


Complementary Payments Evaluation Commission (CECRA)

Questions

- 1 Information received from AQUIB's staff
- 2 Doubt resolution regarding the evaluation process
- 3 Coordination between the Commission and AQUIB
- 4 Presentation of the documentation provided by the AQUIB during the evaluation
- 5 Usefulness of the evaluation guide
- 6 Implication of the other members of the Commission
- 7 Overall satisfaction with AQUIB



Remarks

Satisfaction regarding AQUIB's staff coordination and implication has been always 100 %, showing how good external experts appreciate AQUIB's staff work. On the other hand, the utility of the evaluation guide has relative low scores (always >70 % and mean of 85 % for the whole period). The Agency will try to adapt and enhance the document to make it more useful, although it is elaborated by the General Direction of University Policy and Research and AQUIB can only share its suggestions.

Comments

Experts are encouraged to share any comments or suggestions in the satisfaction surveys. Typically, comments are commendations about AQUIB's staff, procedures or work. The team-working environment is consistently seen as one of AQUIB's strengths.

A few examples of other feedback have been selected:

Feedback	AQUIB's response	Year
The guide should be updated with the feedback given by the Commission members during this year's meetings.	AQUIB will share this Commission's feedback with the body responsible of the elaboration of this evaluation guide.	2022
The evaluation guide should be revised. Some merits should have a maximum value, such as congress participations. Furthermore, it should be clarified that only research publications are counted.	AQUIB presented to the General Direction of University Policy and Research the proposal of this Commission with suggestions and comments to enhance the evaluation guide established in Decree 7/2017. We will keep insisting in the need of the modification of the evaluation guide.	2020
It appears that online work previous to the meetings has not been taken into account in the final retribution.	The retributions are fixed by the Board of Directors. The technical director consulted the retributions paid by other Spanish quality agencies and presented a proposal to the Board of Directors.	2020
The revision of the documentation related to application should be able to be done online. The planification of the meetings is not easy due to the different agendas of the members of the Commission. This way, the process would be more agile	In this call, the University presented some applications in digital format and others in physical format, for the first time ever. Once all applications are presented digitally, the possibility of on-line evaluations will be studied.	2018