

External evaluation guide for ex post accreditation of official university study programmes

AQUIB | Balearic Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education

C. Isaac Newton, Naorte building, 3-4-5

07121 Palma, Illes Balears

Tel.: 971 72 05 24

Published by: Agència de Qualitat Universitària de les Illes Balears.

Guide adopted by the Criteria Commission at its meeting of September 14, 2023.

Index

1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. THE EXPERT PANEL: SITE VISIT AND EVIDENCE OF SITE VISIT	6
2.1. CONSTITUTION OF THE PANEL OF EXPERTS	6
2.2. PLANNING TO CONDUCT THE SITE VISIT	6
2.3. BEFORE THE SITE VISIT	9
2.3.1. <i>Receipt and individual examination of the accreditation dossier</i>	9
2.3.2. <i>Drawing up the agenda for the site visit</i>	10
2.3.3. <i>Selection of reference subjects (bachelor/master)</i>	14
2.3.4. <i>Selection of the files of persons in doctoral programmes</i>	15
2.3.5. <i>Selection of possible additional evidence</i>	16
2.3.6. <i>Sharing meeting of individual assessments</i>	16
2.3.7. <i>Organisation of the visit</i>	16
2.4. SITE VISIT	17
2.4.1. <i>Preparation of the EV</i>	18
3. COMMISSION OF STUDY PROGRAMMES EVALUATION (CET): THE EVALUATION FOR EXPOST ACCREDITATION.....	20
3.1. PREPARATION OF THE PROVISIONAL EXPOST ACCREDITATION REPORT	20
3.2. ANALYSIS OF ALLEGATIONS AND/OR IMPROVEMENT PLAN AND PREPARATION OF THE FINAL EXPOST ACCREDITATION REPORT	21
ANNEX I. MAIN CHANGES COMPARED TO PREVIOUS VERSIONS	23

Table of acronyms and abbreviations

Acronyms and abbreviations used in this text are alphabetically listed in this table. Note that all of them come from its Spanish translation.

ANECA	National Agency for Quality Evaluation and Accreditation
AQUIB	Balearic Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
CET	Commission of Study Programmes Evaluation
CURSA	University Commission for the Regulation of Follow-up and Accreditation
EEES	European Higher Education Area
EV	Evidence of site visit
IA	Self-assessment report
IDS	Final follow-up report
IFA	Final expost accreditation report
IPA	Provisional expost accreditation report
IPS	Provisional follow-up report
MV	Verified report
REACU	Spanish Network of University Quality Agencies

1. INTRODUCTION

The Balearic Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (AQUIB), as an external quality assurance agency for higher education in the Balearic Islands, carries out the evaluation for the renewal of the accreditation of official university education in the Balearic Islands university system.

Within the framework of the evaluation for ex post accreditation, this guide aims to assist the members of the Panels of experts and the Commission of Study Programmes Evaluation (CET), which is divided into two sub-commissions and is the body ultimately responsible for the quality evaluation of these courses.

The main objective of the ex post accreditation process is to verify compliance with the commitments made in the last verified report (MV), as well as to evaluate the results of the study programme, guaranteeing its quality. This entails recommending or not recommending the continuity of the study programme until the next ex post accreditation. This process is organised in several evaluation stages:

- **Self-assessment.** The university describes and assesses the status of the study programme according to the established criteria and guidelines. The result is the self-assessment report (IA).
- **External site visit.** AQUIB appoints the Panel of Experts, made up of external assessors. This panel analyses the IA and visits the centre(s) where the study programme is taught in order to contrast the information gathered and issue a reasoned assessment following the elements contemplated in the assessment model (criteria, guidelines, evidence, indicators, etc.). The result of this stage is the Evidence of the site visit (EV).
- **Evaluation by the CET.** The CET of AQUIB assesses the IA, the EV and the rest of the information available. It then issues a Provisional ex post Accreditation Report (IPA) with an assessment in terms of "favourable" or "with aspects that must necessarily be amended in order to obtain a favourable report". The university may present allegations and/or an improvement plan within 20 working days and,

after this period, the CET issues a final ex post accreditation report (IFA) in terms of favourable or unfavourable to the ex post accreditation.

The general procedure for the assessment for ex post accreditation is detailed in the *Framework Document* available on AQUIB'S website¹.

2. EXPERT PANEL: SITE VISIT AND EVIDENCE OF SITE VISIT

The purpose of the visit to the centre(s) attached to the study programme to be assessed is to ascertain, from a perspective external to the university, how the study programme is positioned with regard to the assessment model for the renewal of accreditation. This is determined through the documentary analysis of the study programme's Dossier and the opinions gathered during the site visit, which enables the judgements that, as experts, the results achieved by the study programme merit.

2.1. Constitution of the Panel of Experts

The Panel is constituted in accordance with the *Regulations for the appointment and internal functioning of the Commission of Study Programmes Evaluation (CET) and the Panel of Experts of the Balearic Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (AQUIB)*.

2.2. Planning for the site visit

The table below provides general information on the three work phases - before, during and after the site visit - that the Panel of Experts should follow, the tools at their disposal and the result obtained at the end of each phase. The following pages also explain in detail the information and concepts presented in the table.

¹ Aquib. (2023). Documentation. [Framework Document](#).

Phase	Stages	Information on which the analysis is based	Tools	Result	Time
Before the site visit	Receipt of the Accreditation Dossier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Last report verified. - Verification/ amendment report (ANECA). - Annual internal follow-up reports. - External follow-up reports. 	IT platform to support evaluation staff.	Checking the documentation of the study programme dossier.	8 weeks before the site visit
	Individual study of the Accreditation Dossier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ex post accreditation reports (if applicable). - IA and evidence. 		Analysis, assessment and individual observations of the different guidelines of the evaluation model.	8-4 weeks before the site
	Drawing up the agenda for the site visit Selection of reference subjects / doctoral students' dossiers Selection of possible additional evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual study of the study programme dossier. 	IT platform to support evaluation staff. External evaluation guide.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed agenda for the site visit. - Selection of reference subjects (Bachelor's and Master's degrees) and study of their teaching guides. - Selection of doctoral students' dossiers (in PhD programmes). - Possible additional evidence to be requested and its analysis. 	7-2 weeks before the site visit
	Pre-meeting for sharing individual assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IA. - Individual assessments of compliance with the model's guidelines. 	IT platform to support evaluation staff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Joint assessments document. - Selection of questions to each group. - Distribution of tasks during the visit. 	3-2 weeks before the site visit

Phase	Stages	Information on which the analysis is based	Tools	Result	Time planning
Site Visit	The course of the visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Interviews with groups. – Possible documentary review of evidence. – Review of the contributions to the IA's public exposure mailbox. – Visit to facilities. 	Means made available to the Panel by AQUIB and the university.	Drawing conclusions to guide the drafting of the site visit evidence (EV).	1-3 days (estimated duration)
After the visit	Preparation of the Site Visit Evidence (EV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Information collected before and during the site visit. – IA. 	IT platform to support evaluation staff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EV. – Site visit completion certificate. 	0-2 weeks after the visit

2.3. Prior to the site visit

2.3.1. Receipt and individual study of the accreditation dossier

AQUIB provides access to the Panel of Experts to all the information on the study programme necessary to carry out the site visit. Each member carries out an **individual study**, in accordance with each of the guidelines of the assessment model for the ex post accreditation. Each assessor must collect on the IT support platform the following information:

- **Assessment of each guideline of the evaluation model.** The evaluator has a semi-quantitative rating scale for the model guidelines, which consists of the following levels:

Compliance achieved, differentiated where appropriate into:

- Excellently achieved (A) when no deficiencies have been detected, the curriculum development excels in its field and relevant good practices are identified.
- Achieved (B) when the development of the curriculum is in accordance with the plan, without any deficiencies being detected in the development of the curriculum.
- Partially achieved (C) when deficiencies are detected in the development of the curriculum, but no serious breaches are detected in the commitments acquired in the last verified report. The deficiencies detected entail the requirement to implement improvement actions.

Compliance not achieved:

- Not achieved (D) when non-compliance with the commitments made in the last verified report (MV) is detected. For example, when the aspects indicated as requiring special attention in previous external assessment reports have not been addressed.

The option *Not applicable* is selected for those guidelines that cannot be assessed due to the nature of the study programme itself.

If the study programme is taught in several centres, the assessor must distinguish in the descriptive assessment of each guideline the aspects common to all the centres and differentiate the specific aspects of each one, thus establishing disaggregated assessments. In any case, the joint semi-quantitative assessment (A, B, C or D) must be unique and must correspond to that of the centre with the lowest assessment.

- **Justification of the assessment given.** The assessor must justify the semi-quantitative assessment given. He/she may also point out any confusing, insufficient, contradictory, non-existent or missing information or the need for additional information in relation to the evidence.
- **Additional evidence to be requested prior to the site visit.** List of evidence that was not present in the Self-Assessment Report and that the Expert Panel may request prior to the site visit for consultation during the visit.
- **Key questions and the corresponding group to be interviewed.** List of the key questions to be asked during the different hearings. In this section, the evaluator must indicate the group to be interviewed in order to extract the corresponding information.

Depending on the programme being evaluated, interviews with different groups may be considered, including students, teaching staff, graduates, employers, study programme managers, the centre's management team, internship coordinators, administration and services staff, among others.

2.3.2. Drawing up the agenda for the site visit

The model of the visit agenda depends on the number of study programme's to be evaluated by the Panel of Experts, the teaching mode, as well as other unique evaluation features. However, the following aspects are common to all cases:

- The proposed agenda for the site visit should be sent to the university preferably seven weeks before the start of the visit so that the final agenda can be agreed at least one week before the visit.
- It should be flexible during the visit to allow for unforeseen events and should allow for rest periods.
- Consideration should be given to whether the Panel of Experts has to visit one or more centres and the logistics involved.
- It should specify the groups to be interviewed, as well as the time foreseen for each of the hearings and the appropriate material for their development.
- The ideal length of each hearing is between 30 and 45 minutes, leaving a final 15 minutes to summarise conclusions and prepare for the next hearing. No session should exceed 75 minutes in length.
- When determining the duration of the visit, it should be considered whether several study programmes are to be evaluated simultaneously. Therefore, it has to be determined which groups could be interviewed in the same hearing, regardless of the study programme to which they are linked, and which groups should be interviewed in separate hearings.
- The visit begins with the reception of the Panel of Experts by the person(s) in charge designated by the university.
- It is recommended that the interview with the centre's management team or those responsible for the study programme(s) be carried out in the first instance. Similarly, it is recommended that the visit to the facilities is not carried out in the first part of the visit, in order to be able to gather relevant information in the different hearings with the groups interviewed.
- The Panel of Experts must have access, prior to the visit, to the contributions made in the public exposure mailbox of the study programme that the university provides for the university community. Here, people who have not participated

directly in the development of the IA can send their comments, suggestions, discrepancies, etc. regarding it.

- The agenda of the site visit, where appropriate, may include a time slot for the documentary review of evidence selected by the Panel of Experts after analysing the documentation related to the study programme.
- The audiences must be representative in order to ensure that the opinions collected reflect as closely as possible the plurality of sensitivities of the different groups. In this sense, the criteria for selecting the interviewees should take into account:

In the case of **Bachelor's** and **Master's degree courses**, the following groups must be present during the hearings:

- **Student body** from different courses and with differentiated characteristics in terms of the route or degrees of access to the study programme or other distinctions that the Panel of Experts considers in accordance with the characteristics of the study programmes to be evaluated. Part of the student body must be students who exercise some kind of student representation, such

as course delegates, but always in direct relation to the study programme being evaluated.

- **The teaching staff** may be part of the teaching staff of the reference subjects or fields of knowledge considered by the Panel of Experts and the university, as long as they are agreed in the final agenda of the site visit.
- **The support and services staff (PAS)**, which should be a representation of the different areas that provide support to the study programme under evaluation.
- **Graduates** who, as far as possible, are not currently linked to the university.
- **Employers** representing organisations that have taken on a graduate in the course of the last few years, have offered external placements, etc.

This composition differs in the case of **PhD programmes**, in which the following must be present:

- **PhD students** with different degrees of progress in their studies and with different characteristics such as different access routes or degrees, with complementary training, research stays or other distinctions considered by the Panel of Experts depending on the characteristics of the study programmes to be evaluated.
- **The teaching staff** made up of both thesis tutors and supervisors who have actively participated in the assessment period and those who form part of the

study programme's self-assessment committee. In addition, the research teaching staff involved in the PhD programme must also be included.

- **Support and service staff (PAS)** which should be a representation of the different areas that provide support to the programme under evaluation.
- **Graduates**, preferably with different job opportunities.
- **Employers** representing organisations that have taken on a graduate in recent years (teaching, post-doctoral scholarships, R&D&I activities in companies, etc.).

If it is difficult for people from a particular group to attend, they may be present by virtual means (multiconference or similar).

2.3.3. Selection of reference subjects (bachelor's/master's)

In the case of Bachelor's and Master's degrees, for each degree, subjects and Bachelor's/Master's Final Projects (TFG/TFM) must be selected to serve as a sample for assessing the various guidelines of the evaluation model (especially those relating to *Criterion 6. Learning Results*)

To this end, their teaching guides, the teaching staff's summarised CVs must be carefully analysed in order to assess the suitability of their profiles with the subjects, the methods for evaluation learning results, the alignment of the teaching methodology with the training activities, the evaluation of the acquisition of learning resources, the suitability of the subject to the level of the corresponding MECES, the suitability of the placements and their coordination with the theory, the visit to the associated laboratories/facilities, etc.

Part of this analysis is carried out by reviewing the information in Tables 1-2 of the Self-assessment Report (IA) provided by the university. The other part of the analysis is carried out through the review of the subject dossier and the TFG/TFM. Consequently, it is necessary for the Panel of Experts to request the following information from the university:

- **Subject dossier.** The information requested for each subject refers only to the last reference year of the subject. The dossier must contain the exams taken, as well as other evaluation tests - practical workbooks, assignments, reports, projects, among others - of four students who have taken this subject. The academic responsible for the subject must select the examples in such a way as to include evaluation tests of:
 - A student who has demonstrated that he/she has achieved the competences of the subject with a good grade.
 - A student who has passed the course and obtained a pass mark.
 - A student who has not passed the subject, but with a grade relatively close to a pass mark.
 - A student who has not passed the subject, with a low grade.
 - In the event that all students have passed the subject, the academic officer must provide a sample reflecting the diversity of marks awarded.
- **TFG/TFM.** The university must select three TFG/TFM from students who have passed the subject - one with a very good grade and the others with a lower grade. However, depending on the characteristics of the study programme, the Panel of Experts may request, before or during the site visit, some additional papers.

2.3.4. Selection of the files of people in PhD programmes

In PhD programmes, a sample of doctoral students must be selected, for each study programme, from the tables provided by the university, from which the following evidence is requested in accordance with this *Guide*:

- The additional training carried out.
- The activities document.
- Doctoral theses and the scientific contributions derived from them.

This evidence should serve as a sample for the assessment of various guidelines of the assessment model (especially those related to *Criterion 6 Learning results*).

2.3.5. Selection of possible additional evidence

The Panel of Experts has the possibility to request additional evidence to complete its analysis and/or clarify information or evidence that the university has submitted. It should be noted that additional evidence should only be requested in very justified cases whose absence may affect the assessment of the guideline.

2.3.6. Sharing meeting of individual assessments

Once each evaluator has completed his or her individual assessments, each assessment is integrated into several documents. These documents form the basis for the Panel members to hold a sharing meeting (preferably in virtual mode) in which the following parameters are also determined:

- The key aspects to check during the site visit.
- The target groups to be interviewed and the objectives of each audience.
- The possible visit to specific facilities.

2.3.7. Organisation of the visit

Once the Panel of experts has finished sharing all the aspects identified as critical of the study programme(s) to be assessed, the members must organise the tasks to be carried out during the site visit, as well as distribute the responsibilities among the members. The Panel establishes the work plan in order to provide the necessary means for the visit. The secretariat acts as liaison between the Panel of Experts and the university of the study programme being evaluated.

When preparing the site visit, it is useful to draw up a document setting out the possible questions to be asked, together with the criteria and guidelines linked to these questions.

2.4. Site visit

The visit to the teaching centre(s) of the study programme(s) to be evaluated lasts between one and three days, depending on the number of study programme(s) or the circumstances in which they are taught. In cases where the number of programmes to be evaluated is higher or requires travel to several centres, the visit may last more than three days. In any case, the university must:

- Make available to the Panel of Experts a suitably equipped room in which they can conduct the planned interviews.
- Provide another room - with internet access and a computer and printer - for the Panel of Experts to hold internal meetings. In addition, this room is where the documentary evidence, if necessary, provided by the university should be located.
- Facilitate on-campus travel for the Panel of Experts if necessary.
- Select people from the different stakeholder groups requested by the Panel of Experts and organise the meetings appropriately.
- Address the Panel's demands regarding the evaluation process for ex post accreditation.

The site visit includes at least the following stages:

- **Reception of the Panel of experts.** The members of the Panel will be received by the university to welcome them and to organise everything necessary to facilitate their task.
- **Interviews** with the different groups.
- **Guided tour of the facilities.** This is particularly important in experimental study programmes or in recently created centres. Someone responsible for the programme being evaluated must accompany the Panel of experts during the site visit.
- **Analysis of possible additional evidence** (development of training activities, TFG/TFM, doctoral theses, etc.).
- **Internal meetings of the Panel of Experts.**

- **Final meeting with those responsible for the study programme** with the aim of providing the university with a summary of the main conclusions of the site visit. The Panel of Experts cannot communicate the result of the evaluation, as this is a decision that corresponds to the Commission of Study Programmes Evaluation (CET). Thus, the Panel of Experts provides first impressions and, from that moment, draws up the EV, which requires time for reflection and analysis of all the information.

It is necessary that the members of the Panel of Experts to hold a final face-to-face meeting to share the most relevant conclusions of the site visit, so that they can serve as a basis to prepare the EV.

2.4.1. Elaboration of EV

The chairperson of the Panel of Experts, with the help of the secretary and the rest of the members, draws up the EV for each of the assigned study programmes. This must be agreed by all the members of the Panel of Experts. The following aspects must also be considered when drafting the EV for each of the study programmes assigned:

- The members of the Panel of Experts should bear in mind that the purpose of their report is primarily to identify the degree of compliance with the criteria and guidelines of the ex post accreditation evaluation model. The EV may provide recommendations if the Panel of Experts deems it necessary for a better understanding of its report.
- Assessments should be supported by sufficient data and evidence. They should also be consistent with the evidence provided during the evaluation process, with clear and precise references to the evaluated points referred to.
- Assessments must always be made in accordance with the evaluation criteria established in the evaluation model for the ex post accreditation of AQUIB, avoiding the extension of this with observations and comments outside the aspects contemplated in the evaluation model.
- Comparisons between the evaluated study programme and other programmes should be avoided in the EV, since the purpose of the evaluation is not the

comparison but the diagnosis of the evaluated study programme in the framework of the criteria of the reference evaluation model (formative evaluation).

- Assessments should be unambiguous and consistent with each other.
- Evaluators should take all necessary precautions to prevent the identity of individuals, organisations or participants in the evaluation from being revealed, deliberately or unintentionally, without the express consent of the persons concerned, outside the specific context or the evaluation process team.
- The wording should be impersonal and objective, avoiding pejorative terms and blunt or disqualifying expressions.

Once the EV has been completed, the chairperson of the Panel of Experts must sign it and submit it to AQUIB within a maximum of two weeks from the end of the site visit. It is then submitted to the CET and the external evaluation of the study programme enters the last stage of the process.

Once the site visit has been completed, AQUIB issues a certificate of visit to the university so that it can begin the administrative procedure for the ex post accreditation before the Council of Universities.

3. COMMISSION OF STUDY PROGRAMMES EVALUATION (CET): EVALUATION FOR EX POST ACCREDITATION

The following diagram details the phases to be followed by the CET for the elaboration of the IPA and the IFA for the evaluation of the ex-pots accreditation.

Phase	Information on which the analysis is based	Result
Analysis of degree documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IA. - Other documents in the Accreditation Dossier. - EV. 	Provisional ex-post accreditation report (IPA)
Analysis of allegations and/or improvement plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EV. - Provisional IPA. - Allegations. - Improvement plan. 	Final ex post accreditation report (IFA)

3.1. Preparation of the Provisional IPA

The dossier for ex-post accreditation mainly includes the last MV, the IA, the EV and the rest of the previous information available on the study programme.

AQUIB starts the documentation analysis process by assigning each programme to an academic member of the corresponding subcommission. This person acts as rapporteur and reviews the dossier of the study programme to prepare a draft of the IPA using the IT support platform for the assessment staff. The reviewer analyses it and provides his/her comments, which are reviewed by the rapporteur. The rapporteur presents the draft to the rest of the members of the subcommission for discussion. Finally, as a result of this process, the CET issues the IPA.

The IPA must be reasoned and consists of an introduction, an assessment of each of the seven criteria of the ex-post accreditation model, which may include requirements, aspects that will receive special attention in future evaluations, suggestions for improvement and good practices, as well as their semi-quantitative assessment (A, B, C or D) and an overall assessment that may be:

- Favourable.
- With aspects that necessarily need to be modified in order to obtain a favourable report.

The IPA is sent to the university so that, within 20 working days, it can make the allegations it deems appropriate.

Whenever the report contains "aspects that must necessarily be modified in order to obtain a favourable report", the university must attach an improvement plan that must conveniently detail the actions to be carried out and their timing. This plan will be subject to special follow-up by AQUIB.

3.2. Analysis of allegations and/or improvement plan and preparation of the IFA

After receiving the allegations and/or the improvement plan presented by the university, AQUIB makes these documents available to the CET for analysis. The programme's rapporteur elaborates an IFA final draft, which is presented for discussion within the same subcommission. In accordance with the results of the analysis, the CET decides whether or not to modify the IPA and, finally, issues the IFA.

The IFA is prepared using the IT support tool provided by AQUIB. This document contains an introduction, a qualitative assessment of each of the seven criteria of the ex post accreditation model², as well as the result of the evaluation, which can be:

- Favourable.
- Unfavourable.

² The IFA, unlike the IPA, does not contain the semi-quantitative assessment for each criterion.

The IFA may include requirements, aspects that will be the subject to special attention in future evaluations of the study programme, suggestions for improvement and also good practices. It also establishes the periodicity for the next external follow-up of the study programme by AQUIB.

Once the CET issues the IFA, AQUIB forwards it to the Council of Universities, the university, the competent university authority, and the autonomous community.

ANNEX I. MAIN CHANGES COMPARED TO PREVIOUS VERSIONS

Version 0 (Pilot project)	Version 1
<p>STRUCTURE OF THE GUIDE</p> <p>The guide was structured in two main blocks (Site Visit, Assessment for Accreditation and 6 Annexes).</p>	<p>STRUCTURE OF THE GUIDE</p> <p>The guide is structured in three main blocks (visit, assessment for re-accreditation and panel of experts). The annexes have been reduced to 3 templates: evidence of the visit, IPA and IFA. The relevant content of the removed ANNEXES (assessment template, assessor support tool and interview agenda) has been integrated into the guide itself.</p>
<p>SEMI-QUANTITATIVE RATING SCALE</p> <p>In the pilot project the labels for each category of the rating scale were as follows:</p> <p>A. Excellently achieved: the criterion or guideline is consistently and exemplarily fulfilled in all aspects that can be assessed.</p> <p>B. Achieved: The criterion or guideline is achieved for all aspects to be assessed on a regular basis, although there is room for minor improvement.</p> <p>C. Partially achieved: the criterion or guideline is achieved in most of the aspects to be assessed, but not in all, and there is clearly room for significant improvement.</p> <p>D. Not achieved: the criterion or guideline is not met for most of the aspects to be assessed. There is hardly any indicative evidence of compliance.</p>	<p>SEMI-QUANTITATIVE RATING SCALE</p> <p>After the development of the pilot project, the definition of the values of the rating scale agreed within REACU changes:</p> <p>A. Excellently achieved: the standard corresponding to the criterion is fully achieved and, in addition, it is an example that exceeds the basic requirements.</p> <p>B. Achieved: the standard corresponding to the criterion is fully achieved.</p> <p>C. Partially achieved: the standard is achieved at the minimum level, but specific areas for improvement are identified.</p> <p>D. Not achieved: The criterion does not achieve the minimum level required to reach the corresponding standard.</p>
<p>SITE VISIT AGENDA</p> <p>A model agenda was established that included a Public Hearing so that the groups that had not participated in the different hearings had the opportunity to make their contributions to the evaluation of the study programme.</p>	<p>SITE VISIT AGENDA</p> <p>In order for the groups affected to know and give their opinion on the IPA, the university must make it public and set up a mailbox where opinions on the content of the self-assessment report can be collected from those people who have not participated in its preparation. The authors of these opinions must be identified and the information contained in the mailbox must be made available to the visiting panel prior to its implementation.</p>

EVALUATION REPORTS Expert Panel Reports

In relation to the ex-post accreditation procedure, a first phase was established in which the Panel of Experts issued a provisional site visit report to which the university could make observations due to material errors made in the drafting of the report. After this phase of observations, the final report of the visit was drawn up and submitted to the Accreditation Commission.

Reports of the Accreditation Commission

In the Provisional and Final Reports for the ex-post accreditation, semi-quantitative A, B, C or D ratings were established for each of the criteria.

EVALUATION REPORTS Expert Panel Reports

The Provisional Site Visit Report and the 10-day phase in which the university was allowed to make observations have been eliminated. The Visiting Panel will issue a single Visiting Report that will be submitted to the Accreditation Commission.

Reports of the Accreditation Commission

Semi-quantitative assessments are maintained in the provisional report but are not included in the final report. In the case of a favourable report, the Final Report will indicate the timeframe in which the study programme will be subject to a follow-up process through AQUIB's Official study programmes Follow-up Programme.

Version 2 (15/12/2016)

- The document "External Evaluation Guide" is divided into two documents: *External Evaluation Guide: 1st Phase: The visit of the Panel of Experts* and *External Evaluation Guide: 2nd Phase: The evaluation by the Accreditation Renewal Commission*.
- The stages of the external evaluation are reviewed, introducing the preparation of the site visit agenda and the selection of reference subjects.
- References to ANECA's ACREDITA programme have been removed, given the termination of the collaboration agreement between ANECA and AQUIB.
- The deadlines established for the stages are reviewed, adapting them to the reality of the process.
- The text is simplified and various corrections are made.

Version 3 (15/12/2017)

- The provision of training on AQUIB's ex-post accreditation programme to evaluators is specified in all cases (section 2.1 Constitution of the Panel of Experts).
- The reception of the documentation and its analysis is separated into two stages, estimating different deadlines for each stage (section 2.2 Planning the site visit).
- The option of visiting a master's degree course in one day is provided for (section 3.6. Site Visit development).
- It is explicitly stated that the Panel of Experts will be accompanied by a member of the study programme supervisor during the visit to the facilities (section 3.6 Development of the site visit).

- The need for a final face-to-face meeting of the Panel of Experts is indicated in order to share the most relevant conclusions of the site visit (section 3.6 Development of the site visit).
- It is included in the selection criteria for the evaluators that an attempt will be made to ensure that one of their universities of origin is similar in size to the university being evaluated (section 4.2 Profile of the evaluators of the Panel of Experts).
- The profile of the student member is revised to facilitate collaboration with AQUIB (section 4.2 Profile of the evaluators of the Panel of Experts).
- Various corrections and modifications are made to the text to make it easier to understand.

Version 4 (21/12/2018)

- The name of the Ex post accreditation Commission is changed to the Commission of Study Programmes Evaluation.
- The guide is adapted for use in carrying out the site visit for ex post accreditation of doctoral programmes. The main changes reside in the evidence to be consulted during the site visit, in the groups to be interviewed and in the visit report (annex 2).
- The time of the visit is adjusted from one to two days, exceeding this number in cases where it is considered necessary (large number of study programmes to be evaluated or centres to be visited).
- Various corrections and modifications are made to the text to make it easier to understand.

Version 5 (14/09/2023)

- The content is adapted to Royal Decree 822/2021, of 28 September, which establishes the organisation of university education and the procedure for quality assurance.
- The content of the document is harmonised with the *evaluation protocol for the follow-up and ex post accreditation of official university bachelor's and master's degrees* drawn up by REACU.
- This guide merges the documents External assessment guide: the site visit of the panel of experts and the External evaluation guide: the evaluation by the Commission of Study Programmes Evaluation (CET).
- A general revision of the drafting is carried out, and various corrections are made. During the drafting of the document, attention has been paid to the use of inclusive language.