

Report of the panel of the external review Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd

February 2015

0. Index

0. Index	2
1 Executive Summary	3
2 Glossary of acronyms	4
3 Introduction	5
3.1 Background and outline of the review process	5
3.2 The higher education system in the Madrid region	5
3.3 Fundación para el Conocimiento Madimasd	6
3.4. Structure of the Foundation	8
3.5 The Foundation and ENQA	8
3.6 The review process	9
3.7 The national context of the review	10
4. Findings	11
4.1 ENQA Criterion 1 / ESG 3.1 and ESG 3.3	11
4.2 ENQA criterion 2 / ESG 3.2: Official status	25
4.3 ENQA criterion 3 / ESG 3.4: Resources	26
4.4 ENQA criterion 4 / ESG 3.5: Mission statement	28
4.5 ENQA criterion 5 / ESG 3.6: Independence	29
4.6 ENQA Criterion 6 / ESG 3.7: External quality assurance criteria and processes used by the agencies	32
4.7 ENQA Criterion 7 / ESG 3.8: Accountability procedures	34
4.8 ENQA Criterion 8: Consistency of judgements, appeals system and contribution to ENQA aims	37
5 Conclusion and development	38
6 Recommendations	38
7 Annexes	39

1 Executive Summary

This report analyses the compliance of the *Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd* (“the Foundation”) with the ENQA Membership Criteria. The report is based on an ENQA coordinated type A peer review. Based on this report the Foundation will apply for full membership of ENQA for the first time. Currently it is not a member nor an affiliate of ENQA. The site visit of the peer review panel in charge of the evaluation of the compliance with the ENQA Membership Criteria took place November 18-20 2014.

Until 2013, the Agency for Quality, Accreditation and Prospective of the Universities of Madrid, ACAP, was the official agency for quality assurance in the Region of Madrid. Towards the end of 2013, ACAP merged with the Foundation, leading to a stronger and more flexible organisation. All activities related to evaluation, certification and accreditation of institutions, programmes, and individuals of the Madrid Higher Education System are now performed by the Foundation. The Foundation has gained a high level of support for its activities.

ACAP, and later the Foundation, have developed their policies and procedures over the last number of years in order to fulfil the ENQA Membership Criteria. The Foundation performs a broad range of quality assurance activities, varying from the level of the individual professor and study programme to the level of university centres and complete institutions. For several evaluation schemes, cooperation exists with other regional, national and international quality assurance bodies.

The panel has also noted strong support from all stakeholders for the Foundation to become a full member of ENQA. Indeed, Spanish legislation states that full membership of ENQA is a necessary condition to take full responsibility for some evaluation schemes, such as the ex-ante accreditation of university programmes.

Overall, the review panel noted a strong leadership within the Foundation, a supportive approach toward the higher education institutions and well established procedures. The review panel considers a more active involvement of international experts, the development of a light follow-up of accreditation renewal procedures and the development of initiatives in the field of system-wide analysis as main areas for improvement.

In the light of the documentary and oral evidence it considered, the review panel judges that the Foundation is in substantial compliance with the ENQA Membership Provisions. The panel notes that the agency fully complies with the ENQA Membership criteria 2, 4 and 7; and substantially complies with criteria 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8. On the basis of its findings, the panel recommends to the Board that the Foundation be admitted to membership of ENQA.

2 Glossary of acronyms

AAC-DEVA	Andalusian Agency of Knowledge, Department of Evaluation and Accreditation
ACAP	Agency for Quality, Accreditation and Prospective of the Universities of Madrid
ACSUCYL	Quality Assurance Agency for the University System in Castilla y León, Valladolid
ACSUG	Axencia para a Calidade do Sistema Universitario de Galicia - Agency for Quality Assurance in the Galician University System
ANECA	Agencia Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad y Acreditación - National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation of Spain
AQU Catalunya	Agència per a la Qualitat del Sistema Universitari de Catalunya - Catalan University Quality Assurance Agency
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
ENQA	European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
EQAR	European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education.
ESG	European Standards and Guidelines (for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area)
FCIM	Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd
HEI	Higher Education Institution
IQAS	Internal Quality Assurance System
REACU	Red Española de Agencias de Calidad Universitaria - Spanish Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education

3 Introduction

This is the report of the review of the *Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd* ("the Foundation") undertaken November 18-20 2014 for the purpose of determining whether the agency meets the criteria for full membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA).

3.1 Background and outline of the review process

The Statutes of ENQA require all member agencies to undergo an external cyclical review, at least once every five years, in order to verify that they fulfil the membership provisions.

In November 2004, the General Assembly of ENQA agreed that the third part of the ESG should be incorporated into the membership provisions of its (then) regulations (now statutes). 'Substantial' compliance with the ESG thus became the principal criterion for membership of ENQA. The ESG were subsequently adopted at the Bergen ministerial meeting of the Bologna Process in 2005. The third part of the ESG covers the cyclical external review of quality assurance and accreditation agencies.

The external review of *Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd* was conducted in line with the process described in the Guidelines for external reviews of quality assurance agencies in the European Higher Education Area and in accordance with the timeline set out in the Terms of Reference.

The review panel for the external review of the Foundation was composed of the following members:

- David Timms, Higher Education Consultant, David Timms Consulting Ltd, United Kingdom, Chair
- Pieter-Jan van de Velde, Staff member Quality Assurance, VLUHR Quality Assurance - Flemish Higher Education Council, Belgium, Secretary
- Cláudia Sarrico, Associate Professor, ISEG Lisboa School of Economics and Management, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
- Marcel Crochet, Emeritus, Honorary Rector of Université Catholique de Louvain and Chairman of IRSA, Royal Institute for Deaf and Blind Children, Belgium, EUA nomination
- Simona Divoska, Student in the Faculty of Law Iustianus Primus - Skopje Master degree - LL.M in Intellectual Property, Macedonia, ESU nomination

The *Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd* produced a self-evaluation report which provided a substantial portion of information which the panel used to form its conclusions. The panel conducted a site-visit to validate fully the self-evaluation and clarify any points at issue. The review panel has been given access to all documents and people it wished to consult throughout the review. It wishes to thank the members and staff of the Foundation for their welcome and good preparation of the site-visit, as well as the participants of the meetings who shared their experience with the panel.

3.2 The higher education system in the Madrid region

The Region of Madrid, located in the central area of Spain, is one of Spain's Autonomous Communities. The region holds a total of fifteen universities in its territory, and includes 18% of the country's universities.

Of these fifteen universities which make up the Madrid Higher Education System six are public:

- Universidad de Alcalá

- Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
- Universidad Carlos III de Madrid
- Universidad Complutense de Madrid
- Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
- Universidad Rey Juan Carlos

The other nine are private:

- Universidad Alfonso X El Sabio
- Universidad Antonio de Nebrija
- Universidad Camilo José Cela
- Universidad a Distancia de Madrid
- Universidad Europea de Madrid
- Universidad Francisco de Vitoria
- Universidad San Pablo CEU
- Universidad Pontificia Comillas de Madrid
- Universidad para la Tecnología y la Empresa

This large university network has granted access to Higher Education to 271,097 students in the Region of Madrid during the academic year 2012-2013. The distribution of students enrolled in the Region of Madrid was:

- 208,936 in public universities and their affiliated centres;
- 56,411 in private universities and in those of the Catholic Church;
- 5,750 in the Universidad a Distancia de Madrid (UDIMA).

Since the transition of the Spanish university system to the common features of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) from 2008 on, the structure of university studies in Spain has been in a process of change. In the new system aligned with the EHEA, Spanish universities now offer the same three cycles as in other countries: Bachelor degrees (in Spanish, Grado), Master degrees, and Doctoral degrees.

The main body of academic staff in Spain are civil servants, full-time professors/researchers. Universities also employ professors/lecturers on a contractual full-time or part-time basis. Most of the staff must be evaluated as “accredited” before employment in higher education teaching.

3.3 [Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd](#)

The *Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd* is a non-profit organization established in 2002 on the initiative of the Regional Government of Madrid. Its objectives are strengthening and coordinating the Madrid R&D Regional System through joint projects and actions in the areas of:

- Technology-based entrepreneurship;
- Technology transfer;
- European Research Area;
- Science and Society;
- Quality of the Higher Education System.

The Foundation aims at promoting the development of science and technology, knowledge and culture, enhancing technology innovation and consolidating joint actions between the scientific and business communities, supporting technology transfer and commercialization activities, developing a framework to encourage start-ups from R&D projects, fostering the participation in European R&D programmes, and improving the quality of the higher education system in the Region of Madrid.

Until 2013, the Agency for Quality, Accreditation and Prospective of the Universities of Madrid, ACAP, was the official agency for quality assurance in the Region of Madrid. Towards the end of 2013, ACAP merged with the Foundation, leading to a stronger and more flexible organisation. All activities related to evaluation, certification and accreditation of institutions, programmes, and individuals of the Madrid Higher Education System are now performed by the Foundation.

The merger of the two institutions was reflected in the revision of the Foundation's Articles of Association, approved on 20 December 2013, in the meeting of the Board of Trustees, and endorsed by the publication of the Decree 63/2014, of 29 May, which designates the *Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd* as the official assessment body for the Madrid Higher Education System. The updated mission of the Foundation in the new Articles of Association reflects the expansion of the Foundation's mandate:

"The Foundation's goal is to contribute to converting the quality in higher education, science, technology and innovation into a key element in the competitiveness and wellbeing of the citizens."

The Foundation performs a broad range of evaluations. The evaluation activities carried out by the Foundation until now may be divided into two main types: activities developed by the Agency itself, and activities developed jointly with other Quality Assurance Agencies, including the *Agencia Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad y Acreditación (ANECA)*, the national quality assurance agency. The relative responsibilities of the Foundation and ANECA are described in summary below.

A) Activities developed by the Foundation itself

Evaluation of study programmes:

- **Monitoring** is a follow-up evaluation of the ex-ante evaluation ('verification') by ANECA. Once a programme has been authorized the Foundation monitors the completion of the project contained in the proposal approved after two or three years. The Foundation implemented this programme in 2012. Since then this programme has been the Foundation's major activity at programme level.
- **Accreditation Renewal** is the ex-post evaluation of higher education programmes that takes place 4 or 6 years (Master or Bachelor degrees, respectively) after the programme has been evaluated ex-ante by ANECA. This evaluation is carried out by the Foundation. Pilots for this evaluation scheme have been implemented in 2014. The programme is expected to become the Foundation's major activity from 2015 on.
- **Ex-ante evaluation of master programmes in the Arts.** For master programmes in music and dance, in performing arts, in preservation and restoration of cultural heritage, and in design and visual arts, the Foundation is endowed with the competence to assess these study programmes.

Evaluation of academic staff on the basis of their teaching and research:

- **Evaluation of candidates for contractual lecturer positions.** This evaluation is valid in the Madrid Region only. The national agency ANECA provides a national evaluation (valid throughout the country). ANECA is also responsible for the evaluation of candidates for statutory lecturer positions.

B) Activities in cooperation with other agencies:

- **DOCENTIA** - This is a voluntary evaluation scheme to support universities in the design of their own procedures for the evaluation of the quality of teaching. DOCENTIA has been jointly designed with the national agency (ANECA) and the other Spanish regional quality assurance agencies.

- **Cooperation** with international sectorial accreditation agencies. In order to promote cooperation with other international accreditation agencies, the Foundation has signed cooperation agreements with entities specialized in sectorial accreditations, such as the National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB), the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) and the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP).

3.4. Structure of the Foundation

The **Board of Trustees** and the Manager are the governing bodies of the agency. The composition of the Board of Trustees is regulated in the Statutes of the Foundation. The Regional Minister for Higher Education chairs the Board, and two further representatives of the Regional Government have seats on the Board. In addition the Minister designates up to two representatives from the Universities of Madrid, nominated by the Madrid Higher Education Council and up to three experts 'of proven experience in the areas related to the Foundation's aims'. The Madrid Confederation of Employers and Industries appoints one representative. Up to four additional persons of recognised prestige in the areas related to the goals of the Foundation may be added to the Board. The Board of Trustees is competent for all matters related to either governance or management of the Foundation. The Executive Director has been endowed with all the powers in the organization, except for the approval of the Annual Accounts and Budget, the approval of the Annual Action Plan, the modification of the Articles of Association, the merger and closure of the Foundation, and those other matters that require the authorization of the Foundation's Protectorate and those that remain in the Board of Trustees.

The **Executive Director** is designated by the Board of Trustees and must be a person of recognised professional prestige in the areas of the Foundation's scope. The Executive Director has appointed a Manager who is responsible for the coordination of the general services of the Foundation, including finances.

The Foundation has an international advisory body: the Advisory Committee on Higher Education Quality. This Committee's aim is to assess the Foundation's activities, to suggest the organisational innovations that - based on the experiences of other advanced university systems - may be included in the higher education institutions of Madrid, and to propose actions of quality improvement for the University System of Madrid. The Advisory Committee consists of a maximum of nine independent, international experts of recognised prestige in the academic and scientific fields. The Committee includes a student member.

The Foundation has also established a regional advisory body: the Advisory Council on University Quality of the Region of Madrid. The aim of this Council is to assess the Foundation's operation and activities, to suggest organisational innovations based on the knowledge and experience of the most relevant institutions related to the university system of the Region of Madrid. The Advisory Council consists of representatives of the Government of the Region of Madrid, the public universities of Madrid, the Social Council of the public universities of Madrid, the private universities and experts in evaluation, accreditation and quality.

3.5 The Foundation and ENQA

The Foundation has requested this review in order to become a full member of ENQA. Until now, the Foundation and its predecessor ACAP have been active internationally mainly through cooperation agreements with sectorial accreditors. The Foundation hopes to strengthen its entire current activity through becoming a member of ENQA. They expect that this will entail greater commitment and transparency; will allow the Foundation to establish new links; will permit access to more information when participating in ENQA's active working groups; and enable the agency to

learn best practice implemented in other European agencies. Moreover, they expect membership to strengthen all of the Foundation's international and innovation activities, which are among the Foundation's main objectives, and ultimately contribute to the improvement of higher education in the Region of Madrid.

Furthermore, Spanish legislation states that full membership of ENQA is a necessary condition to take full responsibility for some evaluation schemes, such as the ex-ante accreditation of university programmes. ENQA membership will thus open the doors to new activities.

The Foundation hopes to act as a relevant partner in ENQA, serving as a communication platform within the university system of the Region of Madrid. In this sense, the Foundation's membership of ENQA may contribute to the dissemination of information and best practices among all those in the system.

During this review, the panel has noted strong support from all stakeholders for the Foundation to become a full member of ENQA.

3.6 The review process

The panel was appointed in August 2014 and received the self-evaluation report shortly after its appointment. The self-evaluation report and its attachments were analysed by each of the panel members before the site visit. The Panel discussed the individual findings during its preparatory meeting, the first day of the site visit.

The site visit took place on November 18-20 2014 in the Foundation's offices in Madrid. The Foundation drew up the programme for the site visit in close cooperation with the chair and secretary of the panel. The programme included interview sessions with the President of the Region of Madrid, the Minister for Education, Youth and Sports of the Region, members of the Board of Trustees, the Executive Director, the Manager and a number of staff members, representatives of the Advisory Council and Advisory Committee, representatives of the public and private higher education institutions, the social councils of the Public Universities (which represent the "social partners" of universities), members of the Foundation's Evaluation and Accreditation Committee and panel members involved with other of the Foundation's evaluation activities, including student representatives.

Although the self-evaluation report and its annexes provided relevant information, they would have been improved by being more self-critical. The available documentation, nevertheless, constituted a sufficient frame of reference for the interviews during the site visit, which provided further oral evidence and constructive (self)analysis and feedback.

The Panel appreciates the fact that a number of relevant documents, originally in Spanish, were provided in English translation. Some of the panel members had sufficient command of the language to enable them to analyse the documentation in Spanish. The findings about these documents were shared with all panel members during internal meetings of the panel. At the end of the site visit, the panel held an internal meeting where it agreed on the preliminary conclusions related to level of compliance of the Foundation in relation to each of the standards in part 2 and 3 of the ESG. The secretary of the panel then drafted the report in cooperation with the rest of the panel. The draft report was submitted to the Foundation for factual verification on January 6th 2014 and with reference to ENQA standards the Foundation was given two weeks to comment on the report.

In relation to its conclusions, the Panel finds it important to note that it assessed the Foundation's level of compliance with the standards and also took into account the Foundation's practice in relation to some of the indicators listed in the guidelines. It has also provided a number of

recommendations. The panel intends that this approach reflects the policy for external reviews of agencies decided by the ENQA Board which came into effect on July 1st 2011. The policy states (among other things) that the enhancement aspect of the reviews shall be strengthened in the second round and the agency thus be given more recommendations for further development than in the first round of reviews.

3.7 The national context of the review

In Spain, activities related to the external quality assurance procedures are within the competence of the national quality assurance agency ANECA and the responsible local assessment bodies established by regional law. The amendment to the law on universities - law 4/2007 of 12 April - establishes that ANECA and the regional bodies shall, in the application of international standards, establish mechanisms for cooperation and mutual recognition.

The relationship between the regional agencies and ANECA is determined by national and regional laws. ANECA and the regional agencies collaborate within the Spanish Network of University Quality Assurance Agencies (REACU). The Foundation and its predecessor ACAP have been active in the REACU network since its inception in 2006.

Ten of the seventeen regions in Spain have established regional agencies for quality assurance. These agencies are responsible for external quality assurance within their territories. Spanish legislation states that full membership of ENQA is a necessary condition for taking full responsibility for some evaluation schemes, such as the ex-ante accreditation of university programmes. Five regional agencies are full members of ENQA: AAC-DEVA - Andalusian Agency of Knowledge, Department of Evaluation and Accreditation, Sevilla; ACSUCYL - Quality Assurance Agency for the University System in Castilla y León, Valladolid; ACSUG - Agency for Quality Assurance in the Galician University System, Santiago de Compostela; AQU Catalunya - Catalan University Quality Assurance Agency, Barcelona and Unibasq - Agency for Quality Assurance in the Basque University System, Vitoria-Gasteiz. As indicated above, the Foundation is committed to joining this group by becoming a full member of ENQA.

4. Findings

4.1 ENQA Criterion 1 / ESG 3.1 and ESG 3.3

a. ESG 3.1 - Part 2: External quality assurance processes

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

The standards for external quality assurance contained in Part 2 provide a valuable basis for the external quality assessment process. The standards reflect best practices and experiences gained through the development of external quality assurance in Europe since the early 1990s. It is therefore important that these standards are integrated into the processes applied by external quality assurance agencies towards the higher education institutions. The standards for external quality assurance should together with the standards for external quality assurance agencies constitute the basis for professional and credible external quality assurance of higher education institutions.

Findings of the panel

Compliance with the standards of Part 2 of the ESG is addressed in the following sections. Compliance with these standards is only relevant with regard to the overall compliance with standard 3.1.

4.1.1 - ESG 2.1 Use of internal quality assurance procedures

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

The standards for internal quality assurance contained in Part 1 provide a valuable basis for the external quality assessment process. It is important that the institutions' own internal policies and procedures are carefully evaluated in the course of external procedures, to determine the extent to which the standards are being met. If higher education institutions are to be able to demonstrate the effectiveness of their own internal quality assurance processes, and if those processes properly assure quality and standards, then external processes might be less intensive than otherwise.

Findings of the panel

The Foundation's current core activities relate to the monitoring of study programmes, to voluntary evaluation schemes for the quality of academic staff teaching activity (DOCENTIA), and to ex-ante staff accreditation. At the moment of the peer review, the Foundation was preparing the accreditation renewal of a significant number of study programmes. Furthermore, the Foundation has established cooperation agreements with several sector specific accreditors. These procedures take into account the relevant requirements of Part 1 of the ESG. The accreditation renewal framework takes those elements into account explicitly.

The Foundation has procedures in place to check whether institutions have in place policies and procedures for quality assurance (ESG 1.1). This element is taken into account in the mandatory procedures at programme level (monitoring and accreditation renewal).

In Spain an extensive system of external quality assurance processes for approval, monitoring and periodic review of the programmes (ESG 1.2) operates. Before a new programme is offered, ex-ante evaluation by ANECA is required. The Foundation organises mid-term monitoring after the programme is implemented, to check whether the programme runs as planned, and renewal of accreditation after 4 years (for master's degrees) and 6 years (for bachelor's and doctoral degrees).

Students should be assessed using published criteria, regulations and procedures which are applied consistently (ESG 1.3). The assessment of students is a specific criterion in the assessment framework for accreditation renewal. Within DOCENTIA also, assessment of students is evaluated.

Quality assurance of teaching staff (ESG 1.4) is central in the work of the Foundation. The Foundation both evaluates individual staff and assesses the quality of teaching teams and staff policy within several evaluation schemes. As a condition of applying for some contractual positions at a university in the Madrid Region, accreditation by the Foundation is necessary. Furthermore, the Foundation is one of the agencies implementing the DOCENTIA scheme, which supports universities in designing procedures for internal evaluation of teaching. Finally, quality assurance of teaching staff is taken into account explicitly in the accreditation renewal procedure.

Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.5) are assessed in the accreditation renewal procedure.

At study programme level the accreditation renewal procedure assesses which information systems (ESG 1.6) the study programme uses and the way it follows up on this information. Within the DOCENTIA programme information about the quality of teaching is gathered and evaluated.

Public information (ESG 1.7) plays a major role in the external quality assurance processes of the Foundation. It is a central criterion within the monitoring procedure.

The Foundation plans to accept the decisions of international accreditation agencies with which it has cooperation agreements as replacement for its own accreditation renewal process. The Foundation has such agreements with the National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB), the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) and the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP). The staff of the Foundation convinced the review panel it had analyzed the assessment frameworks of these accreditors thoroughly, and participated as observer during site visits. Nevertheless, the panel suggests that the Foundation formalize this careful examination, and produce a public document which documents the conformity of the international accreditors' frameworks with both the Spanish assessment frameworks and the ESG Part 1.

Recommendations

- The Foundation should formalize its examination of assessment frameworks leading to accreditation decisions which are accepted as replacement of the Foundation's own accreditation renewal processes.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation fully complies with ESG 2.1.

4.1.2 - ESG 2.2 Development of external quality assurance processes

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

In order to ensure clarity of purpose and transparency of procedures, external quality assurance methods should be designed and developed through a process involving key stakeholders, including higher education institutions. The procedures that are finally agreed should be published and should contain explicit statements of the aims and objectives of the processes as well as a description of the procedures to be used. As external quality assurance makes demands on the institutions involved a preliminary impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that the procedures to be adopted are appropriate and do not interfere more than necessary with the normal work of higher education institutions.

Findings of the panel

The aims and objectives of the Foundation's evaluation schemes are determined before the processes themselves are developed. However, the Foundation's freedom to develop its external quality assurance activities is to some extent limited. The Spanish Government decides on the overall legal framework. Within this framework procedures are designed in close coordination with the Network of Spanish Quality Agencies (Red Española de Agencias de Calidad Universitaria, REACU) and the national agency ANECA in order to keep some consistency between the autonomous regions in Spain. Furthermore, the Regional Government decides on additional requirements for the Foundation's work.

Nevertheless, within the legal and national framework, the Foundation can decide on key characteristics of the design of the external evaluation schemes. The specific design to be used in the Region of Madrid is developed by an experts' working group, under the supervision of a project manager employed by the Foundation. This working group is set up by the Evaluation and Accreditation Committee.

The panel appreciates that, once the draft of the model is outlined, it is reviewed by the Advisory Council in Higher Education Quality of the Region of Madrid. In this Council representatives of the Government of the Region of Madrid, the public universities of Madrid, the Social Council of the Public Universities of Madrid, the private universities and experts in evaluation, accreditation and quality are represented. The panel noted that the Social Council members, whilst being aware of the needs of social stakeholders, were typically themselves members of universities: direct involvement by employers or their organizations is not built in to the arrangements for operation and oversight of review methods.

Typically, the implementation of a new model comprises a pilot application on a limited set of assessment subjects, which allows detecting strengths and weaknesses of the process. For example, during the renewal of the accreditation of degrees, a pilot has been carried out which has helped to improve the procedures and to adapt them to the needs of the process accordingly. The pilot suggested that the original procedure was too burdensome for the higher education institutions, which resulted in changes to the procedures in order to have a lower impact on the work load of the higher education institutions.

The formal approval of all procedures is the responsibility of the Foundation's Executive Director. The approved procedures, evaluation protocols and guidelines are published on the Foundation's website before the evaluation processes start. The structure of an assessment model contains the aims and objectives, the purpose, the object to be assessed, standards and guidelines, and the evaluation protocol and criteria.

Recommendations

- The Foundation should make better use of stakeholders such as employer organisations in the operation and oversight of their review methods.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation fully complies with ESG 2.2.

4.1.3 ESG 2.3 - Criteria for decisions

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

Formal decisions made by quality assurance agencies have a significant impact on the institutions and programmes that are judged. In the interests of equity and reliability, decisions should be based on published criteria and interpreted in a consistent manner. Conclusions should be based on recorded evidence and agencies should have in place ways of moderating conclusions, if necessary.

Findings of the panel

The Foundation disseminates protocols and criteria, and other complementary documentation developed for any assessment process. These are published on the Foundation's website before the process starts.

In the accreditation renewal processes, three different panels or committees are involved consecutively before issuing the final report, to help ensure that the reports are both balanced and consistent. Each of these committees acts at a higher level than the previous one, and checks out a larger number of programme reports, so that the perspective gradually becomes more general:

- Review panel: one per school, which evaluates from three to four programmes on average.
- Branch Committee: which prepares provisional reports (subject to allegation). The five Branch Committees (one per field of knowledge) handle reports from the review panels in the particular domain, along with other supplementary pre-existing reports and complementary information.
- The Plenary Meeting of the Evaluation and Accreditation Committee.

The ENQA review panel accepts that this three-layered system contributes to the consistency of decision making. Nevertheless, this system bears some risks. As reports are adapted by committee members who have not been involved in the peer review itself, errors could be introduced during the process. The panel therefore suggests that the Foundation involve the panel members in the feedback procedure and has the final report checked by the review panel before the Evaluation and Accreditation Committee finally publishes the report.

In addition to internal discussions within panels and committees, all experts receive training at the beginning of each evaluation process in order to guarantee consistency. These sessions provide training on the procedure to be followed, the items to be evaluated and the criteria to be applied. Furthermore, the Foundation's staff assures that the process fits the established criteria and procedure.

The representatives of universities the review panel met during the site visit were generally positive on the consistency of the assessment procedures and the reports written by the Foundation.

Recommendations

- The Foundation should involve panel members in the feedback procedure and should have the final report checked by the review panel before the Evaluation and Accreditation Committee finally publishes it.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation fully complies with ESG 2.3.

4.1.4 ESG 2.4 Processes fit for purpose

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

Quality assurance agencies within the EHEA undertake different external processes for different purposes and in different ways. It is of the first importance that agencies should operate procedures which are fit for their own defined and published purposes. Experience has shown, however, that there are some widely-used elements of external review processes which not only help to ensure their validity, reliability and usefulness, but also provide a basis for the European dimension to quality assurance. Amongst these elements the following are particularly noteworthy:

- insistence that the experts undertaking the external quality assurance activity have appropriate skills and are competent to perform their task;
- the exercise of care in the selection of experts;
- the provision of appropriate briefing or training for experts;
- the use of international experts;
- participation of students;
- ensuring that the review procedures used are sufficient to provide adequate evidence to support the findings and conclusions reached;
- the use of the self-evaluation/ site visit/ draft report/ published report/ follow-up model of review;
- recognition of the importance of institutional improvement and enhancement policies as a fundamental element in the assurance of quality.

Findings of the panel

The composition of the review panels is defined in each assessment model document. The Foundation has compiled a database of more than 800 eligible reviewers, from which the panels are

formed. The officer responsible for each assessment process selects suitable experts for each panel depending on the curricula, fields of expertise, and profile required for the panel. The Foundation makes great efforts to involve experts from outside the Madrid Region in every panel. In case the panel cannot be formed from the experts included in the Foundation's database, a specific search is carried out, in cooperation with other evaluation agencies and institutions. For the accreditation of official programmes and for the DOCENTIA programme, the panels consist of teaching staff, external experts in the areas to be assessed, and students. In the accreditation renewal process and upon request from the universities, the door is open for professionals to participate. The panel notes that a procedure is in place to assess the contribution of every panel member at the end of each assessment procedure.

Prior to the implementation of the evaluation activities the Foundation provides the experts with briefing and training. During the training process, the agency provides the experts with information about evaluation management, guidelines for elaborating reports, explanations about the evaluation protocols etc. All members of evaluation committees met by the panel are positive about the training they receive.

The Foundation has an Advisory Committee on Higher Education Quality, consisting of high level international experts. However, in the panels and committees which perform the actual evaluations international experts are very rarely used. Foreign experts who speak Spanish language are not difficult to find. However, the extant procedure, where experts themselves need to apply in advance to become eligible for panel membership (i.e. to be included in the Foundation's database), is an obvious barrier for international expert involvement. In the opinion of the review panel, participation by international experts is one of the most important areas for improvement for the Foundation. The panel therefore suggests that the Foundation develop procedures to encourage the participation of international experts in reviews.

The Foundation includes students in its assessment processes and advisory bodies. Students participate in the review panels in Bachelor, Master and higher studies in the arts and in the DOCENTIA programme. Students are also full members of the Evaluation and Accreditation Committee. Moreover, an international student participates in the Advisory Committee on Higher Education Quality. Students are not involved in the procedures for accreditation of individual staff members. The panel notes the Foundation's efforts for the systematic involvement of students in evaluation procedures related to study programmes and quality of teaching. The panel understands that it is not always easy to appoint students on the panels and committees. The panel encourages the Foundation to cooperate with student organisations and other relevant stakeholders in order to find more students who would be willing to engage in external quality assurance processes.

The review model for accreditation renewal includes a self-evaluation report, a site visit, a draft report and a final report. However, no external follow-up happens after a positive accreditation renewal decision until the next accreditation renewal procedure 4 to 6 years later. After a negative overall evaluation accreditation is only granted upon submission of an improvement plan. In this case the Foundation decides on how much time the programme receives to implement the improvement plan. The monitoring process is in itself a follow-up procedure for the verification process (monitoring after 2-3 years). At institutional level the voluntary evaluation scheme DOCENTIA consists of several steps, from the design of the system and its implementation, over annual follow-up of the implementation, until the full certification upon successful implementation. Only in the certification phase does a site visit takes place. The representatives of the institutions with whom the panel have spoken all indicate that they find the model of review adequate. They also find the interaction with the reviewers satisfactory.

For evaluation and accreditation of staff, evaluation is always based on a file submitted by the person who wants to be evaluated. Based on the evaluation of this file a draft report is sent to the applicant. The applicant may comment on this report before it is finalized. No public reports are issued, as the content of the reports is subject to privacy regulations. The review panel finds this a satisfactory review model for the evaluation and accreditation of staff.

The Foundation implements the DOCENTIA programme in order to support **institutional** improvement and enhancement policies, which can serve as a fundamental element in the assurance of quality. In addition to this evaluation scheme at centre or institutional level, the external evaluation schemes at study programme level are primarily focused on quality improvement. The review panel finds this approach satisfactory.

At the end of any assessment process, a meta-evaluation is carried out. Information from the parties involved in the process is requested through different procedures, typically surveys. After analysis of the information gathered, findings are incorporated for the effective improvement of future processes. In addition to the meta-evaluation, the Foundation relies on its advisory bodies, external input, and the internal improvement tools included in its internal quality assurance system as mechanisms for continuous improvement.

Overall, the review panel is satisfied with the efforts done by the Foundation to make the procedures as fit-for-purpose as possible with the framework of the Spanish legislation. Also representatives of the institutions give a clear positive overall evaluation on the evaluation schemes the Foundation implements. Nevertheless, the combination of external assessments at individual, programme and institutional level might become excessive if sustained over a longer period of time. The ex-ante accreditation of staff in particular is an important barrier for entry of foreign staff in the Spanish higher education system, and is at odds with the international ambitions of higher education institutions and regional government in the Region of Madrid. The review panel does appreciate the initiatives taken by the Foundation to avoid double evaluations. Institutions certified within the DOCENTIA programme are exempt from some criteria within the programme evaluation schemes. Furthermore, the Foundation accepts international accreditations as replacement for the accreditation renewal process in case it has cooperation agreements in place with those accreditors and if those accreditations are in line with what has to be evaluated within the national procedure.

Recommendations

- The Foundation should further invest in finding more students who would be willing to engage in external quality assurance processes.
- The Foundation should develop procedures which encourage the participation of international experts in reviews.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation substantially complies with ESG 2.4.

4.1.5 ESG 2.5 Reporting

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

In order to ensure maximum benefit from external quality assurance processes, it is important that reports should meet the identified needs of the intended readership. Reports are sometimes intended for different readership groups and this will require careful attention to structure, content, style and tone. In general, reports should be structured to cover description, analysis (including relevant evidence), conclusions, commendations, and recommendations. There should be sufficient preliminary explanation to enable a lay reader to understand the purposes of the review, its form, and the criteria used in making decisions. Key findings, conclusions and recommendations should be easily locatable by readers. Reports should be published in a readily accessible form and there should be opportunities for readers and users of the reports (both within the relevant institution and outside it) to comment on their usefulness.

Findings of the panel

Evaluation reports are drafted by the different review panels and Evaluation Committees. The structure of the reports follows the guides, templates, protocols and criteria previously established. In general, the reports are structured with an introduction where the objective of the report, a description of the assessment performed, and conclusions, commendations and recommendations for improvement are laid out.

The evaluation reports are communicated directly to the interested parties, as follows:

- Reports on the monitoring and accreditation renewal of study programmes: the final evaluation reports are communicated to the evaluated party and final reports are published on the Foundation's website.
- Reports on DOCENTIA evaluations: the reports are published on the website after having been communicated to the evaluated institution.
- Teaching staff evaluation: since these are individual evaluations, only the person in question is informed about the outcome of the evaluation. This procedure is in line with the legal framework.

Based on the discussions the panel had during the site visit, it is clear that the intended readership of the reports is limited to the evaluated party. The panel suggests that the Foundation consider broadening the intended readership of the reports. In particular, the reports of individual study programmes may be useful for students and their families as independent sources of information, provided that the style and the information provided fit their needs.

Universities give positive feedback on the usefulness of the published reports. The review panel supports the positive evaluation in relation to suggestions for improvement. In all reports the panel read, clear suggestions are formulated for further quality improvement.

Nevertheless, reports should give - in addition to suggestions for improvement - clear justification for the conclusions they state. Although the justification of conclusions seems to be understood by the higher education institutions themselves, in some of the reports the panel reviewed, clear

justification of the conclusions is intelligible to a wider readership. Reports on accreditation renewal and DOCENTIA certification give a good insight in the strong and weak points per criterion, but the reports lack a clear deliberation per criterion and overall why the evaluation is positive or negative. Similarly, reports on Master programmes in the Arts lack such deliberation. In case of negative evaluations a list of recommendations for improvement supports the score somehow, while in cases of positive overall evaluation, no deliberation at all is stated explicitly in the report. Finally, also in Monitoring reports deliberation is lacking. Based on the analysis of reports, the panel has the impression that the Foundation recently improved its procedures relating to mentioning strong and weak points. The panel urges the Foundation to make sure this is the case in all reports it publishes. Additionally, the panel urges the Foundation to make explicit in all reports the deliberation which leads to a positive or negative conclusion. Probably, this would also help to make the reports more understandable for the broader readership, which is not involved on a daily basis with the unit of evaluation.

Recommendations

- The Foundation should relate key findings to conclusions more explicitly in its reports, making the deliberation by the panel visible.
- The Foundation should consider the style of reports, to make them useful to a wider readership.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation substantially complies with ESG 2.5.

4.1.6 ESG 2.6 Follow-up procedures

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

Quality assurance is not principally about individual external scrutiny events: It should be about continuously trying to do a better job. External quality assurance does not end with the publication of the report and should include a structured follow-up procedure to ensure that recommendations are dealt with appropriately and any required action plans drawn up and implemented. This may involve further meetings with institutional or programme representatives. The objective is to ensure that areas identified for improvement are dealt with speedily and that further enhancement is encouraged.

Findings of the panel

The Spanish legal framework requires that the Foundation must perform a periodic follow-up of the "official" study programmes (those leading to a degree with validity throughout the Spanish territory). This monitoring process is based on available public information and on information the universities acquire through the implementation of an internal quality assurance system, in advance of submission of the proposal for the accreditation renewal. The Foundation decided to monitor

each programme once between the verification process and accreditation renewal. The main aim of the monitoring process is to follow-up on the implementation of the verification report and improvement measures since the verification process. Nevertheless, the monitoring process might be focused more on the quality. It would be useful to evaluate whether the implemented programme is still fit for purpose and whether it has kept up with recent developments in the area of study.

Within the accreditation renewal process, the results of previous evaluations are taken into account. The renewal process of the accreditation envisages that the University comes up with a plan for improvement, to be evaluated by the Foundation. Only in case of a negative overall evaluation the Foundation requests an improvement plan before accreditation is granted. In any other case it is deemed to be the responsibility of the institution to follow up the suggestions made within the accreditation renewal process.

Regarding the DOCENTIA programme, the Foundation monitors the implementation for at least two years, and in the third year of implementation the certificate is issued for a period of 5 years, provided the conditions are met. After certification no follow-up is organised by the Foundation.

Within the procedures of staff evaluation no follow-up role is assigned to the Foundation. The follow-up is the responsibility of the higher education institution.

Overall, the panel notes that some opportunities for follow-up are taken, mainly in the set-up phase of programmes and when the DOCENTIA scheme is implemented in the higher education institution. Nevertheless, the ESG guideline states that the objective of follow-up procedures should be to ensure that areas identified for improvement are dealt with “speedily” and that further enhancement is encouraged. The panel is not convinced that the external quality assurance procedures as they are designed do guarantee that areas for improvement are dealt with speedily. Lack of follow-up ensuing accreditation renewal is the review panel’s major area of concern. The Foundation is recommended to consider requesting an action plan with a light follow-up check within a set period of one year at most.

Recommendations

- The Foundation should consider to focus more on quality within the monitoring process, rather than on mere implementation.
- The Foundation should implement a follow-up procedure within one year at most following accreditation renewal.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation partially complies with ESG 2.6.

4.1.7 ESG 2.7 Periodic reviews

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

Quality assurance is not a static but a dynamic process. It should be continuous and not “once in a lifetime”. It does not end with the first review or with the completion of the formal follow-up procedure. It has to be periodically renewed. Subsequent external reviews should take into account progress that has been made since the previous event. The process to be used in all external reviews should be clearly defined by the external quality assurance agency and its demands on institutions should not be greater than are necessary for the achievement of its objectives.

Findings of the panel

In the evaluation of study programmes (ex-ante accreditation, follow-up and accreditation renewal) as well as in the evaluation at institutional level (DOCENTIA scheme), evaluation is implemented on a cyclical basis, with periods of evaluation defined before implementation. In all these schemes, the evaluation protocols and criteria are published on the Foundation’s web site prior to the start of the processes.

As foreseen in the Spanish legal framework, accreditation of official programmes is a cycle that stretches either over 4 years (Master programmes), or over 6 years (Bachelor and Master studies in the arts programmes). The cycle starts with the Verification (ex-ante evaluation). The Accreditation Renewal takes place every 4-6 years (ex-post evaluation), with Monitoring between Verification and first Accreditation Renewal.

In DOCENTIA the Foundation evaluates the design of the teaching activity evaluation. Once the designs are favourably evaluated, the university must start the experimental implementation of these evaluations. During this stage a follow-up is conducted and once favourably passed, the university receives the certification of the evaluation procedures. After certification, a cyclical evaluation is established.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation fully complies with ESG 2.7.

4.1.8 ESG 2.8 System-wide analyses

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

All external quality assurance agencies collect a wealth of information about individual programmes and/or institutions and this provides material for structured analyses across whole higher education systems.

Such analyses can provide very useful information about developments, trends, emerging good practice and areas of persistent difficulty or weakness and can become useful tools for policy development and quality enhancement. Agencies should consider including a research and development function within their activities, to help them extract maximum benefit from their work.

Findings of the panel

Although the Foundation has taken some opportunities to inform higher education institutions and broader society about its activities, it recognizes as an area for improvement the publication of reports with additional information about developments, trends, emerging good practice and areas of persistent difficulty or weakness. The review panel stresses that the Foundation must invest more in system-wide analyses of the higher education system in the Region of Madrid, to exploit the potential of the work they carry out in the areas of public information and quality enhancement.

In relation to the monitoring of official programmes, a preliminary and provisional analysis of the first round of monitoring activity was presented at a conference for local higher education institutions on 19 March 2013. On that occasion, the focus was rather on the dissemination of the global results in order to improve the process. As soon as the Foundation has more experience with the accreditation renewal process, it foresees carrying out a global analysis of the results for the Madrid Higher Education System as a whole. For the time being, however, they consider that it is too early to come up with any meaningful and representative analysis. The review panel is sympathetic to this position, in view of the short time that the Foundation has been operating in its present form.

In the framework of cooperation with ANECA and the other regional Spanish agencies, the Foundation contributed to the organization of the 1st Conference on Best Practices in the DOCENTIA scheme on 26 February 2013. The event aimed at highlighting the good practices performed by universities on the basis of their involvement in the DOCENTIA scheme. The objective of the conference was to support the dissemination and encourage further improvement of the evaluation scheme.

The Foundation publishes annual activity reports which include a list of all activities carried out in relation to evaluation processes, including statistical data on these evaluations. Furthermore the Foundation participates in the drafting of annual reports on higher education in Spain in cooperation with ANECA and REACU. These reports feature the main outcomes of the activities of the higher education quality assurance agencies, both with respect to the evaluation of study programmes and institutions and of teaching and research staff.

Further dissemination activities evidencing the Foundation's endeavour to provide useful information, and its interest in carrying out relevant analytical studies, are an experts' seminar at the CEU University, a study on teaching staff mobility at the universities of Madrid, a report on the perceptions and expectations of secondary school leavers regarding the university and a report on internationalization of the universities of Madrid, which was also presented in a seminar.

Recommendations

- The Foundation should use the general findings of its external quality assurance processes more as a basis for system-wide analyses on the higher education system in the Region of Madrid.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation partially complies with ESG 2.8.

4.1.9 Findings of the panel in relation to ESG 3.1

Until 2013, the Agency for Quality, Accreditation and Prospective of the Universities of Madrid, ACAP, was the official agency for quality assurance in de Region of Madrid. In 2012 a process of change began, on the initiative of ACAP, with a view to adapting its operations to the ESG. Towards the end of 2013 ACAP merged with the *Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd*. The merger of the two institutions was reflected in the revision of the Foundation's Articles of Association. The merger has led to a stronger and more flexible organisation. All activities related to evaluation, certification and accreditation of institutions, programmes, and individuals of the Madrid Higher Education System are now performed by the Foundation.

Based on its analysis of documents provided and meetings with the stakeholders involved in the work of the Foundation, the panel concludes that the Foundation has implemented a broad range of evaluation schemes and it just started the implementation of the accreditation renewal procedure at study programme level which complements the existing procedures. The Foundation is broadly recognized as contributing to the quality culture in the higher education system in the Region of Madrid.

Although the panel identifies a number of areas for improvement in relation to Part 2 of the ESG, the panel is convinced that the external quality assurance activities of the Foundation satisfactorily take into account the presence and effectiveness of the external quality assurance processes described in Part 2 of the ESG.

The Foundation complies fully with ESG 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.7.

The Foundation complies substantially with ESG 2.4 and 2.5.

The Foundation complies partially with ESG 2.6 and 2.8.

Conclusion on ESG 3.1 Use of external quality assurance procedures for higher education

The panel concludes that the Foundation substantially complies with ESG 3.1.

b. ESG 3.3: Activities

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

These may involve evaluation, review, audit, assessment, accreditation or other similar activities and should be part of the core functions of the agency.

Findings of the panel

The Foundation is responsible for external quality assurance activities in the higher education system in the Region of Madrid. Since 2002, the Agency for Quality, Accreditation and Prospective of the Universities of Madrid, ACAP, and since the merger in 2013, the *Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd* has regularly developed activities related to external quality assurance.

At study programme level, the Foundation is responsible for follow-up procedure of all official Bachelor (Grado), Master and Doctoral study programmes. Starting from 2014 it has been involved in re-accreditation processes of all official study programmes in the Region of Madrid. Furthermore, the Foundation is responsible for ex-ante accreditation of Master programmes in the Arts.

At institutional level, the Foundation implements the nation-wide voluntary system for quality assurance of teaching activities DOCENTIA for the Region of Madrid.

One of the specific features of the Spanish university system is the external evaluation of teaching and research staff to be conducted by the quality evaluation agencies. ANECA is responsible for those activities for civil servants. Regional agencies can take up roles in the evaluation of contractual staff. Calls are launched by the Regional Government. This evaluation of teaching and research staff for their ex-ante accreditation, which is a precondition to obtaining a work contract at a university activity, involves a high workload for the Foundation.

In addition to its statutory tasks, the Foundation cooperates with international sectorial accreditation agencies. In order to promote international cooperation and recognition, the Foundation has signed cooperation agreements with agencies specialized in sectorial accreditations, such as the National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB), the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) and the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP). The Foundation promotes the activities of these agencies in the Region of Madrid and participates as an observer in the accreditation processes these agencies implement in the Region of Madrid.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation fully complies with ESG 3.3.

Conclusion on ENQA Criterion 1

Taking into account that the Foundation substantially complies with ESG 3.1 and fully complies with ESG 3.3, the panel concludes that the Foundation substantially complies with ENQA criterion 1.

4.2 ENQA criterion 2 / ESG 3.2: Official status

STANDARD:

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

Findings of the panel

The *Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd* is a non-profit organization established on 25 April 2002, by Decree 63/2002, under the initiative of the Regional Government of Madrid. Following the winding up of ACAP in 2013, the Government Council of the Region of Madrid was empowered to appoint the new official assessment body for the Madrid Higher Education System. With the publication of the Decree 63/2014 of 29 May, the Foundation was designated by the Regional Government as the official assessment body for the Madrid Higher Education System. Thus ACAP's activities and competences were taken over by the merged institution (the Foundation).

The Foundation's (and previously ACAP's) mandate derives from the competences bestowed upon the regional governments under the Organic Act 6/2001, of 21 December, modified by the Organic Act 4/2007, of 12 April, on universities. Article 31 stipulates that "*the functions of assessment, and the ones leading to the certification and accreditation..., correspond to both the National Agency for Quality and Accreditation, and to the assessment bodies foreseen in the legal frame by their respective regional governments, within their competencies.*"

As set out in the Articles of Association, the Foundation has the following functions:

- Contributing to the improvement of higher education through evaluation and other reports leading to the accreditation and certification of quality in the university system, as well as performance measurements of the public higher education service pursuant to objective procedures and transparent processes, considering the Spanish, European and international setting.
- Evaluating and accrediting science and technology programmes and projects.
- Promoting the protection and transfer of knowledge and technology between universities and research centres and workplace settings.
- Promoting the creation, consolidation and growth of companies with a technological base.
- Managing research and training programmes, and encouraging the dissemination of science and innovation through the organization of information and dissemination activities such as awards, scholarships, publications, conferences, seminars, etc.
- Promoting Madrid as a venue of international excellence in higher education, science and technology.
- Conducting such other activities as may be appropriate to achieve the aims set out above.

The Foundation is thus clearly recognized by the competent authority and has an established legal basis.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation fully complies with ESG 3.2, and thus fully complies with ENQA Criterion 2.

4.3 ENQA criterion 3 / ESG 3.4: Resources

STANDARD:

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

Findings of the panel

As outlined in its Articles of Association, the Foundation's funds may come from grants, voluntary contributions, inheritances, legacies, and donations received from public bodies or individuals. The Foundation may also obtain incomes from its own activities.

In practice, the Foundation's external quality assurance activities are mainly funded by an annual assignment from the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport included in the General Budget of the Government of the Region of Madrid. This assignment is based on the Annual Action Plan of the Foundation.

Other activities of the Foundation receive funding from the participation in European R&D programmes, mainly from the European Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development. Furthermore the Foundation charges fees for training activities and for other services provided by the Foundation.

The budget of the Assessment and Accreditation Area has decreased in a steady way over the last 5 years, parallel to the economic situation in Spain and cyclical changes in the workload of the Foundation. In 2008, ACAP had a budget of 1.5 million euro, which decreased to an assessment and accreditation budget of 881,032 euro for the Foundation in 2014. Nevertheless, the resources assigned to its activity have proven to be sufficient, given the amount and type of work to be carried out. The Strategic Plan approved by the Board of Trustees features a chapter on sustainability. One of its aims is to increase and diversify the funding sources, which will increase independence from the Government. The review panel supports this ambition. The panel understood that the merger of ACAP and the Foundation offers the Executive Director more freedom to spend the available budget and to create extra capacity for assessment and accreditation when a need arises. Indeed, the overall annual budget of the Foundation amounts to 3.4 million euro.

As the external quality assurance system has been implemented at the same moment for most higher education institutions, the Foundation faces peaks of workload in the years all programmes need monitoring or accreditation renewal. From 2015 on, most programmes will need accreditation renewal. This will lead to a strong growth of the work load with consequent increased expense. The Regional Minister of Education has promised an increase in the budget for the assessment and accreditation activities of the Foundation for 2015.

The Foundation has full legal capacity to define the profiles required for each of the positions to be filled, and may arrange selection processes for the provision of vacancies.

In addition to the Executive Director and the Manager, the staff of the Foundation consists of twelve administrative staff covering the five different areas of work. The staff serving at the Assessment and Accreditation Area (5 persons) hold higher education degrees and have broad experience in the fields of teaching, research, and university management, as well as experience in quality in higher education. The staff are trained on a regular basis.

The staff's role is to design and coordinate the procedures, with the support of the advisory bodies, while other purely administrative tasks or those that require specific skills are normally outsourced. The Foundation contracts technical support depending on the workload. For example, in 2014 two technical and two administrative staff were hired additionally. By operating this way, the Foundation is able to adapt to changes and needs. External staff and technical assistance complete the model and back the Foundation's sustainability. The panel notes this flexibility. Nevertheless, the model places increased emphasis on the need for effective internal communications in order to make sure that all staff involved in the implementation of external quality assurance are well informed. The panel noticed during its meeting with the staff a large gap in knowledge between the coordinating staff and the technical staff, e.g. about the ISO-certification of the Foundation. The panel believes that a stronger involvement of all staff could further improve the quality of the Foundation's work. In particular, when new staff are hired to cope with the peak of work load from 2015 on, efforts will be necessary to involve all staff in order to guarantee high quality and consistency in the implementation of assessment procedures.

The Foundation has adequate material resources for the correct performance of its tasks. The Foundation occupies an office in the city centre of Madrid. The premises include two meeting rooms and a classroom, where training activities and smaller meetings are organised, and sufficient working space.

Recommendations

- The Foundation should consider its internal communications strategy, to ensure the active involvement of all staff within the organization.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation substantially complies with ESG 3.4, and thus substantially complies with ENQA Criterion 3.

4.4 ENQA criterion 4 / ESG 3.5: Mission statement

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

These statements should describe the goals and objectives of agencies' quality assurance processes, the division of labour with relevant stakeholders in higher education, especially the higher education institutions, and the cultural and historical context of their work. The statements should make clear that the external quality assurance process is a major activity of the agency and that there exists a systematic approach to achieving its goals and objectives. There should also be documentation to demonstrate how the statements are translated into a clear policy and management plan.

Findings of the panel

The Foundation's mission is "to contribute to converting the quality in higher education, science, technology and innovation into a key element in the competitiveness and wellbeing of the citizens". It is formally laid down in the Articles of Association, approved on 20 December 2013, and in the Quality Policy, reviewed by its Managing Committee and signed by the Manager on 21 February 2014.

Alongside the mission, the Quality Policy and the Strategic Plan likewise focus on the view and values that must predominate over the actions of the Foundation: "In the field of higher education Evaluation, Certification and Evaluation, the Foundation aims to be a public organization with international recognition; a leader amongst Spanish agencies for quality, and a model in the promotion and development of measures and plans of quality and innovation in universities."

The principles stated in the mission are contained in the Foundation's strategic plan. This plan, designed for three years, is the key instrument of the Annual Action Plans that determines the strategic directions and the annual commitments to be undertaken.

The review panel discussed the position of external quality assurance activities within the Foundation with the different stakeholders. While at first it was afraid that ACAP was taken over by the Foundation and its activities might have lost importance in the new organisation, the panel has been convinced that the operation should rather be seen as a merger between two equal partners. The merger even strengthened the position of the external quality assurance activities as the newly organisation is strongly convinced of the value of external quality assurance and has more capacity and financial resources to implement its ambitions.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation fully complies with ESG 3.5, and thus fully complies with ENQA Criterion 4.

4.5 ENQA criterion 5 / ESG 3.6: Independence

STANDARD:

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

GUIDELINES:

An agency will need to demonstrate its independence through measures, such as

- its operational independence from higher education institutions and governments is guaranteed in official documentation (e.g. instruments of governance or legislative acts);
- the definition and operation of its procedures and methods, the nomination and appointment of external experts and the determination of the outcomes of its quality assurance processes are undertaken autonomously and independently from governments, higher education institutions, and organs of political influence;
- while relevant stakeholders in higher education, particularly students/learners, are consulted in the course of quality assurance processes, the final outcomes of the quality assurance processes remain the responsibility of the agency.

Findings of the panel

While involving external stakeholders at policy level, the panel is satisfied that the Foundation has sufficient safeguards in place in order to guarantee operational independence. Based on the information the panel received and the discussions it had with the different stakeholders, it has no indication that the Foundation's actions in the field of external quality assurance are influenced by public administrations, higher education institutions, external stakeholders, nor anybody with direct interests in the higher education setting.

The independence of the Foundation is formally established in its Articles of Association. When the Foundation was restructured so to include the activities previously performed by ACAP as part of its mission, the Articles of Association were set up to fully comply with the principle of independence. Thus, there are several elements in the Foundation's Articles of Association that evidence its legal and operational independence:

- Article 4: the Foundation "has its own legal entity and therefore has full legal capacity to act".
- Article 6: "Having regard for the circumstances attendant on each case, the Foundation shall act freely in order to focus its actions on any of the goals [...], in accordance with the specific aims that, at the discretion of its Board of Trustees, may take priority at that moment".
- Article 25.3: "The results of the evaluations carried out by the evaluation committees may not be modified by any other body of the Foundation".

The principle of independence is complemented in the text of the Code of Ethics by the principle of impartiality, declaring that:

- the Foundation "will avoid any form of preferential treatment in favour of institutions (public or private) or individuals."

- the Foundation “will always be in a position to justify its resolutions through decision-making procedures that exclude the use of arbitrary or insufficiently founded criteria.”
- The Foundation “staff will raise the conflicts of interest that may arise in relation to their work for the Foundation. In particular, they will refrain from taking decisions that may benefit either themselves, any of their nearest relatives, or any individual or group with vested interests.”

While the ESG focus on operational sustainability, the integration of ACAP into the Foundation has also increased independence from the higher education institutions at governance level within the organisation. While all Rectors of the universities of the region were members of ACAP’s Board, only two Rectors are now represented in the Foundation’s Board of Trustees. The review panel notes these efforts to increase the agency’s independence of higher education institutions and the fact that the Board of Trustees has a well-balanced composition with representation of Government, the higher education institutions, society and higher education and quality assurance experts. Nevertheless, it has some concerns about the important role the Government plays in the composition of the Board of Trustees and the funding of the Foundation.

Under the Foundation’s current Articles of Association, the Regional Minister of Education appoints the majority of members of the Board of Trustees. The Minister chairs the Board, and the Board has two further representatives of Government. The two representatives of the universities and three external experts need Ministerial approval also. Only the appointments of one representative of the Confederation of Employers and Industries of the Region of Madrid, and four international experts do not need to be approved by the Minister. The panel was convinced that the central role the current Regional Minister of Education plays in the composition of the Board was a formal step, necessary for the required change in the composition of the Foundation’s Board. Further, the panel took the view that the Minister’s highly active support has been a critical factor in the successful initial establishment of the Foundation’s increased responsibilities. There was no sign whatever that the Minister had intervened in assessment judgements. In practice, therefore, the input of the current Regional Minister is a very positive factor, at the Foundation’s current state of evolution. However, in the longer term, the panel considers that the Foundation’s independence should have better guarantees, and that it would be desirable to make arrangements for more independence from Government over time. A common way to establish such independence is to make the Board itself responsible for replacing members as their terms of office finish; however, it is the end of independence from government that the panel considers important, not any particular means to ensure it.

As indicated before (see Criterion 3: Resources), the Foundation relies for the great majority of its funding on the Regional Government, which allocates funds on the basis of an acceptable annual action plan and budget. This does not appear to have a direct impact on the decision making processes within the Foundation, but it does limit its independence to change its activities fundamentally. The review panel therefore suggests the Foundation should strive to diversify its sources of income.

In relation to the operational independence of the Foundation, the Executive Director is endowed with executive powers to act with full independence from the Board of Trustees (Article 23). The Executive Director signs off all procedures for the evaluation, accreditation and certification processes of the Foundation, as well as the composition of the panels.

For the composition of panels and committees, the Foundation has access to an expert database with currently approximately 800 names registered. This database allows for a selection of

independent experts. In any case, the principle that is common to all the selection criteria used for the different assessment processes is that at least 50% of the reviewers need to come from outside of the University System of Madrid at the time of their selection. As indicated above, the review panel recommends that the Foundation makes greater efforts to find more experts outside Spain.

In order to consolidate the effective application of the principle of independence, the composition of all review panels and the Assessment and Certification Committee are made public through the Foundation's website. This allows the stakeholders or institutions to know the identity of the members who will be involved in the processes. Thus they may object to the participation of those whom they deem likely to have vested interests. In those cases, and when these objections are properly founded and motivated, the Foundation will replace the expert.

Most important to guarantee the independence of the results of the quality assurance processes is that the panels and committees can function independently. This guarantee for real independence of the experts' opinions is set in the Foundation's Articles of Association, where in article 25, point 3, it is established that "The results of the evaluations carried out by the evaluation committees may not be modified by any other body of the Foundation".

While the final outcomes of the quality assurance processes clearly are the responsibility of the panels and committees, relevant stakeholders in higher education, such as students and representatives of civil society (including employers) are consulted in the course of quality assurance processes.

Recommendations

- The Foundation might reconsider the appointment procedure of the Board of Trustees in order to achieve greater formal independence from the Regional Government.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation substantially complies with ESG 3.6, and thus substantially complies with ENQA Criterion 5.

4.6 ENQA Criterion 6 / ESG 3.7: External quality assurance criteria and processes used by the agencies

STANDARD:

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

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

GUIDELINES:

Agencies may develop and use other processes and procedures for particular purposes.

Agencies should pay careful attention to their declared principles at all times, and ensure both that their requirements and processes are managed professionally and that their conclusions and decisions are reached in a consistent manner, even though the decisions are formed by groups of different people.

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

Findings of the panel

All external quality assurance processes carried out by the Foundation are defined prior to the beginning of the process. In some cases, due to legal requirements, processes are published in the Official Gazette of the Regional Government of Madrid. It is a requirement that the process be perfectly defined, since this is the only way in which the rights and obligations of the individuals or institutions that undergo an assessment are fully guaranteed.

All documents are published on the Foundation's website (www.madrimasd.org). Moreover, the Foundation usually organises information and training seminars with universities, participates in thematic forums, visits Higher Education institutions upon request, etc.

The external quality assurance processes handled by the Foundation entail the preparation of a self-report, understood as a self-assessment to be completed by the institution of the programme that is being assessed. These self-reports, in addition to answering to the specific items associated to the assessment process, need to involve a reflection for those who are responsible for the assessment processes; a reflection that will allow them to verify both the strengths and weaknesses of the processes that are being analysed.

The assessment of self-reports is carried out by a group of experts. The exact composition of the review panels is determined by the nature of each assessment process. In processes evaluating study programmes and in the DOCENTIA programme students are involved. Site visits are limited, in

principle, to those processes in which the accreditation of an institution or of a programme is carried out. They do not apply to monitoring processes. In the case of institutional and teaching quality assessments, site visits are foreseen within an accreditation process for the development of the model as a whole. The panel believes site visits play an important role in external quality assurance as they allow an active exchange between the people evaluated and their peers.

The peer review panel discussed with Foundation staff and stakeholders the procedures for programmes and institutions to comment on draft reports. In the case of study programmes and institutional evaluations, the Branch Committee issues a preliminary report which is communicated to the interested party. Then a period for the submission of allegations is opened about the contents of the report. Finally, the Accreditation and Evaluation Committee reviews the report, taking into account the relevant considered observations, and the final report is issued. For the verification of Arts programmes, the review panel drafts the concept report and the Branch Committee is responsible for issue of the final report. As indicated under ESG 2.3, the panel suggests that the final report be checked by the review panel before it is finally established.

Appeal procedures are in place, but no appeals have been submitted yet, except in relation to the accreditation of teaching staff. In discussion with the review panel, representatives of higher education institutions were not able to explain how an actual appeal would work. The panel therefore considers that the appeal procedure should be communicated more explicitly. A description of the appeal procedure should always be part of the protocol describing the full procedure. The Foundation is aware that it should create clear appeal procedures for the other evaluation schemes.

As discussed under ESG 2.5 Reporting, the reports written by the Foundation are well appreciated by the higher education institutions involved. Nevertheless, in most of the reports reviewed by the panel a clear deliberation why the evaluation is positive or negative is lacking. Reports are published for monitoring and accreditation renewal of study programmes and for DOCENTIA.

As discussed under ESG 2.6 Follow-up, the review panel does not find the Foundation's follow-up procedures adequate in all cases. The monitoring process offers a follow-up of the verification process, although the panel does not consider this follow-up to be speedy. For the accreditation renewal process, no follow-up at all is foreseen in case of an overall positive report. Within the DOCENTIA programme, an extensive system of follow-up is in place in the phase the programme is established, but also after certification the implementation is followed up.

Recommendations

- The Foundation should clearly communicate the appeal procedures.
- The Foundation should implement a follow-up procedure after a positive accreditation renewal decision.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation substantially complies with ESG 3.7, and thus substantially complies with ENQA Criterion 6.

4.7 ENQA Criterion 7 / ESG 3.8: Accountability procedures

STANDARD:

Agencies should have in place procedures for their own accountability.

GUIDELINES:

These procedures are expected to include the following:

1. A published policy for the assurance of the quality of the agency itself, made available on its website.
2. Documentation which demonstrates that:
 - the agency's processes and results reflect its mission and goals of quality assurance;
 - the agency has in place, and enforces, a no-conflict-of-interest mechanism in the work of its external experts;
 - the agency has reliable mechanisms that ensure the quality of any activities and material produced by subcontractors, if some or all of the elements in its quality assurance procedure are sub-contracted to other parties;
 - the agency has in place internal quality assurance procedures which include an internal feedback mechanism (i.e. means to collect feedback from its own staff and council/board); an internal reflection mechanism (i.e. means to react to internal and external recommendations for improvement); and an external feedback mechanism (i.e. means to collect feedback from experts and reviewed institutions for future development) in order to inform and underpin its own development and improvement.
3. A mandatory cyclical external review of the agency's activities at least once every five years.

Findings of the panel

The Foundation considers **quality** to be a key factor in the performance of its functions. In this sense, it directs all its efforts towards the continuous improvement of its service through a process-based management, which is intended for the clients, and the results within the framework of innovation, development, and learning. Within this framework, the Foundation has established an ISO 9001 certified internal quality assurance system, in which its mission, vision, and values are integrated. This quality assurance policy is available on the Foundation's website.

With the aim of describing the Quality Management System, a Quality Handbook was set up. This Handbook is applicable to all the documents and records of the Quality System of the Foundation, generated from the services provided in the field of higher education quality within a framework of both national and international cooperation. These include the activities of design and application of evaluation, certification, and accreditation systems of institutions, programmes, and individuals.

A process flow chart with the processes necessary for the management of quality and the continuous improvement of the system's effectiveness and the sequence and interaction between them has been developed for several processes. All the processes described in the flowchart are subject to a detailed description, in a continuous effort for control and improvement. The review panel has checked several of the process descriptions and is convinced that much attention is paid to the design of procedures for all major processes within the organisation.

The agency's processes and results reflect its quality assurance mission and goals. Based on the meetings the review panel had with the different stakeholders, it is clear that the Foundation operates in line with its ambition to contribute to the quality of higher education in the Region of Madrid and is considered an important actor in this objective. The day-to-day activities of the Foundation are based on a Strategic plan and Annual Action Plans which indicate priorities the Foundation focusses on.

Furthermore, the Foundation has established a Code of Ethics, available on its web site, intended to avoid conflicts of interests in its assessment activity. This Code is applicable both to its staff and to external experts. The Code of Ethics clearly points at the issue of conflicts of interest (section 6): "The Foundation's staff will state the conflicts of interest that may arise in relation to their work for the Foundation. In particular, they will refrain from taking decisions that may benefit either themselves, any of their nearest relatives, or any individual or group with vested interests." This section is also applicable to the members of the managerial bodies of the Foundation and the external experts who cooperate with the Foundation.

This Code of Ethics underlies all evaluation protocols. In review processes carried out by the Foundation, reviewers are informed that they must abide by the Code of Ethics, and report to the Foundation any conflict of interest they might identify. In addition to this, the Foundation makes public its review panels and reviewers' evaluations. Thus, should any conflict of interest arise, it can be reported to the Foundation, and the issue will be reconsidered.

The Foundation has a specific procedure for the evaluation and re-evaluation of suppliers which is applicable to suppliers of goods and general services used by the Foundation to carry out its activities.

Internally, the Foundation schedules a weekly Technical Coordination meeting in order to check the results of recent activities and plan the work for weeks to come. Additionally, a system of Quality Audits has been designed. This procedure explains how internal and external system quality audits and assessments are scheduled, programmed, executed, and how the outcomes are used for continuous improvement. Also for nonconformities procedures have been developed to take corrective actions. Based on the feedback of the stakeholders the peer review panel met, it concludes that the Foundation indeed shows a great willingness to continuously improve the quality of its work.

External feedback is gathered through clients' and stakeholders' satisfaction surveys and meetings. Although stakeholders are positive about the amount and quality of the surveys they receive, some of them would appreciate more face-to-face meetings in order to give feedback on the work of the Foundation.

Furthermore, the Foundation counts on two advisory bodies that gather periodically: the Advisory Committee on Higher Education Quality, with an international scope, and the Advisory Council for Higher Education Quality in the Region of Madrid, with a national/regional scope. These advisory bodies are sources of ideas and recommendations for improvement. The review panel notes that these advisory bodies facilitate regular meetings with a broad range of stakeholders. Nevertheless, based on its meetings with several members of the Advisory Committee, the panel is convinced that this Committee could be used more actively in order to design the strategy for the future of the Foundation. For example, it surprised the panel that the whole merger process between ACAP and the Foundation had not been discussed with this Committee.

The Foundation is committed to undergoing an external review every five years, once it has become a Full Member of ENQA.

Recommendations

- The Foundation should use the Advisory Committee on Higher Education Quality better.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation fully complies with ESG 3.8, and thus fully complies with ENQA Criterion 7.

4.8 ENQA Criterion 8: Consistency of judgements, appeals system and contribution to ENQA aims

STANDARD

- i. The agency pays careful attention to its declared principles at all times, and ensures both that its requirements and processes are managed professionally and that its judgments and decisions are reached in a consistent manner, even if the judgments are formed by different groups.
- ii. If the agency makes formal quality assurance decisions or conclusions which have formal consequences, it should have an appeals procedure. The nature and form of the appeals procedure should be determined in the light of the constitution of the agency.
- iii. The agency is willing to contribute actively to the aims of ENQA.

Findings of the panel

Based on its discussions with different stakeholders and the documentation provided, the panel is convinced that the Foundation pays careful attention to quality improvement and the development of a quality culture in the higher education system in the Madrid Region. The Foundation ensures both that its requirements and processes are managed professionally and that its judgments and decisions are reached in a consistent manner. The system of checking through Branch- and Evaluation and Accreditation Committees plays an important role in guaranteeing consistent judgments.

As mentioned under ESG 3.7, the peer review panel has discussed the procedures for programmes and institutions to appeal. Appeal procedures are well established for evaluation schemes which evaluate individual performance. For the other evaluation schemes the Foundation should communicate existence of appeal procedures better.

As mentioned before, the panel has noticed the strong support from all stakeholders and particularly from regional government ministers for the Foundation to become a Full Member of ENQA, as an important step to ensure its full involvement in the European Higher Education Area. Indeed, Spanish legislation states full membership of ENQA as a necessary condition to take full responsibility for some evaluation schemes, such as the ex-ante accreditation of university programmes. Furthermore, the Foundation has the ambition to become more active at the European level. Until now, international cooperation within the Foundation has been mainly focussed on the US and the Spanish speaking world. ENQA membership may allow to extend this network to the whole of Europe. The establishment of stronger networks in Europe may be a step towards stronger involvement of international panel members in review procedures.

Recommendations

- The Foundation should clearly communicate the appeal procedures.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the Foundation substantially complies with ENQA Criterion 8.

5 Conclusion and development

In the light of the documentary and oral evidence considered by it, the Review Panel is of the opinion that, although in the performance of some of its functions, the *Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd* is not fully compliant with the *ENQA Membership Provisions*, the Agency is, nonetheless sufficiently compliant to justify full membership of ENQA, and the review panel recommends that the ENQA Board accept the Foundation's application.

The criteria where full compliance has been achieved are 2, 4 and 7. For criteria 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8 the Foundation complies substantially. The Foundation is recommended to take appropriate action, so far as it is empowered to do so, to achieve full compliance with these criteria at the earliest opportunity.

6 Recommendations

- The Foundation should formalize its examination of assessment frameworks leading to accreditation decisions which are accepted as replacement of the Foundation's own accreditation renewal processes.
- The Foundation should make better use of stakeholders such as employer organisations in the operation and oversight of their review methods.
- The Foundation should involve panel members in the feedback procedure and should have the final report checked by the review panel before the Evaluation and Accreditation Committee finally publishes it.
- The Foundation should further invest in finding more students who would be willing to engage in external quality assurance processes.
- The Foundation should develop procedures which encourage the participation of international experts in reviews.
- The Foundation should relate key findings to conclusions more explicitly in its reports, making the deliberation by the panel visible.
- The Foundation should consider the style of reports, to make them useful to a wider readership.
- The Foundation should consider to focus more on quality within the monitoring process, rather than on implementation of the original plans.
- The Foundation should implement a follow-up procedure within one year at most following a positive accreditation renewal decision.
- The Foundation should use the general findings of its external quality assurance processes more as a basis for system-wide analyses on the higher education system in the Region of Madrid.
- The Foundation should consider its internal communications strategy, to ensure the active involvement of all staff within the organization.
- The Foundation might reconsider the appointment procedure of the Board of Trustees in order to achieve greater formal independence from the Regional Government.
- The Foundation should use the Advisory Committee on Higher Education Quality better.
- The Foundation should clearly communicate the appeal procedures.

7 Annexes

7.1. Annex - Site visit schedule

Tuesday November 18th 2014

15:30 - 18:30 Private meeting of the review panel

18:30 - 20:00 Presentation of the evaluation activities and first meeting with the Management of the Agency

- Luis Sánchez Álvarez - Executive Director
- José de la Sota - Manager

20:00 Dinner

Wednesday November 19th 2014

9:00 - 10:00 Advisory Council in University Quality of the Region of Madrid

- David Carabantes Alarcón - Vicerrector Universidad Complutense de Madrid
- Luis Miguel Doncel Pedrera - Vicerrector Universidad Rey Juan Carlos
- Francisco Santos Olalla - Deputy Vicerrector Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
- Isabel Mayor Bastida - Social Council Universidad Rey Juan Carlos
- Sixto García Alonso - Social Council Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
- Javier Gabiola Ondarra - Vicerrector Universidad Alfonso X el Sabio
- José Ignacio Baile Ayensa - Vicerrector UDIMA
- Esther Balboa García - Expert (ANECA)

10:00 - 10:15 Break

10:15 - 11:15 Meeting with the Board of Trustees

- Eugenio Martínez Falero - Vicepresident of fmid
- Rocío Albert López-Ibor - General Director of Universities and Research
- Sol Olabarri Fernández - Secretary General of CEIM
- Jesús Andreu Ardura - General Director of Fundación Carolina
- José María Sanz Martínez - Rector Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
- Daniel Sada Castaño - Rector Universidad Francisco de Vitoria

11:30 - 12:00 Meeting with the Regional Minister of Education, Youth and Sports

- Lucía Figar de Lacalle - Region Minister of Education, Youth and Sports

Assisted by:

- Lorena Heras Sedano - General Vicedirector of Universities
- Irene Correas Sosa - Chef of Cabinet, Ministry of Education Youth and Sports

12:00 - 13:30 Lunch break

13:30 - 14:00 Meeting with the President of the Madrid Regional Government

- Ignacio González González - President of the Madrid Regional Government President

14:00 - 14:15 Break

14:15 - 15:15 Meeting with the Universities' Technical Quality Units

- M^a del Mar Herrador - Universidad San Pablo CEU
- Myriam Muñoz - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
- Cristina Peláez Lorenzo - Universidad Europea de Madrid
- Paloma Puente Ortega - Universidad Francisco de Vitoria
- Ana Alonso - Universidad de Alcalá
- Patricia López Navarro - Universidad Carlos III de Madrid
- Belén Jiménez del Olmo - Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

15:15 - 15:30 Break

15:30 - 16:30 Meeting with the Evaluation and Accreditation Committee

- Ubaldo Cuesta Cambra - Universidad Complutense de Madrid
- Laura Ortíz Chaves - Universidad de Barcelona (Student)
- Francisco Ayuga Téllez - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
- Celso Rodríguez Fernández - Universidad de Santiago de Compostela
- Antonio Calvo Bernardino - Universidad San Pablo CEU
- Manuel González Morales - Universidad de Cantabria

16:30 - 16:45 Break

16:45 - 17:30 Meeting with the Advisory Committee on Higher Education Quality

- Rainer H. F. Künzel - Universität Osnabrück
- Guy Haug - International Expert

17:30 - 18:00 Individual calls with members of the Advisory Committee

- Miroslav Hajnos - European Student Union
- Steven D. Crow - S.D. Crow & Co, LLC.
- Michael K. J. Milligan - Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, ABET

18:00 - 18:15 Break

18:15 - 19:15 Meeting with members of Review panels

- Rosanna de la Rosa Eduardo - Universidad Pública de Navarra (Student)
- Raúl Arellano Colomina - Universidad de Granada
- Covadonga de la Iglesia Villasol - Universidad Complutense de Madrid
- Matilde Sierra Vega - Universidad de León
- Manuel Larran Jorge - Universidad de Cádiz
- José Antonio Portilla Figueras - Universidad de Alcalá
- José Manuel Vasallo Magro - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
- Rosa Santero Sánchez - Universidad Rey Juan Carlos

20:00 Dinner

Thursday November 20th 2014

9:00 - 10:00 Meeting with Experts involved in Docentia and staff accreditation

- Eduardo García Jiménez - Universidad de Sevilla

- Fernando Blanco Lorente - Universidad de Zaragoza
- Fernando Galán Palomares - Universidad de Cantabria (Student)
- Jesús Romero Trillo - Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
- Mari Carmen Cartagena - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
- José Manuel Udías Moineiro - Universidad Complutense de Madrid

10:00 - 10:15 Break

10:15 - 11:15 Final meeting with the Staff of the agency

- Raúl de Andrés - Quality Assurance Manager
- Óscar Vadillo - Head of Unit Evaluation and Accreditation
- Concha Serrano - Head of Unit Evaluation and Accreditation
- Irene Santos García - Technical Assistance
- Irene de la Jara - Technical Assistance
- Jesús Rojo - International Accreditations Manager
- Guillermo García-Badell - International Accreditations Expert

11:15 - 13:00 Internal review panel discussion

13:00 - 13:30 Final meeting with the Management of the agency

- Luis Sánchez Álvarez - Executive Director
- José de la Sota - Manager

13:30 - 16:00 Final discussion of review panel to agree outcomes and to discuss main lines of the report with lunch

16:00 - 16:15 Presentation of the conclusions of the panel to the Board and staff

7.2 Annex - Supporting document

Criterion 1 – Activities (ESG 3.1, 3.3)	
ESG 2.1 USE OF INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES	
1.1.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
1.1.2	Royal Decree 1393/2007, of 29 October, modified by the Royal Decree 861/2010, of 2 July
1.1.3	DOCENTIA Guide for Certification
1.1.4	Higher Education in the Arts Evaluation Protocol
1.1.5	Framework Document for Official Degrees Monitoring
1.1.6	Accreditation Renewal Protocol
ESG 2.2 DEVELOPMENT OF EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES	
1.2.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
1.2.2	DOCENTIA Guide for Certification
1.2.3	Higher Education in the Arts Evaluation Protocol
1.2.4	Framework Document for Official Degrees Monitoring
1.2.5	Accreditation Renewal Protocol
1.2.6	Minutes of the Advisory Council in Higher Education Quality of the Region of Madrid
1.2.7	PO01 Design of evaluation models for education quality
1.2.8	PE04 Evaluation and Accreditation Committee
ESG 2.3 CRITERIA FOR DECISIONS	
1.3.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
1.3.2	DOCENTIA Guide for Certification
1.3.3	Higher Education in the Arts Evaluation Protocol
1.3.4	Framework Document for Official Degrees Monitoring
1.3.5	Accreditation Renewal Protocol
1.3.6	PE04 Evaluation and Accreditation Committee
ESG 2.4 PROCESSES FIT FOR PURPOSE	
1.4.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
1.4.2	DOCENTIA Guide for Certification
1.4.3	Higher Education in the Arts Evaluation Protocol
1.4.4	Framework Document for Official Degrees Monitoring
1.4.5	Accreditation Renewal Protocol
1.4.6	Internal Reviewers Database (available on site)
1.4.7	PS05 Experts' participation in evaluation systems
1.4.8	PM06 Evaluation and re-evaluation of reviewers
1.4.9	PE03 Advisory Committee on Higher Education Quality
1.4.10	PE04 Evaluation and Accreditation Committee
ESG 2.5 REPORTING	
1.5.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
1.5.2	DOCENTIA Guide for Certification
1.5.3	Higher Education in the Arts Evaluation Protocol
1.5.4	Framework Document for Official Degrees Monitoring
1.5.5	Accreditation Renewal Protocol
1.5.6	Assessment Reports
1.5.7	Minutes of meetings of the Review Panels
1.5.8	Records of meetings with the Higher Education Institutions
ESG 2.6 FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES	
1.6.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
1.6.2	DOCENTIA Guide for Certification
1.6.3	Higher Education in the Arts Evaluation Protocol
1.6.4	Framework Document for Official Degrees Monitoring
1.6.5	Accreditation Renewal Protocol
1.6.6	Assessment Reports
1.6.7	Improvement plan of Universities
ESG 2.7 PERIODIC REVIEWS	
1.7.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
1.7.2	DOCENTIA Guide for Certification
1.7.3	Higher Education in the Arts Evaluation Protocol
1.7.4	Framework Document for Official Degrees Monitoring
1.7.5	Accreditation Renewal Protocol
1.7.6	Royal Decree 1393/2007, of 29 October, modified by the Royal Decree 861/2010, of 2 July

ESG 2.8 SYSTEM-WIDE ANALYSES	
1.8.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
1.8.2	Annual Activity Reports
1.8.3	Annual Reports on Higher Education in Spain
1.8.4	Report on the perception and expectations of secondary school leavers
1.8.5	Documentation of the DOCENTIA Conference
1.8.6	Documentation of Expert's Seminar at CEU
1.8.7	Study on Faculty Mobility
1.8.8	Report on Internationalization of the Universities of Madrid
1.8.9	Documentation about the seminar of presentation of the Report on internationalization
Criterion 2 - Official Status (ESG 3.2)	
2.1	Act 6/2013, of 23 December, on Budgetary and Administrative Measures, of the Regional Government of Madrid
2.2	Decree 63/2014, of 29 May, which designates the <i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> the evaluation body in Higher Education in the Region of Madrid
2.3	Decree 63/2002, of 25 April, which authorises the creation of the <i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i>
2.4	Organic Act 6/2001, of 21 December, modified by the Organic Act 4/2007, of 12 April, on Universities
2.5	Articles of Association of <i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i>
Criterion 3- Resources (ESG 3.4)	
3.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
3.2	Organizational Chart
3.3	Lists of Review Panels
3.4	PE04 Evaluation and Accreditation Committee
3.5	Evaluation and Accreditation Committee Minutes
3.6	Annual Action Plan
3.7	Headquarters premises plan
3.8	Board of Trustees Minutes
3.9	Accounts Records (available on site)
Criterion 4 – Mission Statement (ESG 3.5.)	
4.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
4.2	<i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> Articles of Association
4.3	<i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> Quality Policy
4.4	<i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> Strategic Plan
4.5	Annual Action Plan
Criterion 5 – Independence (ESG 3.6.)	
5.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
5.2	<i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> Articles of Association
5.3	<i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> Quality Policy
5.4	Code of Ethics
5.5	PS05 Experts Participation in Evaluation Systems
Criterion 6 – External Quality Assurance, Criteria And Processes Used By Members (ESG 3.7)	
6.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
6.2	DOCENTIA Guide for Certification
6.3	Higher Education in the Arts Evaluation Protocol
6.4	Framework Document for Official Degrees Monitoring
6.5	Accreditation Renewal Protocol
6.6	Assessment Reports
6.7	Lists of Review Panels
6.8	Annual activity reports
Criterion 7 – Accountability Procedures (ESG 3.8)	
7.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
7.2	<i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> Quality Policy
7.3	<i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> Quality Handbook
7.4	<i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> ISO 9001:2008 Certificate
7.5	ACAP ISO 9001:2008 Certificate
7.6	Code of Ethics
7.7	<i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> Articles of Association
7.8	PM05 "Evaluation and re-evaluation of suppliers"
7.9	PM06 "Evaluation and re-evaluation of reviewers"
7.10	PE01 Establishment of Quality Policy, Quality Objectives and System Review by Direction
7.11	PE02 Technical Coordination
7.12	PM01 Quality Audits
7.13	PM02 Nonconformities, corrective actions and preventive actions

7.14	PM03 Clients and stakeholders satisfaction evaluation
7.15	PE03 Advisory Committee on Higher Education Quality
7.16	PE05 Advisory Council for Higher Education Quality in the Region of Madrid
Criterion 8 – Consistency Of Judgements, Appeals System And Contribution To ENQA AIMS	
8.1	Web site (www.madrimasd.org/acreditacion)
8.2	<i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> Quality Policy
8.3	<i>Fundación para el Conocimiento Madrimasd</i> Strategic Plan
8.4	DOCENTIA Guide for Certification
8.5	Higher Education in the Arts Evaluation Protocol
8.6	Framework Document for Official Degrees Monitoring
8.7	Accreditation Renewal Protocol
8.8	PE04 Evaluation and Accreditation Committee
8.9	Meta-assessments Reports
8.10	PE03 Advisory Committee on Higher Education Quality
8.11	Memorandum of understanding and cooperation agreements signed with International Accreditation Entities