** are adequate.	
Not applicable	—
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating the validations and recognitions. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The validation and recognition process does not follow the indications of the Decree of 8 July 2020, approving Official Higher Education Degrees. • The HEI does not monitor the validation and recognition process. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following circumstances are fulfilled: • The validation and recognition process follows the indications of the Decree of 8 July 2020, approving Official Higher Education Degrees. • The HEI correctly monitors the validation and recognition process. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The HEI monitors the validation and recognition process.

Key aspect IV.2. Learning support resources

*Criterion IV.2.a. The **material resources** and services allocated to the study programme are **adequate** for the teaching model, the number of registered students and the competencies to be achieved.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

- If the material resources (classrooms and their equipment, work and study areas, laboratories, libraries, etc.) are adequate for the number of students and the planned academic activities of the study programme.
- If, in the case of non-presential and blended teaching models:
  - The technological infrastructures and teaching materials allow for the development of educational activities and achievement of the competencies of the study programme.

o The structure and potential of the virtual campus and the tools used for the teaching/learning process are adequate.

o The design of the material for the teaching/learning process adapts to the teaching model.

Evidence

- Access to the virtual campus and platforms used by students.
- Visit to the HEI's facilities.

Indicators

- Level of student satisfaction regarding the HEI's resources and services.
- Level of satisfaction of the teaching staff regarding the HEI's resources and services.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion VI.2.a will be evaluated according to the rubric of Table A1.26.

Table A1.26. Evaluation rubric for Criterion VI.2.a

Criterion IV.2.a. The **material resources** and services allocated to the study programme are **adequate** for the teaching model, the number of registered students and the competencies to be achieved.	
Not applicable	—
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating the material resources and services allocated to the programme. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The material resources (classrooms and their equipment, work and study areas, laboratories, libraries, etc.) are not adequate for the number of students and the planned academic activities of the programme. • The technological infrastructures and teaching materials do not allow for the development of educational activities and achievement of the competencies in the programme. • The structure and potential of the virtual campus and the tools used do not enable the teaching/learning process. • The design of the material for the teaching/learning process does not adapt to the teaching model. • The students and teaching staff at the HEI present a level of satisfaction that is lower than the average of the survey results. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following circumstances are fulfilled: • The material resources (classrooms and their equipment, work and study areas, laboratories, libraries, etc.) are adequate for the number of students and the planned academic activities of the programme. • The technological infrastructures and teaching materials allow for the development of educational activities and achievement of the competencies in the programme.

	• The structure and potential of the virtual campus and the tools used enable the teaching/learning process.
	• The design of the material for the teaching/learning process adapts to the teaching model.
	• The students and teaching staff at the HEI present a level of satisfaction that is higher than the average.
	• The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very Adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The structure and potential of the virtual campus and the tools used enable the teaching/learning process. • The design of the material for the teaching/learning process adapts to the teaching model and is innovative. • The students and teaching staff at the HEI present an excellent level of satisfaction.

DIMENSION V. PUBLIC INFORMATION

This dimension refers to public information, that is, the information that higher education institutions make public to offer their services to society and be accountable for their quality. Table A1.27 presents the key aspects and criteria considered for this dimension.

Table A1.27. Key aspects and criteria of Dimension V. Public Information

Key aspect	Criteria
DIMENSION V. PUBLIC INFORMATION	
V. 1. Public information	Criterion V.1.a. The HEI suitably informs all stakeholders about the characteristics of the study programme.

The main legislative framework of Dimension V. Public Information is presented in Table A1.28. Furthermore, the dimension relates to the following **ESG**:

- ESG 1.8. Public Information.

Table A1.28. Legislative Framework of Dimension V. Public Information

Law/Regulations	Related articles
Law 14/2018, of 21 June, on Higher Education	• Article 9. Study Programmes • Article 14. Operation
Statutory Regulation for Official Higher Education Degrees	• Article 6. Teaching Programmes • Article 18. Third cycle: Doctorate • Article 22. Quality and Continuous Improvement

Key aspect V.1. Public Information

*Criterion V.1.a. The HEI **suitably informs all stakeholders** about the characteristics of the study plan.*

Evaluation of this criterion will consider:

- If the HEI publishes true, comprehensive, up-to-date and accessible information about the characteristics of the official degree and its operational development.
- If the HEI publishes information about the academic results and satisfaction.
- If the HEI publishes the monitoring and internal quality processes of the official degree and the results of the monitoring and accreditation of the official degree.

Evidence
- Website of the HEI and the official degree.
- Documentation related to the monitoring and internal quality management of the study programme.

Indicators

- Progress of updates carried out.

Evaluation rubric

Criterion V.1.a will be evaluated according to the rubric of *Table A1.29*.

Table A1.29 Evaluation rubric for Criterion V.1.a

***Criterion V.1.a.** The HEI **suitably informs all stakeholders** about the characteristics of the study programme.*	
Not applicable	—
Insufficient information	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The provided information is insufficient for evaluating how stakeholders are informed about the characteristics of the study programme. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of the achievement of the criterion or of its challenges and opportunities.
Inadequate	At least one of the following points is fulfilled: • The HEI does not publish true, comprehensive, up-to-date and accessible information about the characteristics of the official degree and its operational development • The HEI does not publish information about the academic results and satisfaction. • The HEI does not publish the monitoring and internal quality processes framing the official degree and the results of monitoring and accreditation of the official degree. • The HEI does not provide an assessment of achievement of the criterion or the provided information is not coherent in relation to its challenges and opportunities.
Adequate	All the following circumstances are fulfilled: • The HEI publishes true, comprehensive, up-to-date and accessible information about the characteristics of the official degree and its operational development. • The HEI publishes true, comprehensive, up-to-date and accessible information about academic results and satisfaction. • The HEI publishes true, comprehensive, up-to-date and accessible information about the monitoring and internal quality processes framing the official degree and the results of monitoring and accreditation of the official degree. • The HEI assesses achievement of the criterion and is aware of its challenges and opportunities.
Very Adequate	In addition to the points covered at the 'adequate' level, at least one of the following points is also met: • The HEI publishes true, comprehensive, up-to-date and accessible information about academic results and satisfaction and supplements it with a reflection on challenges and/or areas for improvement. • The HEI publishes true, comprehensive, up-to-date and accessible information about the monitoring and internal quality processes framing the official degree and the results of monitoring and accreditation of the official degree and supplements it with a reflection on challenges and/or areas for improvement.

ANNEX 2: GLOSSARY

Definition of evaluation indicators (from A to Z)

Average duration of doctoral studies: Average time between the start and end of the doctoral programme.

Average h-index of the degree's teaching staff in the last period: Average h-index of the degree's teaching staff in the last period.

Average time before employment: Sum of times between finalising studies and gaining employment for each graduate divided by the total number of graduates.

Drop-out rate from the study programme: Number of students in the cohort considered to have permanently left their studies up to the last academic year in relation to the number of enrolled students.

Drop-out rate of the doctoral programme: Drop-out rate associated to the number of students who have left the doctoral programme.

Drop-out rate for each language during the evaluated period: Drop-out rate associated to the languages in which the study programme is taught.

Drop-out rate for each teaching mode since the introduction of the study programme: Drop-out rate associated to the teaching model.

Graduate efficiency rate: Indicates the level of success of graduates in completing their studies after fulfilling only the required credits outlined in the study programme. It is the result of dividing the credits required in the study programme by the credits registered per student, then multiplying the result by 100 (to obtain a form of percentage) and averaging across all graduates in the evaluated academic year.

Graduates with recognised credits: Number of graduates who have had credits recognised in the last period.

Graduates with validated credits: Number of graduates who have had credits validated in the last period.

Graduation rate of the study programme: In relation to new students and assuming a uniform inflow over the years of validity of the study, the graduation rate would be the result of dividing the number of graduates in the reference year 18 by the number of

students that enrolled as many years earlier as theoretical duration of this study programme. For the calculation of this indicator, students graduating in a specific academic year are considered to be the students in the cohort who finish on time t and those who finish one year later (t+1). The formula for calculating the graduation rate is:

$$G = \frac{A_t + A_{t+1}}{A_o},$$

where *G* is the graduation rate, A_t the students who finish in the expected time, A_{t+1} the students who graduate in the expected time plus one year, and A_0 the students who initially enrolled in the official degree.

Impact of publications deriving from the theses (in the case of a doctorate): Average number of citations from publications stemming from a single thesis, considering each quartile.

Implemented improvement actions (internal monitoring) of the study programme from validity or last modification: Improvement actions implemented by the HEI since the introduction or last programme modification in terms of quantity and quality.

Improvement actions and their implementation: Improvement actions implemented by the HEI in terms of quantity and quality.

Internal assessments (internal monitoring) of the study programme since its introduction or last modification: Number of internal assessments (internal monitoring) of the study programme carried out since its introduction or last modification.

Level of student satisfaction regarding the teaching model in the last period: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of the HEI's students regarding the teaching model.

Level of teacher satisfaction regarding the teaching model in the evaluated period: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of the teachers of the HEI regarding the teaching model.

Level of teacher satisfaction regarding the HEI's resources and services: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of the teachers of the official degree regarding the HEI's resources and services.

Level of satisfaction of the doctoral students regarding the doctoral programme: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of doctoral students regarding the doctoral programme.

Level of student satisfaction with each of the teaching units regarding the teaching-learning model, educational activities, resources and materials, and assessment methods and workload: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of the HEI's students regarding the teaching-learning model, educational activities, resources and materials and assessment methods and workload.

Level of student satisfaction regarding the model in the evaluated period: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of the students regarding the teaching model.

Level of student satisfaction regarding internship management and implementation: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of the HEI's students regarding internship management and implementation.

Level of student satisfaction regarding mobility management and implementation: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of the HEI's students regarding mobility management and implementation.

Level of student satisfaction regarding the teaching staff of the official degree: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of the students regarding the teaching staff.

Level of student satisfaction regarding the HEI's resources and services: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of the students of the official degree regarding the HEI's resources and services.

Level of satisfaction of the tutors at placement centres regarding management and coordination with the HEI: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of the tutors at internship centres regarding internship management and implementation.

Level of satisfaction of the tutors and supervisors regarding the doctoral programme: Weighting of results obtained in internal surveys of the thesis tutors and/or supervisors regarding the doctoral programme.

Mobility options offered by the HEI: Mobility options offered by the HEI in terms of quantity and quality.

Modifications requested since the introduction of the study programme: Number of modifications requested since the introduction of the study programme.

Number of students registered on the doctoral programme: Number of students registered in the doctoral programme during the evaluated period.

Number of doctoral thesis supervisors and tutors: Number of thesis tutors and/or supervisors who have supervised doctoral theses in the evaluated period.

Number of languages in which the study programme is taught: Number of languages used to teach an official degree.

Number of teaching models: The subjects of the study programme are classified according to the level of presential teaching. In a presential subject, the teacher delivers more than 70% of the teaching with the students present. In blended subjects, the teachers deliver presential and non-presential sessions, so that presential teaching represents between 25% and 70% of the total. Non-presential subjects are those in which the students are present for less than 25% of the teaching time.

Number of publications derived from theses (in the case of a doctorate): Average number of publications derived from a single thesis considering each quartile.

Number of graduates in employment: Number of graduates who are currently employed.

Percentage of the study programme ECTS that are taught in each language: Ratio between the ECTS of the study programme which are taught in a particular language and the total number of ECTS of the study programme (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of ECTS taught by collaborating teaching staff in the last period: Ratio between the ECTS taught by collaborating teachers and the total number of ECTS of the study programme (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of ECTS taught by teaching staff at each MAQ level in the evaluated period: Ratio between the ECTS taught by the teachers at each MAQ level and the total

number of ECTS of the study programme (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of students in the doctoral programme who have carried out research internships: Ratio between the students registered in the doctoral programme who have carried out research internships and the total number of students enrolled in the official degree (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of students registered for support classes to improve language skills in the evaluated period: Ratio between the students enrolled in support classes to improve language skills and the total number of students enrolled in the official degree (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of students enrolled in each language in the evaluated period: Ratio between the students enrolled in a specific language and the total number of students enrolled in the official degree (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of the total number of students enrolled in the last period who have registered for complementary studies: Ratio between the students enrolled in complementary studies and the total number of students enrolled in the official degree (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of the total number of students registered in the last period who have made use of mobility: Ratio between the students who have used mobility and the total number of students enrolled in the official degree (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of different access routes out of the total number of enrolments in the last period: Ratio between a specific access route to the official degree (university entrance exams, vocational training, etc.) and the total number of enrolments in the official degree (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of full-time enrolments in the last period: Ratio between full-time enrolments and the total number of enrolments in the official degree (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of part-time enrolments in the last period: Ratio between part-time enrolments and the total number of enrolments in the official degree (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of enrolments of the total requested preregistrations in the last period: Ratio between enrolments in the official degree and the total requested preregistrations (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of enrolments by gender in the last period: Ratio between enrolments by a specific gender and the total number of registrations in the official degree (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of collaborating teaching staff out of the total teaching staff assigned to the official degree in the last period: Ratio between collaborating teachers and the total number of teachers assigned to the official degree (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Percentage of teaching staff at each MAQ level out of the total teaching staff assigned to the official degree in the evaluated period: Number of teachers with a certain MAQ level among the total number of teachers in the study programme.

Percentage of the total teaching staff that has completed a continuous training course in the last period: Ratio between teachers who have studied and followed a continuous training course successfully and the total number of teachers assigned to the official degree (the result is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage).

Performance rate of each teaching unit: Performance rate referring to each of the teaching units.

Performance rate of the language courses in the evaluated period: Performance rate referring to the language subjects.

Performance rate of the internships: Performance rate referring to the internships.

Performance rate of the study programme: Number of credits approved in a subject or set of subjects in relation to the credits achievable by the enrolled students. Calculated for the first year, first cycle, second cycle and the entire official degree, broken down into first and second exam sessions. The formula for calculating the weighted average of the performance rate is as follows:

$$\%R = 100 \cdot \frac{\sum_1^n (cs_n \cdot a_n)}{\sum_1^n (c_n \cdot am_n)},$$

where R is the performance rate per specific exam and subject, cs_n are the credits achieved per student, a_n the number of students who passed, c_n the number of credits for the subject and am_n the students enrolled for this subject.

The performance rates for the first and second exam sessions for core, obligatory and optional subjects are provided separately. Credits that are validated, recognized, adapted, and/or equated are not considered in any case.

Performance rate of the final thesis: Performance rate referring to the final thesis.

Performance rate of each language in the evaluated period: Performance rate referring to the languages taught in the study programme.

Performance rate of each teaching model since the introduction of the official degree: Performance rate referring to the teaching model.

Recognised credits: Number of recognised credits in the last period.

Similarity between the HEI's study programme and the current knowledge in the field: Similarities between the study programme and the current knowledge in the field of the study programme.

Success rate of each teaching unit: Success rate referring to each of the teaching units.

Success rate of the study programme: Number of credits passed by the students in a subject or set of subjects in relation to the credits achievable by the students who sat the exam. Calculated for the first year, first cycle, second cycle and whole official degree, broken down into first and second exam sessions. The formula for calculating the weighted average of the success rate is as follows:

$$\%E = 100 \cdot \frac{\sum_1^n (CS_n \cdot a_n)}{\sum_1^n (c_n \cdot a_{pn})},$$

where E is the success rate per specific exam and subject, cs_n are the credits achieved per student, a_n the number of students who passed, c_n the number of credits for the subject and ap_n the students who sat the subject exam.

Time dedicated by the student to achieving an official degree: Average time that a student takes to graduate in the evaluated official degree. Given in years with one decimal.

Trend in the student-teacher ratio: Calculation of the increase or reduction in the student-teacher ratio (number of registered students per number of teachers assigned to the official degree) within a certain period with reference to the year prior to the first evaluated year.

Trend in updates carried out: Calculation of the increase or reduction in the number of updates carried out within a certain period with reference to the year prior to the first evaluated year.

Trend in enrolments in the last period: Calculation of the increase or reduction in the number of enrolments for the official degree within a certain period with reference to the year prior to the first evaluated year.

Trend in the number of publications by teachers of the official degree: Calculation of the increase or reduction in the number of articles published by the teachers within a certain period with reference to the year prior to the first evaluated year.

Trend in the number of published theses: Calculation of the increase or reduction in the number of publications deriving from a thesis within a certain period with reference to the year prior to the first evaluated year.

Trend in the total number of teachers assigned to the official degree: Calculation of the increase or reduction in the total number of teachers assigned to the official degree within a certain period with reference to the year prior to the first evaluated year.

Validated credits: Number of validated credits in the last period.