

Annex to Self Assessment Report

Fundación para el Conocimiento madri+d

ENQA External Targeted Review 2024

August 2024

INDEX

INTRODUCTION	1
PART II – FOCUS AREAS	2
5.5 ESG STANDARD 2.5 CRITERIA FOR OUTCOMES	2

INTRODUCTION

On 26 July 2024, notification was received that an error had been detected in the drafting of the ToR of the review. The assessment should include the ESG 2.5 standard in its scope, to examine how the updated SISCAL madri+d Internal Quality Assurance Certification standards are consistently implemented.

This annex contains the analysis and reflection that apply exclusively to ESG 2.5 compliance in the SISCAL madri+d process. The chapter numbering used in the SAR is maintained, in order to easily identify where this annex should be located in the complete document. The introductory text to chapter 5.5 is maintained, given that these general reflections are common to all processes and, therefore, to SISCAL madri+d.

ERRATUM

In chapter 5.3.3 SISCAL madri+d, page 31 of the SAR, it is written “Analysis of the evaluation report is made by the International Certification Committee...”.

It should be “Analysis of the evaluation report is made by the ~~International~~ Certification Committee...”.

As there exists an International Certification Committee which is only related to the Sello SOFIA program, different to the Certification Committee only related to SISCAL madri+d, it could lead to misunderstanding.

PART II – FOCUS AREAS

5.5 ESG Standard 2.5 Criteria for outcomes

The criteria for outcomes are specific for each evaluation and are included in the guides published on the madri+d website before any process is implemented to ensure all stakeholders know them. These guides have been set within working groups that involve relevant stakeholders and experts.

To ensure consistency and homogeneity of the evaluation reports and of the conclusions drawn from them, the evaluation processes go through different phases where the consistency in the analysis made by panels is contrasted by different Committees and Commissions.

Regular meta-evaluation or procedures, surveys and reviewer evaluation are implemented to identify possible inconsistencies and implement the required training actions of update of guides that assure consistency in the application of criteria.

5.5.3 SISCAL madri+d

Criteria for outcomes are defined in its guide:

https://www.madrimasd.org/sites/default/files/Guia%20SISCAL%20V02_0.pdf).

Chapter 4 set the standards and guidelines that are reviewed, while Chapter 5 set how each guideline and, subsequently, each standard, and, overall, the report es rated.

While the first version of SISCAL applied only to already implemented IQAS, the updated version establishes also the possibility of an ex-ante evaluation of the IQAS for non-official training.

- The assessment of implemented IQAS is carried out by a review panel.
The consistency of the analysis and the conclusions is guaranteed by the Certification Committee that is responsible for issuing the final reports.
- In the case of the ex-ante IQAS evaluation of non-official training, as it is a desk evaluation, the Certification Committee carries out the evaluation, although it may request a prior analysis from an IQAS expert.

As stated in chapter 5.6.3, no review of university IQAS applied to non-official training has started yet.

In both cases the rating the outcomes follow the same criteria. Each guideline is assessed by the reviewers as “Excellent fulfilment - A”, “Substantial Fulfilment - B”, “Fulfilment with Improvement Need -C” or “Insufficient compliance -D”.

Based on the assessment of the guidelines, the following decisions can be made:

- “Positive”, when all guidelines are rated as A or B.
- “Negative”, when at least one guideline is rated D.
- “In revision”, when at least one guideline is rated C.

Centres with a “In Revision” decision can implement improvement plan focused on the guidelines that are assessed as “Fulfilment with Improvement Need -C. After a period of one year (six months in the case of ex-ante IQAS evaluation of non-official training) a shortened review, focused only on the improvement needs, is carried out. If all the guidelines reach a “Substantial Fulfilment - B” a positive decision is taken. The shortened review is carried out by the SISCAL Certification Committee, based on documents and evidence of the implementation of the improvements. If the Committee judges that the scope and complexity of the improvements require it, it may request that the initial review panel carry out a new review visit.