



AGENCIA NACIONAL DE EVALUACIÓN
DE LA CALIDAD Y ACREDITACIÓN

Audit Guide

Order ECI/229/2006

(Version 1)

This document is property of ANECA. Any total or partial reproduction, modification and/or transmission in any form or by whatsoever means, without the prior written authorization of ANECA, is explicitly prohibited. ANECA shall not be responsible for any possible loss or mistake resulting from modifying the information contained in this document.

1 INTRODUCTION

The Spanish Ministry of Education and Science makes a call for applications for the award and renewal of the Quality Label to Ph.D. studies at Spanish universities for the 2006-2007 academic year. (Order ECI/229/2006, of 20 January 2006).

For Ph.D. programmes that have obtained the Quality Label in previous calls for applications and have not been adapted to Royal Order 56/2005 (Annex C of the Ministerial Command Order), renewal will be as follows:

a) By audit, by way of the *in situ* verification of the information provided in the application that led to the award of the Quality Label. This will apply to cases of renewal of the Quality Label for Ph.D. studies where it was first obtained for the 2005-2006 academic year and cases where it was awarded for the 2004-2005 academic year and either renewal was not applied for relative to the 2005-2006 academic year or renewal was not given for that academic year.

b) By simple renewal, following confirmation that the conditions in which the Quality Label was previously granted are maintained, which will apply to:

1. Ph.D. studies that obtained the Quality Label for the 2004-2005 academic year and obtained renewal by audit for the 2005-2006 academic year.

2. Ph.D. studies that obtained the Quality Label for the 2003-2004 academic year, renewal by audit for the 2004-2005 academic year and did not apply for renewal for the 2005-2006 academic year, or renewal by audit for the 2005-2006 academic year in cases where renewal was not applied for relative to the 2004-2005 academic year.

c) By validation, subject to confirmation that the conditions in which the Quality Label was previously granted are maintained, together with the degree of compliance with the aims and results deriving from this. This will apply to Ph.D. studies that obtained the Quality Label for the 2003-2004 academic year, renewal by audit for the 2004-2005 academic year, and further renewal for the 2005-2006 academic year via the simple procedure.

The information contained in this guide refers to Ph.D. programmes that are renewing the Quality Label according to section a).

The procedure for renewing the Quality Label by AUDIT will begin with an application from the interested party, using the application form available from the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science's website (www.mec.es).

The Directorate General for Universities will begin the processing of applications the day after the deadline for submission. If the information provided is incomplete or does not comply with the prerequisites called for in the abovementioned Order, the applicant will be required to either complete the documentation or make good any shortcoming within a period of ten days, with the warning that non-compliance will signify that the application has been withdrawn, under the terms of article 71.1 of Law 30/1992 of 26 November, with the effects that are stipulated in article 42.1 of said Law.

Once the Directorate General for Universities (DGU) has checked that the applications are correct, they are then sent to the National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation of Spain (ANECA).

The ANECA designates the auditors who will visit the universities between April and June and who will exercise their functions according to this guide.

The auditors will submit their final reports on the audit to the QL Renewal Committee, which is made up of the person in charge of the ANECA's Quality Label Programme and the chairpersons of the five assessment committees (see the procedural manual for the issuance of reports leading to the award of the Quality Label. www.aneca.es), who, on the basis of the reports, shall recommend the list of programmes for renewal of the Quality Label to the DGU.

The ANECA will then send the results of the audits to the DGU, which is responsible for drawing up a resolution with the Ph.D. programmes to be awarded the Quality Label. This resolution will be published in the Official Bulletin of the Spanish State (*Boletín Oficial del Estado*).

The Quality Label represents recognition of the scientific, technical and formative soundness of the Ph.D. studies, and of the groups and departments involved in the doctoral training.

Programmes that obtain the Quality Label will be included in a list of Quality Label Ph.D. studies in Spanish universities, which will be public and will serve as a benchmark for quality assurance that may be used for purposes defined in the call for applications. The DGU will be responsible for disseminating and periodically updating this list.

There is a twofold purpose for the National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation of Spain presenting this guide:

- To indicate the steps to be followed by the auditors when carrying out the audit process of Ph.D. programmes that have requested this.
- To define the documentation that the coordinators of the different Ph.D. programmes must make available to the auditors on the day of the visit (see Annex III).

2 THE AUDIT AND THE AUDITORS

The Ph.D. programme audit consists of a methodical and independent process to determine whether the information provided in the application by the Ph.D. programme at the time of the visit complies with the information given in the application.

The fundamental aim of the audit is therefore to check the veracity, from an external perspective, of the information and the details relative to the Ph.D. programme contained in the audit file prepared for this purpose (Annex I).

This process is carried out by the auditors who analyse the information contained in the dossier sent by the Ph.D. programme, visit the university to check that the information and data provided for this process comply, gather any necessary evidence for the verification process, and write up their conclusions in the audit file and audit report (Annexes I and II).

The audit is thus a way of checking and of providing transparency and an independent approach to an assessment process carried out previously and through which the Quality Label recognition has been awarded.

The knowledge of the contents of this guide is therefore a fundamental prerequisite for both the auditors and those who are being audited, as it is the

frame of reference for verifying the information during the part of the audit process that involves the visit to the university.

2.1 THE AUDITORS

The auditors are persons whose experience, prestige and training accredit them with the technical capability to act as such. The ANECA moreover complements their training in all necessary and specific aspects in order for them to carry out their work in the correct way.

The auditors' actions are guided by the instructions contained in this audit guide and the ANECA code of ethics. Auditors must thereby abide by the confidentiality of the information that they work with and they are prohibited from making public any information or data concerning the Ph.D. programmes in the Quality Label programme.

The auditors' specific tasks are:

To extract the information on the Ph.D. programme to be audited from the documentation submitted for this process.

To analyse the details of aspects to be checked during the audit in relation to the criteria specified in the audit file.

To check the content of the audit file with the information gathered from the various checks that are carried out. It is important to point out that the auditor's mission is not to assess but to check the compliance of the information on the programme.

To draw up a detailed report on the Ph.D. programme.

3 THE AUDIT PROCESS

The audit process identifies any criterion to be identified for which information provided during the visit does not coincide with the information given in the application.

Details of this must be given in the audit report, the content of which is used by the QL Renewal Committee to draw up the list with the PH.D. programmes for which renewal of the Quality Label is proposed.

Details of the various stages of the work to be carried out by the auditors during the audit process are given below.

STAGES:

- STAGE I

BREAKDOWN OF THE AUDITORS WORK

SETTING OF DATES

- STAGE II

STUDY OF THE PROGRAMME'S DOCUMENTATION

- Study and analysis of the dossier of the Ph.D. programme to be audited.

PREPARING THE VISIT

- STAGE III
 - Analysis of the various tasks and functions to be carried out.
 - Establishing the work schedule.
- STAGE IV

THE VISIT

- Reception of the auditors and initial contact.
- Verification of the information on the programme.
- Interviews with the different actors involved.
- Analysis of the information and evidence.
- STAGE V

CONCLUSIONS

3.1 DESIGNATION OF THE AUDITORS

The ANECA will designate the auditors who will carry out the audits. It will also provide the Vice-Rector in charge of Ph.D. studies in the university with the list of auditors who will carry out the visits to the university. The Vice-Rector may, where necessary, reject the list in the case of manifest incompatibility, and in such an event the ANECA will study the university's alleged reasons and proceed, where applicable, to designate other auditors. If, on the other hand, no reply is received from the Vice-Rector within one week, it will be considered that the university accepts the auditors.

Once acceptance of the list of auditors has been formalised, the auditors will be informed of the university/ies and the list of Ph.D. programmes to be audited.

3.2 ANALYSIS OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PROGRAMME

The auditors analyse the dossier on the Ph.D. programme submitted in the previous call for applications together with the information provided in the new call and extract the relevant information to be verified during the audit itself.

The ANECA's Programmes Department (*Dirección de Programas*) makes the audit file (Annex I) available to the auditors so as to facilitate the work of analysing the dossier on the Ph.D. programme and the actual visit itself. This tool serves as a logbook that contains the information that has been analysed as well as notes on the most important aspects detected during the audit, and is the basis for the process of verification during the visit.

The auditors are also given the interview schedule (Annex IV), a document for noting information to be checked during the visit, together with information obtained from each of actors involved in the Ph.D. programme

3.3 PREPARING THE VISIT

3.3.1 The work of the auditors

The ANECA's auditors, together with the Vice-Rector in charge of Ph.D. studies, shall set the dates for the visit to the university. Once this has been set, notification is to be sent by the auditors to: certificacion.doctorado@aneca.es.

The date must be set sufficiently in advance to the visit so the university can make its staff and necessary resources available for the audit.

It is the work of the Vice-Rector to coordinate with the programme coordinator in facilitating and organising the information for the audit.

3.3.2 The work of the university regarding the visit.

Preparation work by the university for the visit will involve the following:

Making available an appropriately equipped workspace for the auditors where the audit can be carried out, where interviews can be held and corresponding work carried out.

Preparation of the representative samples of students, provided that the auditors consider this to be appropriate, and to arrange for them to meet with the auditors.

Provision of all travel arrangements for the auditors in cases where this is necessary.

To publicise in a visible place and sufficiently in advance the aims and the timetable of the audit so that any interested member of the university community may attend an interview.

3.4 THE VISIT TO THE UNIVERSITY

A visit is made to the university where the Ph.D. programme is to be audited on the set dates. The ANECA will take care of all travel and accommodation arrangements for the audit to be carried out.

The audit of each Ph.D. programme will last a maximum of one day and shall at least consist of the following:

Reception of the auditors and initial contact.

The Vice-Rector in charge of Ph.D. studies in the university will be responsible for receiving and welcoming the auditors and to be at their disposal so they can carry out their work.

Initial contact will also be made with the staff involved and the relevant introductions made. The auditors explain the aims and go over the schedule for the visit.

Verification of the information relating to the programme.

The auditors check the information relating to the programme given in the initial application against the information provided on the programme at the time of the visit. This information will serve during the interviews as the basis for highlighting areas where there has been difficulty or any other appropriate aspect.

Interviews with the different actors involved

The auditors may hold as many interviews they deem necessary with the actors involved in the audit process.

The purpose of the interviews with the different actors is to obtain sufficient evidence to be able to check the information on the Ph.D. programme.

The auditors shall guide the interviews with the different actors towards the aspects mentioned in the audit file and interview schedules, and these will be used during the visit as a support that will enable the auditors to gather the necessary information for preparing the audit report.

The visit to the Ph.D. programme that is to be audited shall consist of at least the following activities, provided that the auditors consider them to be appropriate:

Interview with the Ph.D. programme coordinator.

Interview with a representative sample of students in the Ph.D. programme. These must cover whole series of programmed Ph.D. courses.

Individual interviews with members of the university community who request this.

Prior to the finalisation of the visit, the auditors will meet with the Ph.D. programme coordinator to comment their impressions on the aspects checked during the audit.

An example of a feasible timetable for the visit is given below. Such a timetable would need to be discussed and agreed with the programme coordinator.

Timetable	Activity
9:00 to 9:15	The auditors are welcomed by the university's Vice-Rector for Ph.D. studies and taken to the department.
9:15 to 9:30	Meeting with the programme coordinator.
9:30 to 11:30	Verification of the information relating to the programme.
11:30 to 12:00	Meeting with a representative sample of students.
12:00 to 12:15	Meeting with the members of the university community who request this.
12:15 to 12:30	Meeting with the programme coordinator to exchange views.

3.5 ANALYSIS OF THE INFORMATION AND EVIDENCE

The auditors must check and elaborate on information considered to be important for verifying the information relating to the Ph.D. programme during the visit. This verification must be based on the evidence gathered, i.e. proof that shows the veracity of the information available to the auditors during the visit.

The evidence gathered by the auditors is to be based on their analysis of the required information, the interviews with the different actors involved and personal observation.

Analysis of the required information

The main aim of analysing the required information is to check the data and evidence that serve as the basis for the final audit report.

Interviews

The main objective of the interviews is to confirm the information available to the auditor during the visit.

Verifying the information

Once the auditors have verified the relevant information through the various sources, they must then state whether this information coincides or not with the information provided in the application.

The cross-checking of information, where applicable, will involve the various informants. In addition to the variety of different information gathered, an analysis must therefore also be made of its coherence and whether this information and the conclusions that it contains are shared by the majority of the people involved and/or are based on facts and evidence.

These extremely interactive processes give rise to information on the various aspects being considered, which is noted in the observations section of the audit file.

3.6 DRAWING UP OF THE AUDIT REPORT

The auditors must draw up the audit report as indicated in Annex II. The audit report must then be sent by e.mail, together with the audit file and the interview schedules, to the ANECA's Programmes Department at: certificacion.doctorado@aneca.es, and by ordinary post to:

Programa de Mención de Calidad
C/ Orense 11 – 7ª planta;
28020 Madrid

4 GENERAL ASPECTS TO BE CONSIDERED

4.1 RELATIONSHIP WITH THE ANECA

Direct contact with the ANECA will be necessary during the audit to coordinate the work and maintain a continuous flow of information between the two parties, and to expedite the analysis of matters that are of mutual interest and facilitate an understanding of the audit techniques, methods and terminology.

The auditors will therefore be in constant contact with the persons responsible for this programme at the ANECA so they can be informed on developments in the audit, any possible doubts resolved and concepts clarified regarding the methodology and systematics to be followed during the process, in case this is necessary.

For this purpose, a technical expert with the ANECA's Programmes Department will be made responsible for all communications with the auditors, via the e.mail address: certificacion.doctorado@aneca.es.

5 ANNEXS

ANNEX I

AUDIT FILE

The audit file is a tool that enables the auditor to organise the information gathered from the analysis of the documentation provided by the Ph.D. programme, and also to include the information and conclusions resulting from the visit to the university.

The audit file consists of the following sections:

Criterion to be assessed: this gives the criteria specified in the call for applications for the Quality Label in which the programme was assessed. This includes the section reference in the application where the information on the criterion is to be found.

Aspects to be checked: a list of the various aspects to be verified by the auditors during the Ph.D. programme audit. When they have been checked, each one must be marked with an "x" in the corresponding box.

Coincides/Does not coincide – negative/Does not coincide + positive:

"Coincides" indicates that the information available on the programme (including the application) coincides with the information gathered during the visit.

"Does not coincide + positive" indicates that there is a difference between the information on the programme and the information gathered during the visit, and that this is a non-coincidence in excess (i.e. the information gathered during the visit includes the information to be checked as well as additional information not provided when the application was made).

"Does not coincide - negative" indicates that there is a difference between the information on the programme and the information gathered during the visit, and that there is insufficient coincidence (i.e. the information gathered during the visit is lacking in relation to that provided in the application).

Observations by the auditor: the auditor must note all aspects that he/she considers to be of interest during the audit, which will later serve the team when it pools its information and for drawing up the audit report.

A) CRITERIA REFERRING TO THE RESEARCH STAGE AND THE PREPARATION OF PhD THESES.

Aa) Record of research during the last five years of the Ph.D. holders involved in giving the Ph.D. training. (Section 4.6.1 a) of the application).

Aspects that the auditors must confirm:

Whether the published works, funded projects, contracts and invited papers coincide with those given in the application.

The team of auditors must state whether the criterion complies, i.e. if there is coincidence or not, on the basis of the information checked during the visit.

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not Coincide-

Observations by the auditors.

Ab) Publication of research results directly associated with the Ph.D. theses defended during the previous five years in which the Ph.D. holders who are involved in giving the Ph.D. training have participated (Section 4.6.1 b) of the application).

Aspects that the team of auditors must confirm:

Whether the number of published works associated with each thesis defended coincides with that given in the application.

Whether the title of the published works coincides with the title of the published works included in the application.

The team of auditors must state whether the criterion complies, i.e. if there is coincidence or not, on the basis of the information checked during the visit.

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not Coincide-

Observations by the team of auditors.

Ac) Number of theses directed by the Ph.D. holders in section a), in the same period (Section 4.6.1 c) as in the application).

Aspects that the auditors must confirm:

Whether the number of theses coincides with that given in the application.
--

Whether the details of the theses coincide with those given in the application.

Whether the number of Ph.D. holders involved in Ph.D. training coincides with that given in the application.
--

The team of auditors must state whether the criterion complies, i.e. if there is coincidence or not, on the basis of the information checked during the visit.

Coincides / Does not coincide (+positive) / Does not coincide-negative)

Observations by the team of auditors.

Ad) Number of Ph.D. students currently active in the preparation of doctoral theses under the supervision of the Ph.D. holders in section a). (Section 4.6.1 d) of the application).

Aspects that the auditors must confirm:

The existence of the certificate that corresponds with the list active Ph.D. students in the programme.

Whether the data included in the certificate match with those given in the application.

The team of auditors must state whether the criterion complies, i.e. if there is coincidence or not, on the basis of the information checked during the visit.

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-negative)

Observations by the auditors.

Ae) Percentage of defended theses defined as European Ph.D.s and other data that justify the mobility of Ph.D. students during the research stage in the past five years. (Section 4.6.1 e) of the application).

Aspects that the team of auditors must confirm:

Whether the number of theses defined as European Ph.D.s coincides with that given in the application.

Whether the number of students who have participated in a mobility programme during the research training stage coincides with that given in the application.

The team of auditors must state whether the criterion complies, i.e. if there is coincidence or not, on the basis of the information checked during the visit.

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Observations by the team of auditors

B) CRITERIA REFERRING TO THE ADVANCED TRAINING STAGE.

Bb) Mobility and data in support of this in the advanced training stage of students on this particular programme over the past five years. (Section 4.6.2 b) of the application).

Aspects that the team of auditors must confirm:

Whether the number of students that has participated in a mobility programme during the advanced training stage coincides with that given in the application.

The team of auditors must state whether the criterion complies, i.e. if there is coincidence or not, on the basis of the information checked during the visit.

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Observations by the team of auditors.

Bc) Percentage of students that have completed the advanced training stage prior to the research stage. (Section 4.6.2 c) of the application).

Aspects that the team of auditors must confirm:

Whether the number of students that has completed the advanced training stage coincides with that given in the application.

Whether the number of students enrolled in the programme coincides with that given in the application.
--

The team of auditors must state whether the criterion complies, i.e. if there is coincidence or not, on the basis of the information checked during the visit.

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Observations by the team of auditors.

C) GENERAL CRITERIA REFERRING TO THE PROPOSAL.

Ca) Articulation and coherence of the contents and general structure of the programme. (Section 4.6.3 a) of the application).

Aspects that the team of auditors must confirm:

The number of students enrolled is equal to or more than ten.

Whether the Ph.D. programme has been published in paper or electronic format
--

The title of the Ph.D. programme coincides with that given in the application

In the annual programme, whether all of the courses included in the application are actually given.

Whether the number of credits in each academic year coincides with that given in the application.

Whether the number of teaching staff in each academic year coincides with that given in the application.

The team of auditors must state whether the criterion complies, i.e. if there is coincidence or not, on the basis of the information checked during the visit.

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Observations by the team of auditors.

Cb) Number of students from universities other than that/those responsible for the programme enrolled in the programme during the past five years, specifying those that were awarded grants from public schemes. (Section 4.6.3 b) of the application).

Aspects that the team of auditors must confirm:

Whether the number of students from other universities coincides with that given in the application.

The team of auditors must state whether the criterion complies, i.e. if there is coincidence or not, on the basis of the information checked during the visit.

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Observations by the team of auditors.

Cc) Number and type of collaboration in the programme of visiting teaching staff and Ph.D. holders with financial support obtained from public national, regional or international schemes in this same period. (Section 4.6.3 c) of the application).

Aspects that the team of auditors must confirm:

Whether the number of visiting teaching staff and Ph.D. holders with scholarships and financial assistance obtained in competitive award schemes coincides with that given in the application.

The team of auditors must state whether the criterion complies, i.e. if there is coincidence or not, on the basis of the information checked during the visit.

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Observations by the team of auditors.

ANNEX II

AUDIT REPORT

The audit report is the final document that is the result of agreement between the members of the team of auditors and must be drawn up by the head (or chairperson) of the team.

The proposed report layout, which is divided into two sections, is as follows:

1) Information summary

The first page of the Report includes a summary in which the auditor must give the details concerning the Ph.D. programme that has been audited, in addition to whether each criterion coincides or not with that given in the application, on the basis of the verification that has carried out.

2) Conclusion of the Audit

“Coincides” indicates that the information available on the programme (including the application) coincides with the information gathered during the visit.

“Does not coincide + positive” indicates that there is a difference between the information on the programme and the information gathered during the visit, and that this is a non-coincidence in excess (the information gathered during the visit includes the information to be checked as well as additional information not provided when the application was made).

“Does not coincide - negative” indicates that there is a difference between the information on the programme and the information gathered during the visit, and that there is insufficient coincidence (the information gathered during the visit is lacking in relation to that provided in the application).

In the case where the auditors point out that certain criteria have not coincided, mention must be made of both the initial result confirmed in the audit and the result encountered during the visit, together with any appropriate observations. These observations must be as explicit as possible.

In order for the content of the audit report to be comprehensible, the following guidelines must be adhered to:

It must be based on evidence

It must be concise and complete, with the focus on aspects that do not coincide.

Once the audit report has been completed, it must be sent (by the auditors) within seven days to the ANECA's Programmes Department together with the interview schedules and the audit file.

Date of the audit.....

Auditors.....

Name of the Programme.....

Reference.....

University.....

The auditor must indicate whether the above criteria coincide or not with the abovementioned criteria. Coincides/Does not coincide+ /Does not coincide-

Aa

Ab

Ac

Ad

Ae

Bb

Bc

Ca

Cb

Cc

A) CRITERIA THAT REFER TO THE RESEARCH STAGE AND THE PREPARATION OF Ph.D. THESES

Aa) Record of research during the previous five years of the Ph.D. holders who are involved in giving the Ph.D. training (Section 4.6.1 a) of the application).

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Ab) Published works with the results of research directly associated with the Ph.D. theses defended in the past five years in which Ph.D. holders involved in giving the Ph.D. training have participated (Section 4.6.1 b) of the application).

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Ac) Number of theses directed by the Ph.D. holders in section a), in the same period (Section 4.6.1 c) of the application).

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Ad) Number of Ph.D. students currently active in the preparation of doctoral theses under the supervision of the Ph.D. holders in section a). (Section 4.6.1 d) of the application).

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Ae) Percentage of defended theses defined as European Ph.D.s and other data that justify the mobility of Ph.D. students during the research stage in the past five years. (Section 4.6.1 e) of the application)

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

B. CRITERIA THAT REFER TO THE ADVANCED TRAINING STAGE

Bb) Mobility and data in support of this in the advanced training stage of students on this particular programme in the past five years. (Section 4.6.2 b) of the application).

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Bc) Percentage of students that have completed the advanced training stage prior to the research stage (Section 4.6.2 c) of the application).

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

C. GENERAL CRITERIA THAT REFER TO THE PROPOSAL

Ca) Articulation and coherence of the contents and general structure of the programme: background, justification for the programme content, general aims, methodology used for the teaching-learning process, and assessment criteria (Section 4.6.3 a) of the application).

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Cb) Number of students from universities other than that/those responsible for the programme enrolled in the programme during the past five years, specifying those awarded grants from public schemes (Section 4.6.3 b) of the application).

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

Cc) Number and type of collaboration in the programme of visiting teaching staff and Ph.D. holders with financial assistance obtained from public national, regional or international schemes in this same period (Section 4.6.3. c) of the application).

Coincides / Does not coincide+ / Does not coincide-

ANNEX III

INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO THE TEAM OF AUDITORS

This annex gives details of the documentation to be prepared and made ready by the coordinators of the different Ph.D. programmes for the auditors on the day of the visit.

TASKS TO BE CARRIED OUT BY THE UNIVERSITY

- Prepare the representative samples of students and have them ready for the auditors at the time of the audit.
- Make a copy of the application to obtain the Quality Label sent to the Directorate General for Universities and make this available to the auditors.

The information to be provided by the university is confined exclusively to the information submitted to the DGU the first time an application was made for the Quality Label.

Criteria that were not included are not subject to audit.

CRITERION

DOCUMENTATION TO BE PROVIDED BY THE UNIVERSITY

Aa

- The five best published works included in the application, grouped according to each member of staff. For ease of compilation, only the first page of each publication need be submitted.
- Copy of the award of projects funded from competitive grant award schemes and contracts with private enterprise and/or institutions included in the application, for each member of the teaching staff involved in Ph.D. training.
- Document that sets out the invitation to present invited papers in congresses and seminars included in the application.

Ab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Published works, ordered according to theses, with the results of research included in the application. For ease of compilation, only the first page of each publication need be submitted.
Ac	<p>There are two alternatives for verifying compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certificate from the corresponding administrative unit that shows the list of theses included in the application. This certificate must contain all of the details on the theses included in the application (title, author, director, date, etc.). - Ph.D. theses (physical documents).
Ad	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certificate from the corresponding administrative unit that shows the list of active Ph.D. students in the programme.
Ae	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certificate from the corresponding administrative unit that shows the list and details of theses defined as European Ph.D.s or the theses themselves. - Certificate from the corresponding administrative unit that shows the number of students included in the application that have participated in a mobility programme during the research training stage or accreditation of the mobility scholarship or grant. - Certificate from the corresponding administrative unit that shows the number total of students enrolled in the programme. Certification is required exclusively for details provided in the application.
Bb	<p>There are two alternatives for verifying compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certificate from the corresponding administrative unit that shows the nominal list of students that have participated in a mobility programme in the advanced training stage.

	- Accreditation of the scholarship or grant awarded.
Bc	- Certificate from the corresponding administrative unit that shows the nominal list of enrolled students and indicates those that have passed the advanced training stage.
Ca	- The published Ph.D. programme. - The timetable and place where courses are given. - List of enrolled students.
Cb	- Certificate from the corresponding administrative unit that shows the number of students from other universities.
Cc	There are two alternatives for verifying compliance: - Certificate from the corresponding administrative unit that shows the nominal list of visiting teaching staff and Ph.D. holders with scholarships and grants obtained in competitive schemes in the set period covered by the call for applications. - Accreditation of the scholarship or grant awarded.

The documents provided by the university must be accredited or certified by the corresponding administrative unit (Vice-Rector's office for third cycle studies or similar, Ph.D. committee, head of the Ph.D. studies section or academic planning, etc.).

ANNEX IV

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The interview schedule is the document that enables the team of auditors to note the information to be verified during the visit and the information obtained in the interviews considered to be necessary.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Date:

Time:

Programme coordinator:

Auditors:

.....

ASPECTS TO BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION