



QUALITY EXTERNAL EVALUATION PROCEDURE – CHANGE OF RATING

The evaluation will be carried out based on the procedures comprised in the current **Methodology** and **Guide**, within the terms provided for by them.

Taking into account that, in order to *change the rating*, a careful evaluation is needed of all the issues that led to the first rating, including those that, in the first instance, were not signalled or analysed, the following will be verified:

1. General institutional issues.
2. Problems identified at the previous evaluation visit (programmes having obtained other rating than **confidence**, problems concerning the observance of the code of ethics, institutional capacity, effectiveness, academic management etc.)
3. All study programmes having overrun the terms provided for by the law with reference to evaluation/re-evaluation. The evaluation of programmes having obtained the *temporary functioning authorisation*, which overran the terms provided for by the law with concern to accreditation, may lead to the change of status into *accreditation* if adequate quality standards are found to be fulfilled. If it is ascertained that these standards are not fulfilled, the **non-confidence** rating is granted and the elaboration of a new self-evaluation file is requested. This file is submitted to ARACIS within one calendar year for a new quality evaluation. If the result of this evaluation is once more *non-confidence*, the enforcement of Art. 34 of GEO 75/2005 is proposed, so as the respective study programme should enter into the liquidation process. In these cases, the number of evaluators carrying out the study programme visit is three.
4. All study programmes that have obtained the **limited confidence** rating and have not re-submitted a new self-evaluation file according to ARACIS Council's report.



-
5. Evaluation visits will be carried out at all university units (study programmes developed in other cities, which were not periodically evaluated according to the law) on the basis of different self-evaluation reports.
 6. Master's degree areas, with master's degree programmes approved by decisions of the university Senate, will be evaluated.
 7. Other study programmes will be evaluated by mutual agreement with the university's management, if the number of programmes that are registered in a previously mentioned category does not surpass 20%.
 8. Taking into account that evaluated programmes will be considered as PERIODICALLY EVALUATED, the evaluator must also propose a number of students for each programme because, for some of those programmes, at present there is not any record on the number of students. This provision will also be extended for all the programme evaluations within institutional evaluations.
 9. The evaluation costs are established in compliance with the current regulations for institutional evaluations. If the number of programmes determined according to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 is higher than the number corresponding to 20% of the university's accredited Bachelor's degree programmes, an additional estimate is drawn up, calculated according to the evaluation costs per programme diminished by a sub-unitary coefficient if the number of evaluators carrying out the visit per programme is lower than three.
 10. Depending on the relation between the initially granted rating and the rating obtained following the new evaluation, the results' significance is in compliance with the table below:

Initial rating	Non-confidence	Limited confidence	Confidence
New rating	High degree of confidence	High degree of confidence	High degree of confidence
	It is	It is	It is



	considered periodical evaluation for a 5-year period	considered periodical evaluation for a 5-year period	considered periodical evaluation for a 5-year period
New rating	Confidence It is considered periodical evaluation for a 5-year period	Confidence It is considered periodical evaluation for a 5-year period	Confidence It is considered periodical evaluation for a 5-year period
New rating	Limited confidence The provisions of art. 34 of GEO 75 are enforced	Limited confidence The provisions of art. 34 of GEO 75 are enforced	Limited confidence The provisions of art. 34 of GEO 75 are enforced
New rating	Non- confidence The provisions of art. 34 of GEO 75 are enforced	Non- confidence The provisions of art. 34 of GEO 75 are enforced	Non- confidence The provisions of art. 34 of GEO 75 are enforced

Note: This procedure was approved in the ARACIS Council's meeting on 21 October 2010.

ARACIS Council