EVALUATION CRITERIA GUIDE

INTERNATIONAL QUALITY LABEL (SIC)[1]

PROFESSIONAL

EUR-ACE®

(version 06)

[1] Abbreviation in spanish.(Sellos Internacionales de Calidad)

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 licence. Reproduction, distribution and public communication are permitted provided that the author (ANECA-SIC) is acknowledged and no commercial use is made. The full licence is available at: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode

INDEX

1. INTRODUCTION 4

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA..... 9

3. BIBLIOGRAPHY CONSULTED..... 11

4. ANNEXES..... 15

ANNEX. A. NATIONAL ACCREDITATION CRITERIA..... 15

ANNEX. B. ANECA vs ENQA CRITERIA COMPARATIVE.... 21

1. INTRODUCTION

The National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation (ANECA), with the aim of **going a step further in national accreditation**, offers the possibility of obtaining an international quality label of recognised prestige in the context of the Agency's International Quality Label Programme (SIC) (since October 2017), which integrates the previous ACREDITA PLUS Programme (created in 2013).

This document contains the **evaluation criteria** of the EUR-ACE® professional label, which ANECA manages in the context of this programme, in which the evaluation of the obtaining of this label establishes a higher level of demand than the national accreditations, regarding the verification of the acquisition of the learning outcomes, taking into account specific aspects of the field of engineering from a global perspective, as well as in the items (requirements/prescriptions) demanded on the support of the higher education institution (university) to the programme/centre evaluated to achieve this international recognition.

The evaluation process is carried out at two levels: panel of experts and accreditation commission of the label, with the participation of national and international evaluators with academic, professional and student profiles, ensuring that the composition between men and women is balanced and that these people are knowledgeable about aspects related to inclusion in university education in general, and in particular to that of people with functional diversity or abilities.

These evaluation teams are composed of evaluators proposed by ANECA and by the **professional institutions and international quality assurance agencies**[2] with which ANECA has signed a collaboration agreement in the context of the International Quality Label Programme. ANECA is in charge of appointing them, training them and organising and controlling that their work complies with all the standards established in these evaluations.

The evaluation model of these labels is based on the application of the specific standards of the agency that owns each label[3], in addition to those already established in a general way in the accreditation process of the other labels managed by ANECA, such as the ENPHI® Agency's own label for Non-presential and Hybrid Education (applicable to all fields of knowledge), which are periodically audited by the international associations that own the labels and by ENQA[4] and internally through an annual meta-evaluation; in which all facets related to the inclusion of people with functional diversity are always taken into account.

This label may be requested by representatives of faculties or official training centres in the field of engineering that **have obtained a national accreditation prior to the evaluation of the label in the context of the Spanish Network of University Quality Agencies (REACU[5]) or in the specific one of ANECA or in that of a foreign agency with which ANECA has signed a collaboration agreement in the context of the International Quality Labels Programme (SIC)**. In such a way that, prior to the evaluation of the two

[2] Consejo de Acreditación de la Enseñanza de la Ingeniería, A. C, -CACEI- (http://cacei.org.mx) y Comités Interinstitucionales para la Evaluación de la Educación Superior –CIEES- (https://www.ciees.edu.mx).

[3] European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education –ENAEE-.

[4] European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education –ENQA- (https://enqa.eu/).

[5] Abbreviation in spanish.(Red Española de Agencias de Calidad Universitaria)

specific criteria of this label, it is guaranteed that the training programme submitted for evaluation complies with the criteria established in the national accreditation criteria (seven criteria in Spain) (See Annex: A. National Accreditation Criteria).

The aim of awarding this label is to **provide a measurable added value to the previous accreditation of the assessed programme** applying for the label.

In the previous national accreditation, it is necessary to have demonstrated that ***specific measures are still in place to address the needs of a diverse student body and, in particular, to ensure gender equality and attention to the needs of people with functional diversity*** *in access to education*, which were indicated to be implemented in the design of the assessed programmes.

These **measures** are as follows:

- Regarding **access to training programmes:**

The criteria of universal accessibility and design for all must be observed, in accordance with the provisions of Royal Legislative Decree 1/2013, of 29 November, approving the Consolidated Text of the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion, as well as supporting the overcoming of gender or other stereotypes and prejudices in the choice of training programmes.

- Regarding the **competences to be acquired by the students, upon completion of the training programme:**

The competences must be defined taking into account the fundamental rights and equal opportunities between men and women (*in accordance with the provisions of Organic Law 3/2007, of 22 March, for the effective equality of women and men*), the principles for guaranteeing the right to equal opportunities and treatment, as well as the real and effective exercise of rights by persons with disabilities in equal conditions with other citizens (which inform the Royal Legislative Decree 1/2013, of 29 November, approving the Consolidated Text of the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion) and the values of a culture of peace and democratic values (included in *Law 27/2005, of 30 November, on the promotion of education and the culture of peace).*

- About the **academic staff:**

Programmes with a label must have mechanisms in place to ensure gender equality and non-discrimination of people with disabilities. The mechanisms available to the assessed programmes to ensure that the recruitment of teaching and support staff will be carried out in accordance with the criteria of gender equality and non-discrimination of people with functional diversity or disabilities must be made explicit.

- Concerning **the teaching-learning process:**

The application of a perspective of recognition and support for diversity (gender and/or functional) should be encouraged, both in the teaching-learning process and in mobility, internship and employability programmes, as well as adapting the instruments of prevention and intervention against sexual, sex/gender or functional diversity harassment to a virtual environment.

- In terms of **material resources and services:**

The criteria of universal accessibility and design for all must be observed, in accordance with the provisions of Royal Legislative Decree 1/2013, of 29 November, approving the

Consolidated Text of the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion, as well as the preparation of statistical records in which gender and functional diversity are analysed.

The two specific criteria of the international label of professional quality are broken down into guidelines, in which items (requirements/prescriptions) to be fulfilled in order to obtain a positive assessment in each guideline have been agreed upon by experts from different countries.

These criteria, guidelines and requirements/prescriptions to be met by the programmes to be awarded the label are set out below in this document.

Each criterion can be assessed on one of the following scales, listed in the first column of Table 1:

Table 1. Relationship between the rating scale of the guidelines and the justification for this rating.

THE CRITERION WILL BE ASSESSED WITH:	JUSTIFICATION FOR THE ASSESSMENT
A	It will be expressed in terms such as **"excellent", "very outstanding",** etc., but always with examples justifying such excellence, which is considered a good practice to be followed by other higher education institutions (universities).
B	If a need for improvement is identified, but not so peremptory that it needs to be addressed within less than 3 years for an educational programme to maintain the label, the opportunity for improvement will be identified in terms of a recommendation. Seven or more recommendations should never be included in a guideline if the assessment is **B**. If there are more than seven recommendations, they should be moved to **prescriptions** and the guideline will be scored **C.**
C	If a weakness is detected in a sub-guideline that would need to be remedied in less than 3 years for an educational programme to maintain the label, the criterion would be assessed with a **C**, because in this case it would be partially fulfilled and the aspect(s) for improvement would be identified in terms of a prescription. There should never be seven or more prescriptions in a guideline, if the rating is **C**. If there are more than seven prescriptions, the label should be refused and a **D** would be given.
D	The justification shall be written in terms of what is missing or does NOT exist or is NOT provided, if evidence has been requested from the university during the evaluation and the university has not responded to the request made by the evaluators (this is also mandatory evidence to ensure compliance with a given guideline) or even if it has been provided, it does not justify compliance with the guideline to which it is associated or 7 or more weaknesses have been identified that need to be remedied in a period of less than 3 years.

The overall results and the time of awarding the label, according to the ratings given to each guideline, may be as listed in column 1 of Table 2:

Table 2. Relationship between overall results versus guideline rating scales versus time of awarding the label.

POSSIBLE OVERALL RESULTS	POSSIBLE GUIDELINE RATING SCALES	CONCESSION TIME LABEL
REFUSAL OF THE LABEL	There will be at least one guideline valued at **D**.	0 years
OBTAINMENT WITH PRESCRIPTIONS/REQUIREMENTS	At least there will be a **C**.	3 years
OBTAINMENT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS	All will be graded with **B**.	6 years
OBTAINMENT	All will be graded with **A** or **B**.	6 years

Likewise, university programmes which, despite adequately satisfying the other requirements/prescriptions, do not comply significantly with the applicable legislation in force in the field of inclusion, will not be eligible for the label.

For the implementation of this label, it has been necessary to carry out a previous study in which it has been analysed which requirements/prescriptions established by ENAEE are already met by the national processes of compulsory accreditation (VERIFICA) and renewal of accreditation (ACREDITA) and voluntary (AUDIT INTERNATIONAL) of the official programmes and their centres in Spain within the scope of this label, developed in the context of the evaluations carried out by ANECA and others of the Spanish Network of University Quality Agencies (REACU), to identify those standards that have to be incorporated in an extra evaluation, which grants the award of this label to the programmes that demonstrate that they comply with them, after undergoing a voluntary evaluation within ANECA's International Quality Label Programme (SIC).

The standards set by ENAEE can be grouped into the following criteria:

1. Mission and values
2. Syllabus
3. Evaluation
4. Students
5. Academic staff
6. Educational resources
7. Quality assurance
8. Governance and administration

These in turn fall into the following concepts:

1. Needs, objectives and outcomes: includes consideration of the needs of stakeholders, educational objectives and learning outcomes for learners.
2. Educational process: includes the evaluation of the curriculum, its implementation and assessment methods.

3. Resources: integrates the assessment of academic and administrative staff, facilities, financial resources, and agreements and alliances with other institutions.
4. Evaluation of the educational process: includes the evaluation of entry and admission requirements/prescriptions, and certain student and graduate ratios,
5. Management system: considers the organisational and decision-making processes and the internal quality assurance system in place.

For each of these five concepts, a series of requirements/prescriptions have been defined that must have been fulfilled by the programmes that obtain this label. Some of them in an evaluation prior to the evaluation of the label and others in the process of accreditation of the label itself.

In order to avoid that a training programme/centre undergoes a similar evaluation in a short period of time, at the beginning of the implementation of the management of a new label in ANECA, a comparison is made between the criteria established by the association owning each label and the criteria required in other accreditations developed in the specific context of ANECA or REACU or other international agencies collaborating with the Agency, In such a way that the previously evaluated standards must be certified with a favourable result as a requirement to apply for the evaluation of the label, and thus during the evaluation of the label, only those criteria will be analysed which have not been verified to be fulfilled in previous accreditations and which are specific to each label.

Once a comparison has been made between the criteria that are not taken into account in the national processes of compulsory accreditation (VERIFICA) and renewal of accreditation (ACREDITA) and those that are, those that are included in the specific criteria of ANECA's International Quality Label (SIC) evaluation model are identified, adapted to the guidelines of each international association that owns each label and the specificities of the scope of each one of them.

The quality assurance associations that have authorised[6] ANECA to evaluate the award of International Professional Quality Label ***(EUR-ACE® for Engineering, EURO-INF for IT and IT-Business, EURO-LABEL® for Chemistry and WFME for Medicine***), in collaboration with national and international professional associations, establish a series of criteria and accreditation procedures that ANECA has to follow in each of the evaluations of these labels, in order to maintain this authorisation.

This authorisation must be periodically renewed through a process of evaluation of ANECA's SIC Programme by a panel of experts appointed by each of the associations that own these labels, of which ANECA offers the evaluation of their obtaining in the Spanish university context and in other countries.

[6] In the process of authorisation evaluation at WFME

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

After making the comparison between the standards of which the compliance of the programmes evaluated in the national processes of compulsory accreditation VERIFICA and renewal of accreditation ACREDITA and voluntary AUDIT INTERNATIONAL is checked against those that are not, shown below, because they are integrated in the specific criteria of the evaluation model of ANECA's International Quality Labels, adapted to the guidelines of each international association owning the labels and the specificities of their scope from a global perspective, which the programmes/centres with this label must demonstrate that they comply with during the international accreditation process managed by ANECA.

These criteria are shown below:

DIMENSION. INTERNATIONAL LABEL OF QUALITY

Criterion 8. INTERNATIONAL QUALITY LABEL LEARNING OUTCOMES

Standard:

The **graduates of the assessed programme have achieved** the type of learning outcomes established by the international quality agency for the accreditation of the label in the assessed programme area from a global perspective.

Guideline 8.1. The type of learning outcomes defined in the curriculum sampled in the evaluation process i**nclude** those set by the international quality agency for the accreditation of the label in the scope of the assessed programme and are **acquired** by all its graduates.

See document "Learning outcomes established by the European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education (ENAEE) for the award of the EUR-ACE® international professional quality label (SIC)" in which all types of learning outcomes required for the programmes that will obtain this label are listed and "Self-assessment report template for the award of the EUR-ACE® international professional quality label (SIC)", which indicates the aspects to be assessed with regard to these learning outcomes. Documents provided by ANECA to higher education institutions, which express their interest in this international accreditation.

Guideline 9.1. The objectives of the programme are consistent with the mission of the university and their achievement is ensured through adequate financial, human and material support and an organisational structure that allows for appropriate designation of responsibilities, effective decision-making and voluntary self-evaluation and self-improvement.

See "Self-Assessment Report Template for the award of the EUR-ACE® Professional International Quality Label (SIC)" which indicates the evidence that a higher education institution has to provide in relation to each of the guidelines outlined above, grouped into the two specific criteria of the label, to demonstrate the necessary compliance for the award of this label to the evaluated programmes..

If the assessed centre is certified for AUDIT INTERNATIONAL[7] implementation and no recommendations have been issued in its evaluation report, this criterion will be automatically recognised.

All these evaluation criteria of the International Quality Labels integrate the criteria and guidelines established by ENQA (See APPENDIX: B. SIC vs ENQA Criteria).

[7] http://www.aneca.es/Programas-de-evaluacion/Evaluacion-institucional/AUDIT/Fase-de-certificacion-de-la-implantacion-de-los-SAIC

3. BIBLIOGRAPHY CONSULTED

ANECA (2021). *Technical documentation of the International Quality Label (SIC) Programme.* Retrieved from http://www.aneca.es/Programas-de-evaluacion/Evaluacion-de-titulos/SIC/Documentacion-tecnica-del-Programa-de-Sellos-Internacionales-de-Calidad

ANECA (2021). *List of university programmes/training centres with labels of approval.* Retrieved from http://www.aneca.es/Programas-de-evaluacion/Evaluacion-de-titulos/SIC/Resultados-de-los-Sellos-Internacionales-de-Calidad/Titulos-con-sello

ANECA (2020). *AUDIT Programme: Guide to the certification model for the implementation of Internal Quality Assurance Systems (Document 05).* Retrieved from http://www.aneca.es/Programas-de-evaluacion/Evaluacion-institucional/AUDIT/Fase-de-certificacion-de-la-implantacion-de-los-SAIC

ANECA (2020). *AUDIT Programme: Guide for the design of Internal Quality Assurance Systems for university education (Document 01).* Retrieved from http://www.aneca.es/Programas-de-evaluacion/Evaluacion-institucional/AUDIT/Herramientas-para-el-diseno

ANECA (2019). *ACREDITA Programme: Self-evaluation Guide: renewal of accreditation of official Bachelor's and Master's degrees.* Retrieved from http://www.aneca.es/Programas-de-evaluacion/Evaluacion-de-titulos/ACREDITA/ACREDITA-Grado-y-master-universitario/Documentacion-y-herramientas-informaticas

ANECA (2015). *VERIFICA Programme: Evaluation template for the verification of Bachelor's and Master's degrees.* Retrieved from http://www.aneca.es/Programas-de-evaluacion/Evaluacion-de-titulos/VERIFICA/Verificacion-de-Grado-y-Master/Documentacion-y-herramientas

BONILLA-CALERO, A. I., MORALES-GONZÁLEZ, E., & SERRANO-GARCÍA, M.A. (2022). International accreditation of engineering programmes in times of pandemic: a comparative perspective between Spain and Mexico. *Spanish Journal of Comparative Education,* (40), 215–235. Retrieved from http://revistas.uned.es/index.php/REEC/article/view/28373

BONILLA-CALERO, A.I; SERRANO-GARCÍA, M.A. (2021) Virtual audits in ANECA's International Quality Lables (SIC) Programme in times of pandemic, *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación a Distancia,* 24 (2). Retrieved from http://revistas.uned.es/index.php/ried/article/view/29092

BONILLA-CALERO, AI. (2019). International quality recognition in the field of engineering, computer science and chemistry by the Spanish National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation (ANECA). *Revista ACREDITAS por la Excelencia de Iberoamerica*, 1. Retrieved from ACREDITAS.com

BONILLA-CALERO, A.I, MORALES-GONZÁLEZ. E, SASTRE-CASTILLO, M.A. (2018). The European legal order in the higher education area: international cooperation and accreditation models. Reunion: *Análisis problemas universitarios*, 25 (28). Retrieved from https://www.redalyc.org/journal/340/34056722008/html/

CRUE (2020). *Report on Non-Personal Assessment Procedures. Study of the Impact of their Implementation in Spanish Universities and Recommendations.* Retrieved from https://www.crue.org/informes-y-posicionamientos/

DE WIT H, HUNTER F. (2015) The future of internationalization of higher education in Europe. *Int High Educ*, 83(Special issue):2-3.

ENAEE (2015). *EUR-ACE® Framework Standards and Guidelines*. https://www.enaee.eu/eur-ace-system/standards-and-guidelines/#standards-and-guidelines-for-accreditation-of-engineering-programmes

SPAIN (2021). *Royal Decree 822/2021, of 28 September, which establishes the organisation of university education and the procedure for quality assurance.* Retrieved from https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2021-15781

SPAIN (2019). *Law 2/2019 of 1 March 2019 amending the revised text of the Intellectual Property Law, approved by Royal Legislative Decree 1/1996 of 12 April 1996, and transposing Directive 2014/26/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 and Directive (EU) 2017/1564 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 September 2017 into Spanish law.* Retrieved from https://www.boe.es/eli/es/l/2019/03/01/2

SPAIN (2018). *Royal Decree 1112/2018 of 7 September on accessibility of public sector websites and applications for mobile devices.* Retrieved from https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2018-12699

SPAIN (2015). *Royal Decree 420/2015, of 29 May, on the creation, recognition, authorisation and accreditation of universities and university centres.* Retrieved from https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2015-6708

SPAIN (2014). *Royal Decree 592/2014, of 11 July, regulating external academic placements for university students.* Retrieved from https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2014-8138

SPAIN (2020). Organic *Law 3/2020, of 29 December, which amends Organic Law 2/2006, of 3 May, on Education.* Retrieved from https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2020-17264.

SPAIN (2010). *Royal Decree 1791/2010, of 30 December, approving the University Student Statute.* Retrieved from https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2010-20147

SPAIN (2007). *Organic Law 3/2007, of 22 March, for the effective equality of women and men).* Retrieved from https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2007-6115

SPAIN (2007). *Organic Law 6/2001, of 21 December 2001, on Universities, modified by Law 4/2007, of 12 April 2007, incorporates an Additional Provision 24, entitled "On the inclusion of people with disabilities in universities".* Retrieved from https://www.boe.es/buscar/doc.php?id=BOE-A-2007-7786

SPAIN (2005). *Law 27/2005, of 30 November, on the promotion of education and culture of peace.* Retrieved from https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2005/BOE-A-2005-19785-consolidado.pdf

SPAIN (2013). *Royal Legislative Decree 1/2013, of 29 November, approving the Consolidated Text of the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion.* Retrieved from https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2013-12632

EUROPE (2019). *Directive (EU) 2019/882: on accessibility requirements for products and services.* Retrieved from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2019/882/oj?locale=es

FENOLL-BRUNET MR. (2016). The concept of internationalisation in university higher education and its frameworks in medical education. *Educ Med*. 17(3):119-127.

GONZÁLEZ, MARCO y MEDINA (2020) *Report on university online evaluation initiatives and tools in the context of Covid-19.* Retrieved from https://www.ciencia.gob.es/portal/site/MICINN/menuitem.7eeac5cd345b4f34f09dfd1001432ea0/?vgnextoid=ace15fbb878f0710VgnVCM1000001d04140aRCRD

HUERTAS, et al. (2018). *Considerations for quality assurance of e-learning provision. Report from the ENQA Working Group VIII on quality assurance and e-learning*. *Occasional Papers 26*. Retrieved from https://enqa.eu/indirme/papers-and-reports/occasional-papers/Considerations%20for%20QA%20of%20e-learning%20provision.pdf

JAÉN, M. y MADARRO, A. (2004). Mobility of university students in Ibero-America: instruments for the recognition of studies, Revista Iberoamericana de Educación.
Retrieved from https://rieoei.org/historico/documentos/rie35a07.htm

MATHES. (2019) *Global quality in on-line, flexible and technology enhanced education analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats*. Retrieved from https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5b99664675f9eea7a3ecee82/t/5d2476fbe6f76d00010499a3/1562670846037/ICDE+Global+Quality+in+Online+Open+Flexible+and+Technology+Enhanced+Final+REPORT+2018-min.pdf

REACU (2018). *Guidelines for the development and evaluation of bachelor's and master's degrees in distance and blended learning.* Retrieved from http://www.aneca.es/Programas-de-evaluacion/Evaluacion-de-titulos/VERIFICA/Verificacion-de-Grado-y-Master/Documentacion-y-herramientas

RUIZ-CORBELLA. Y GARCÍA-GUTIÉRREZ. (2020). Service-Learning in digital learning scenarios: an innovative proposal in higher education. RIED. *Ibero-American Journal of Distance Education*. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5944/ried.23.1.24391

RUIZ-CORBELLA. Y GARCÍA-GUTIÉRREZ. (2010). Virtual mobility in higher education: opportunity or utopia? *Revista española de pedagogía*. Retrieved from https://revistadepedagogia.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/246-009.pdf

SANTOS-REGO, MELLA-NÚÑEZ, Y SOTELINO-LOSADA. (2020). Mobility and ICT in service-learning: perspectives for a global and technological society. RIED. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación a Distancia*. Retrieved from http://revistas.uned.es/index.php/ried/article/view/24180

UBACHS, G. & KONINGS, L. –COORD. - (2016). *Quality Assessment for E-learning: a Benchmarking Approach.* Recuperado a partir de https://e-xcellencelabel.eadtu.eu/images/E-xcellence_manual_2016_third_edition.pdf

UNE (2017). *Norma UNE 71362. Quality of digital educational materials.* Retrieved from https://intef.es/recursos-educativos/educacion-digital-de-calidad/une-71362/

UNESCO-IESALC (2020). *COVID-19 and higher education: From immediate effects to the day after. Impact analysis, policy responses and recommendations.* Retrieved from http://www.iesalc.unesco.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/COVID-19-ES-130520.pdf

UNESCO (2019). *ICT Competency Framework for Teachers.* Retrieved from https://es.unesco.org/themes/tic-educacion/marco-competencias-docentes

4. ANNEXES

ANNEX. A. NATIONAL ACCREDITATION CRITERIA

DIMENSION 1. DESIGN, ORGANISATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING

Criterion 1. DESIGN, ORGANISATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING

Standard:

The training programme (degree) constitutes a **training proposal** that is relevant in its context and coherent with the needs of the labour market and social demands, **its design** contemplates the learning outcomes established by the accreditation bodies and has been **implemented** in accordance with the conditions established in the **training design** and, where appropriate, subsequent updates.

Guideline 1.1. The degree has adequate **references** and its implementation is **relevant** within the context of the higher education institution that offers it, from an academic, research and/or professional point of view.

Guideline 1.2. The **objectives of the degree** are consistent with the mission of the higher education institution and have been defined with the aim that students achieve a coherent **graduate profile**, which allows them to respond to the needs of the labour market and society in general.

Guideline 1.3. The **planning of the degree** in terms of training units, nature, credit allocation, content, timetable, teaching-learning methodologies and assessment systems is congruent with the acquisition of the defined graduate profile.

Guideline 1.4. The **academic coordination** of the degree allows an adequate time planning of the student's workload, oriented to the acquisition of the learning outcomes, in accordance with the graduate profile.

Guideline 1.5. The **admission criteria** applied ensure that students have the appropriate entry profile to start these studies and the number of places established in the design of the syllabus is respected in their application.

Guideline 1.6. The application of the different **academic regulations** is carried out in an appropriate manner and allows for an improvement in the values of the academic performance indicators.

Criterion 2. INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY

Standard:

The institution has mechanisms in place to adequately communicate to all stakeholders the characteristics of the programme and the processes that ensure its quality.

Guideline 2.1. The institution has mechanisms in place to **adequately communicate** to all stakeholders the characteristics of the programme and the processes that ensure its quality.

Guideline 2.2. Those **responsible for the degree publish adequate and updated information** on the characteristics of the training programme, its development and its results, including information on the monitoring and accreditation processes..

Guideline 2.3. Students enrolled in the degree have access, in a **timely manner**, to relevant information about the **syllabus** and the **intended learning outcomes.**

Criterion 3. INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM (SGIC)

Standard:

The institution has a formally established and implemented internal quality assurance system that effectively ensures the quality and continuous improvement of the degree.

Guideline 3.1. The implemented and regularly reviewed SGIC[8] ensures **the continuous collection and analysis of information and results relevant to the effective management of the degree**, in particular learning outcomes and stakeholder satisfaction.

Guideline 3.2. The implemented SGIC **facilitates** the process of monitoring, modification and accreditation of the degree and guarantees its continuous improvement based on the **analysis** of objective and verifiable data..

Guideline 3.3. The SGIC implemented has procedures that facilitate the **evaluation and improvement of the quality of the teaching-learning process.**

[8] Abbreviation in spanish (Sistema de Garantía Interno de Calidad)

DIMENSION 2. RESOURCES

Criterion 4. ACADEMIC STAFF

Standard:

The number of academic staff teaching is **sufficient and appropriate**, in accordance with the characteristics of the degree and the number of students.

Guideline 4.1. The academic staff of the degree meets the level of **academic qualification** required for the degree and has the appropriate **teaching and research experience and quality.**

Guideline 4.2. Academic staff is **sufficient** and **adequately dedicated** to carry out their duties and serve students.

Guideline 4.3. The teaching staff is updated so that they can approach the **teaching-learning process** in accordance with the characteristics of the degree.

Guideline 4.4. (If applicable) The university has made effective the **commitments** established in the design and eventual updating of the degree, together with the **recommendations** derived from its monitoring, relating to the recruitment and improvement of the teaching and research qualifications of the teaching staff.

Criterion 5. SUPPORT STAFF, MATERIAL RESOURCES AND SERVICES

Standard:

The support staff, material resources and services made available for the development of the degree are adequate according to the nature and modality of the degree, the number of students enrolled and the competences to be acquired by them.

Guideline 5.1. The **support staff** involved in training activities is **sufficient and adequately supports the teaching activity** of the academic staff linked to the degree.

Guideline 5.2. The **material resources** (classrooms and their equipment, work and study spaces, laboratories, workshops and experimental spaces, libraries, etc.) are adapted to the number of students and to the training activities programmed in the degree programme.

Guideline 5.3. In the case of **distance/ blended** learning degrees, the technological infrastructures and teaching materials associated with them enable the development of training activities and the acquisition of the degree's competences.

Guideline 5.4. The **academic, professional and mobility support and guidance services** made available to students are in line with the competences and modality of the degree and facilitate the teaching-learning process.

Guideline 5.5. In the event that the degree includes **external practices**, these have been planned as planned and are appropriate for the acquisition of the degree competences.

Guideline 5.6. The university has made effective the **commitments** established in the design and eventual updating of the degree, together with the **recommendations** derived from its monitoring, regarding the support staff involved in the training activities, the material resources and the support services of the degree.

DIMENSION 3. RESULTS

Criterion 6. LEARNING OUTCOMES

Standard:

The learning outcomes achieved by graduates are coherent with the graduate profile and correspond to the MECES (Spanish Qualifications Framework for Higher Education) of the degree (for Spanish degrees) or the CINE (International Standard Classification of Education) level of the degree (for degrees not taught in Spain).

Guideline 6.1. The **training activities**, their **teaching methodologies** and the **assessment systems** used are adequate and reasonably adjusted to the objective of acquiring the expected learning outcomes.

Guideline 6.2. The learning outcomes achieved meet the objectives of the training programme and are appropriate to their level MECES[9] o CINE[10].

Criterion 7. SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Standard:

The **results of the programme's indicators** are congruent with the design, management and resources made available to the degree and satisfy the social demands of its environment.

Guideline 7.1. The **evolution of the main data and indicators of the degree** (number of new students per academic year, graduation rate, dropout rate, efficiency rate, performance rate and success rate) is adequate, in accordance with its subject area and the environment in which the degree is inserted and is coherent with the characteristics of the new students.

[9] Abbreviation in spanish.(Marco Español de Cualificaciones para la Educación Superior)
[10] Abbreviation in spanish.(Clasificación Internacional Normalizada de la Educación)
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002207/220782s.pdf

Guideline 7.2. The **satisfaction** of students, teaching staff, graduates and other stakeholders is adequate.

Guideline 7.3. The values of the graduate **labour market insertion indicators** are appropriate to the scientific, socio-economic and professional context of the degree.

ANNEX. B. ANECA vs ENQA CRITERIA COMPARATIVE

The relationship between the **Criteria and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area** established by the *European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)* in cooperation with the *European Student's Union (ESU), the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education* (EURASHE) and the *European University Association* (EUA) and the evaluation criteria set out in the SIC Programme is presented below:

Criterion 1.1. Quality assurance policy: *Institutions should have a public quality assurance policy as part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, involving external stakeholders.*

This criterion is assessed by the experts in the evaluation of the label, who analyse whether the higher education institution has a formal internal quality assurance system in place to ensure the continuous improvement of the programme. Three specific guidelines are included in the assessment of the institutions' Internal Quality Assurance System (SGIC). Experts are asked to verify that the SGIC is regularly reviewed and facilitates continuous improvement based on the analysis of objective data and whether it includes processes for quality assurance and enhancement of the teaching-learning process.

Criterion 1.2. Programme design and approval*: Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their study programmes. Programmes should be designed in such a way that they meet the objectives set for them, including expected learning outcomes. The qualification of a programme should be clearly specified and publicly available and should refer to the exact level of the national higher education qualifications framework and thus to the European Higher Education Area Qualifications Framework.*

This criterion is included in the International Quality LabelS evaluation model. The experts must analyse whether each educational programme is updated and has been implemented in accordance with the conditions stipulated in the educational objectives of the programme and subsequent modifications. On the other hand, there are two specific guidelines within this assessment which require the experts to analyse, on the one hand, whether the defined profile for graduates (detailed in the curriculum) is still relevant and updated according to the academic, scientific and professional requirements/prescriptions. And, on the other hand, whether the implementation of the curriculum and the organisation of the programme are consistent with the graduate profile and the educational objectives of the programme as described in the programme specification.

In this assessment model, experts also check whether the learning outcomes acquired by graduates are consistent with the graduate profile and correspond to the level of the programme in the Qualifications Framework in Spain (QF-EHEA / MECES) (Spanish degrees), as well as whether these include all those established by ENAEE.

Criterion 1.3. Student-centred teaching, learning and assessment**:** *Institutions should ensure that programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to actively participate in the creation of the learning process and that assessment and evaluation reflect this student-centred approach.*

This criterion is included in the evaluation model of the International Quality Labels. Experts are asked to verify whether the learning activities, teaching methods and assessment systems used are appropriate and adequately correspond to the target learning outcomes acquired by the learners.

Criterion 1.4. Admission, progression, recognition and certification of learners: *Institutions should consistently apply pre-established and public standards covering all phases of the students' "life cycle", e.g. admission, progression, recognition and certification of students.*

This criterion is included in the evaluation model of the International Quality Labels. There are guidelines within this criterion that require experts to analyse whether the admission requirements/prescriptions of the degree ensure that students have the appropriate entry profile to take the degree, whether the number of places offered in the verified report and the different academic regulations are applied to improve the values of the academic performance indicators.

Criterion 1.5. Teaching staff: *Institutions should ensure the competence of their teaching staff. They should also use fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of their staff.*

This criterion is included in the assessment model of the International Quality Labels. This criterion analyses whether the teaching staff involved in the teaching is sufficient and appropriate according to the characteristics of the programme and the number of students.

Criterion 1.6. Learning resources and support for learners**:** *Institutions must be adequately funded to carry out teaching and learning activities and ensure that sufficient and easily accessible learning support and resources are provided for learners.*

This criterion is included in the evaluation model of the International Quality Labels. Experts are asked to assess whether the support staff, physical resources and facilities available for programme delivery are adequate in relation to the nature and type of programme, the number of students enrolled and the intended learning outcomes. The experts are also asked to assess whether the programme receives adequate support from the institution for its implementation, which ensures its sustainability over time.

Criterion 1.7. Information management*: Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.*

This criterion is incorporated in the evaluation model of the International Quality Labels. Experts are asked to assess whether the SGIC in place facilitates the monitoring, modification and accreditation processes of the degree programme and ensures continuous improvement based on objective and verifiable data analysis. The experts are also asked to assess whether the results of the indicators for the educational programme are consistent with the design, management and resources available for the programme and meet the social demands of the institution.

Criterion 1.8. Public information: *Institutions should publish clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date and easily accessible information on their activities and programmes.*

This criterion is included in the evaluation model of the International Quality Labels. This criterion analyses whether the institution has mechanisms in place to adequately communicate to all stakeholders the characteristics of the programme and the processes that ensure its quality. Specifically, the experts are asked to verify whether:

- ✓ The academic coordinators of the programme publish adequate and up-to-date information on the characteristics of the educational programme, its implementation and its results, both in terms of monitoring and accreditation.
- ✓ Students enrolled in the degree have timely access to relevant information on the syllabus and the intended learning outcomes.

Criterion 1.9. Ongoing monitoring and regular evaluation of programmes: *Institutions should regularly monitor and evaluate their programmes to ensure that they achieve their objectives and respond to the needs of learners and society. Such evaluations should lead to continuous improvement of the programme. As a consequence, any measures planned or taken should be communicated to all stakeholders.*

This criterion is incorporated in the evaluation model of the International Quality Labels. The criterion asks experts to verify whether the defined graduate profile (and its implementation in the programme) remains relevant and is updated as required in each academic, scientific or professional environment. Also, the experts have to analyse whether the SGIC in place facilitates the processes of monitoring, modification and periodic review of the degree.

Criterion 1.10. External cyclical quality assurance*: Institutions must undergo an external quality assurance process of a cyclical nature and in line with ENQA criteria.*

The evaluation model set out in this section establishes the period of validity of this accreditation at 6 years for Bachelor and Master programmes, thus ensuring cyclical external quality assurance.