

## PROCEDURE FOR THE RENEWAL OF ACCREDITATION OF OFFICIAL UNIVERSITY BACHELOR'S AND MASTER'S PROGRAMMES IN THE BASQUE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

### 1. REFERENCE FRAMEWORK

Royal Decree 1393/2007 of 29 October 2007, which establishes the organisation of official university education and its subsequent modifications, determines the general framework for regulating the processes of verification, monitoring and renewal of accreditation of official university education.

Article 24.2 establishes that the renewal of accreditation of official university programmes shall be carried out within the following deadlines:

- a) Official bachelor's programmes of 240 credits must renew their accreditation within a maximum period of six years.
- b) Official university programmes of 300 credits must renew their accreditation within a maximum period of seven years.
- c) Official university programmes of 360 credits must renew their accreditation within a maximum period of eight years.
- d) Official university Master's programmes must renew their accreditation within a maximum period of four years.
- e) Official university doctoral programmes must renew their accreditation within a maximum period of six years.

This period shall be counted from the date of the initial verification of the Bachelor's, Master's or Doctoral programmes, or from the date of its last accreditation.

Official Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral programmes shall renew their accreditation in accordance with the procedure established by each Autonomous Community in relation to the Universities within its sphere of competence, within the framework of the provisions of Article 27 bis.

In this regard, Decree 274/2017, of 19 December, on the implementation and suppression of official university programmes leading to Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral programmes, establishes that the procedure for the renewal process will be regulated by the corresponding Unibasq procedure.

All REACU member agencies collaborated in the drafting of the document "*Evaluation criteria and guidelines for the accreditation of Bachelor, Master and Doctoral programmes*" for the renewal of accreditation, which is part of the document approved at the meeting of the University Commission for the Regulation of Monitoring and Accreditation (CURSA) on 6 November 2013, and in the drafting of its subsequent modifications agreed at the REACU meeting of 8-9 May 2014.

As a result of the experience gained in the evaluation for the renewal of accreditation, and taking as a reference the CURSA protocol, the current regulations, as well as the Criteria and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) developed by the E4 Group (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, ENQA), European Students' Union (ESU), European University Association (EUA), European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE), in cooperation with Education International (EI),

BUSINESSEUROPE and the European Quality Assurance Register of Higher Education (EQAR), European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE), in cooperation with Education International (EI), BUSINESSEUROPE and the European Quality Assurance Register of Higher Education (EQAR), the Agency's Advisory Committee, at its meeting of 6 July 2021, has decided to approve a new document replacing the previous one, the content of which is set out in the following paragraphs.

## **2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE**

The renewal of accreditation is part of a global evaluation process, of a compulsory nature, which all official study programmes of the Basque University System registered in the Register of Universities, Centres and Degrees (RUCT) have to follow periodically.

This document establishes the criteria for the renewal of the accreditation of official Bachelor's and Master's programmes registered in the RUCT of the universities of the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country. If the programme is an inter-university programme, the renewal of accreditation will be carried out by the evaluation agency of the Autonomous Community in which the University that requested the verification of the programme is located.

## **3. PURPOSES**

The objectives of the re-accreditation are as follows:

- To ensure the quality of the study programme offered in accordance with the levels of qualification established and the criteria expressed in the legal regulations in force.
- To guarantee that the quality of the results obtained in the development of official university education corresponds to the commitments acquired and verified.
- Check that the programme has had an appropriate monitoring process and that the quantitative and qualitative information available has been used to analyse its development, generate and implement the relevant proposals for improvement.
- To ensure the availability and accessibility of valid, reliable, pertinent and relevant public information that helps in the decision-making process of the different users and stakeholders of the university system.
- To provide recommendations and/or suggestions for improvement for the programme that support the internal quality improvement processes of the programme and its development, and which will have to be taken into account in future monitoring and renewal of accreditation.

The process of renewal of accreditation will therefore make it possible to check whether the programme is being offered in accordance with what was established in the verification report (or in any subsequent modifications that may have taken place) and whether the results obtained and their evolution justify the renewal of accreditation. Likewise, the renewal assessment process will help the programme to identify those aspects to which special attention must be paid with a view to improving its results.

## **4. PROCEDURE FOR THE ISSUING OF A REPORT FOR THE RENEWAL OF ACCREDITATION OF OFFICIAL STUDY PROGRAMMES IN THE BASQUE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM**

### **1. Receipt of the application at Unibasq.**

In accordance with the provisions of Decree 274/2017, of 19 December, the procedure will begin with the submission of the application by the University to the Department responsible for universities of the Basque Government, within the deadlines approved by Order of the Minister responsible for universities. Together with

the application, the university shall submit the self-assessment report and the evidence justifying the self-assessment.

Once the file has been processed, the department responsible for universities shall send it to Unibasq.

## **2. Constitution of the Visiting Panel**

Unibasq will constitute the Visiting Panels that will carry out the assessment of the implementation of the programme and the visit to the centre where the programme to be assessed is taught.

The actions of the Visiting Panel shall be governed by the indications established by Unibasq in its Code of Ethics and Guarantees, as well as in the internal rules of procedure contained in this document.

The general composition of the Visiting Panel shall be as follows:

- A person holding the presidency, with academic prestige (professor or equivalent rank), who will have experience in the processes of Verification, Monitoring and/or Renewal of the Accreditation of Unibasq programmes or of another agency.
- A variable number of academic members, to be determined according to:
  - The number of programmes to be evaluated.
  - The heterogeneity of the academic field of the programmes to be assessed.
  - One person to act as secretary.
  - One student member from the academic field of the programme to be assessed, with training in assessment processes.
  - A person with expertise in Quality Assurance Systems (QMS).

The Visiting Panel may also include, whenever the University so requires or when the characteristics of the programme so require, a professional member in the scientific-technical field of the programmes to be assessed and/or a foreign expert with experience in assessment processes.

Unibasq will publish on its website the composition of the Visiting Panels.

## **3. Receipt and individual study of the dossier for the renewal of the accreditation of the programme by the Panel.**

Once Unibasq has verified that the programme's self-assessment report complies with the established requirements, the Agency will provide the Visiting Panel with access to the programme's accreditation renewal dossier, which will include all the information on the programme necessary to carry out the visit:

- The latest version of the verified report, which will include those modifications requested by the programme, and the reports on the verification or modification of the programme, as the case may be.
- If applicable, the Programme Authorisation Report generated by Unibasq.
- Annual internal monitoring reports of the programme and the external monitoring reports carried out by Unibasq.
- Certification reports on the implementation of the QMS derived from the AUDIT programme and evidence obtained from the QMS.
- Reports on the DOCENTIA programme certification process.
- Indicators established for the renewal of accreditation.

- The Self-evaluation Report for the renewal of the programme's accreditation, by means of which the University justifies that the results obtained by the programme comply with the objectives for which it was designed and can expand on or complete the evidence contained in the previous points and evidence to be presented together with the Self-evaluation Report.

The members of the Visiting Panel will study all the documentation of the programme and will carry out an individual study of it. To facilitate this task, Unibasq will provide the panel members with access to an application where they can consult the programme dossier and carry out the corresponding evaluation.

#### **4. Sharing of the individual analysis carried out by the Visiting Panel**

Once the individual study has been carried out, the members of the Visiting Panel will share the main conclusions and their first impressions resulting from the analysis. In this meeting, the Visiting Panel should determine the aspects to be emphasised during the visit, as well as:

- Additional evidence to be requested: identify additional information or data needed to substantiate aspects that are confusing, contradictory or not supported by evidence.
- Questions and groups to be interviewed: identify the main issues to be clarified during the visit and the group to be interviewed.
- Site visit: the possible visit to specific facilities.
- Choice of subjects to be analysed: in the case of Bachelor's and Master's programmes, they will select, for each programme, a series of subjects that would serve as a sample for the assessment of various programme guidelines. In the case of the Bachelor's programme, a minimum of 5 subjects is recommended, which could be one basic subject, two compulsory subjects, one optional subject and the final bachelor's thesis (TFG), each corresponding to different academic years. It is recommended in the case of a 60 ECTS Master's programme to select at least one subject and the final master's thesis (TFM), and in the case of a 120 ECTS Master's programme to select at least two subjects and the TFM. The teaching guides, the CVs of the teaching staff will be carefully analysed to assess the suitability of their profiles with the subjects, their methods of assessing competences/learning outcomes, the alignment of the teaching methodology with the training activities and the assessment of competence acquisition, the suitability of the subject to the corresponding MECES level, the demonstration of competence acquisition through the subject's assessment model, the suitability of the practical activities and their coordination with the theory, etc. Many of these assessments will take place prior to the visit through the information provided by the university.
- Agenda proposal: based on the above, an agenda will be drawn up and sent to the University. The programmes under evaluation will be grouped according to their subject matter and/or the centres where they are taught.

#### **5. Preparation of the visit by the University**

The University's tasks for the preparation of the visit are as follows:

- Make available to the Visiting Panel the necessary rooms, suitably equipped, in which they can carry out the planned interviews, as well as their own internal meetings for the sharing of the information gathered. They must also provide facilities for internet access for the evaluation team.
- Facilitating the Visiting Panel's travel where necessary.

- Inform the different groups (teaching and research staff, administrative and service staff, students, student representatives or collaborating entities, among others) through the media about the Panel's visit and, in particular, about the agenda of the visit and the public hearing.
- Select, ensuring the diversity of views necessary to bring out suggestions and actions for improvement, the persons from the different groups involved as requested by the Visiting Panel, according, where appropriate, to its guidelines and/or the specific guidelines established by the Agency, and organise the meetings with these groups appropriately.
- To attend to the Visiting Panel for any requests it may make regarding the evaluation process for the renewal of accreditation. A person from the University will be in charge of receiving the Visiting Panel in order to welcome them and organise everything necessary to facilitate their performance, as well as to see them off at the end of the visit.
- Have the requested additional evidence available to the Visiting Panel.

#### **6. Conduct of the visit by the Visiting Panel**

On the planned dates, a visit will be made to the centre to which the programme or programmes to be assessed are attached.

During the visit, the groups listed in the agenda will be interviewed and there will be a period of time to review the evidence previously requested by the Visiting Panel and to hold a public hearing where any person related to the programme who wishes to provide additional information related to the programme can attend.

#### **7. Issuance of the Visit Report by the Visiting Panel**

The Visiting Panel shall draw up the Visiting Report. Although the person who chairs the panel is ultimately responsible for drafting the report, the members of the Panel will be distributed among the members of the Panel for the preparation of the draft reports. The report will be issued on a collegial basis.

Once the Visit Report has been finalised, the person chairing the Visiting Panel shall send it to Unibasq.

#### **8. Analysis of the programme documentation by the Programme Evaluation Committee.**

The Self-evaluation Report, the Visiting Report and the rest of the previous information available on the programme included in the accreditation dossier will be analysed by the evaluation committees previously assigned by Unibasq.

As a result of the analysis carried out, the Committee shall draw up an Evaluation Report. This interim evaluation report may be:

- favourable to the renewal of accreditation or
- with aspects that necessarily need to be modified in order to obtain a favourable report.

All reports, whatever their outcome, must be reasoned, and may include recommendations for improvement, and/or the requirement for an Improvement Plan.

#### **9. Interim Report and allegations**

The Interim Report and the Visiting Report drawn up by the Visiting Panel will be sent to the University so that, within 20 working days, it may make the allegations it deems appropriate. In the event that the result of the Provisional Report is with "aspects that must necessarily be modified in order to obtain a favourable report", the University may make the appropriate clarifications on the deficiencies detected.

In addition to these clarifications, the University may, where appropriate, attach an Improvement Plan that integrates the strategic decision on which changes will be incorporated into the different processes of the organisation, so that they are translated into an improvement of the deficiencies identified in the Interim Accreditation Report. This plan must allow the control and monitoring of the different actions to be developed, including a sequence, planning and timing for the improvement actions to be proposed.

If no allegations have been submitted after the deadline, the University shall be deemed to have waived its right to submit them and this report shall become the final report.

#### **10. Analysis of allegations by the Programmes Review Committee**

After receiving the allegations and, where appropriate, the Improvement Plan, the corresponding committee will proceed to analyse them, studying both the clarifications made by the University and the viability of the proposed Improvement Plan. As a result of this analysis, the Committee will decide whether or not to modify its Interim Report.

#### **11. Elaboration and submission of the Final Report for the Renewal of Accreditation of Unibasq.**

Unibasq will issue the final accreditation renewal report, which may be favourable or unfavourable to the renewal of the accreditation of the programme, taking into account the assessment of the requirements for overcoming the criteria indicated in section 6 of this document.

Unibasq will send the Final Report to the applicant University, to the Council of Universities, to the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport and to the Basque Government Department responsible for universities and, where appropriate, to the other Autonomous Communities involved. As suggested by the main international standards of reference for External Quality Assurance Agencies, Unibasq may make the accreditation renewal reports public by any means it deems appropriate.

#### **12. Renewal resolution by the Universities Council**

Finally, the Council of Universities will issue the corresponding resolution on the renewal of the programme's accreditation.

Once the resolution has been issued, the Council of Universities shall communicate the corresponding resolution to the Ministry responsible for universities, to the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country and to the University. In the event that the decision on the renewal of accreditation is favourable, the Ministry will make the appropriate entry in the RUCT. In the event of a rejection, the programme will be recorded in the register as extinct as of this date.

#### **13. Appeals**

The University, against the resolution of the Universities Council, may appeal to the presidency of the Council within one month from the date of the resolution (article 27.7 bis of Royal Decree 861/2010). The Universities Council, through its committee of experts, is the body that may ratify the resolution or accept the appeal and send it to Unibasq, indicating specifically the aspects of the assessment that must be reviewed, all within a maximum period of three months from the lodging of the appeal. The University shall inform the Basque Government Department responsible for universities of the lodging of the aforementioned appeal within ten days of the aforementioned lodging.

A committee composed of the chairpersons of the five Programme evaluation committees will analyse and resolve the appeal and communicate its decision to the Council of Universities.

### **5. EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The evaluation model is based on three dimensions:

- **MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAMME.** The management and organisation of the programme (including access, teaching coordination mechanisms and credit transfer and recognition systems), the transparency and visibility of the programme in terms of the information it provides to the different interest groups or agents, and the effectiveness of the QMS as an instrument for collecting information, analysing it, implementing improvement actions and monitoring them.
- **RESOURCES.** The adequacy of the academic staff and the material resources, infrastructures and services made available to students will be analysed in order to guarantee the achievement of the competences defined by the programme.
- **RESULTS.** Aspects related to the results of the programme and their evolution during its development will be evaluated. In this sense, the mechanisms established by the University to verify the adequate acquisition, by the students, of the competences initially defined for the programme, or more correctly, their learning outcomes, will be analysed. The evolution of the different indicators of academic, professional (employability) and personal (satisfaction with the training experience) results will also be analysed.

The dimensions are further broken down into seven criteria that allow a sufficient degree of disaggregation to identify the necessary information to facilitate proper analysis. Each criterion is defined by a standard that should be achieved.

Finally, each criterion is specified in one or more assessment guidelines, on which they will be indicated:

- Aspects on which the analysis is based.
- The evidence and indicators that support the formulation of value judgements (proposed documentation is indicated in each guideline).

<i><b>DIMENSION 1. MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAMME</b></i>	<i><b>DIMENSION 2. RESOURCES</b></i>	<i><b>DIMENSION 3. RESULTS</b></i>
<b>CRITERION 1. ORGANISATION AND DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>CRITERION 4. ACADEMIC STAFF</b>	<b>CRITERION 6. LEARNING OUTCOMES</b>
<b>CRITERION 2. INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY</b>	<b>CRITERION 5. SUPPORT STAFF, MATERIAL RESOURCES AND SERVICES</b>	<b>CRITERION 7. SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</b>
<b>CRITERION 3. QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM</b>		



## DIMENSION 1. MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAMME

### CRITERION 1. ORGANISATION AND DEVELOPMENT

**Standard:**

**The programme is up to date and has been implemented in accordance with the conditions established in the verified report and/or its subsequent modifications.**

Guideline 1.1: The implementation of the syllabus and the organisation of the programme are coherent with the competence profile and objectives of the programme set out in the verification report and/or its subsequent modifications.

Guideline 1.2: The defined graduate profile (and its deployment in the curriculum) remains relevant and up-to-date according to the requirements of its academic, scientific and professional field.

Guideline 1.3: The programme has teaching coordination mechanisms (horizontal and vertical articulation between the different subjects) that allow both an adequate allocation of the students' workload and an adequate time planning, ensuring the acquisition of the learning outcomes.

Guideline 1.4: The admission criteria applied allow students to have the appropriate entry profile to start these studies and their application respects the number of places offered in the verified report.

Guideline 1.5: The implementation of the different academic regulations is carried out in an appropriate manner and allows for the improvement of 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: Those responsible for the programme publish adequate and up-to-date information on the characteristics of the programme, its development and its results, both in terms of monitoring and accreditation.

Guideline 2.2: The information necessary for decision-making by potential students interested in the programme and other agents of interest in the national and international university system is easily accessible.

Guideline 2.3: Students enrolled in the programme have timely access to relevant information about the curriculum and the intended learning outcomes.

### CRITERION 3. QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (QMS)

**Standard:**

**The institution has a formally established and implemented quality management system that effectively ensures the continuous improvement of the programme.**

Guideline 3.1: The implemented and regularly reviewed QMS ensures the continuous collection and analysis of information and results relevant to the effective management of the programme, in particular learning outcomes and stakeholder satisfaction.

Guideline 3.2: The implemented QMS facilitates the process of monitoring, modification and accreditation of the programme and ensures its continuous improvement based on the analysis of objective data.

Guideline 3.3: The implemented QMS has procedures in place to facilitate the evaluation and improvement of the quality of the teaching-learning process.



## 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 programme and the number of students.**

Guideline 4.1: The academic staff of the programme meets the level of academic qualification required for the programme 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 the student body.

Guideline 4.3: The teaching staff is updated so that, taking into account the characteristics of the programme, they can approach the teaching-learning process in an appropriate manner.

Guideline 4.4: (Where applicable) The University has implemented the commitments included in the verification report and the recommendations defined in the reports on the verification, authorisation, where applicable, and monitoring of the programme relating to the recruitment and enhancement 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 programme are adequate according to the nature and modality of the programme, the number of students enrolled and the learning outcomes 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 programme.

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 programme.

Guideline 5.3: In the case of distance/ blended learning programmes, the technological infrastructures and teaching materials associated with them allow for the development of training activities and the acquisition of the programme learning outcomes.

Guideline 5.4: The academic, professional and mobility support and guidance services made available to students once enrolled are in line with the learning outcomes and modality of the programme and facilitate the teaching-learning process.

Guideline 5.5: If the programme includes external/clinical placements, these have been planned as planned and are appropriate for the acquisition of the programme learning outcomes.

Guideline 5.6: The University has made effective the commitments included in the verification report and the recommendations defined in the reports on the verification, authorisation, where applicable, and monitoring of the programme relating to the support staff involved in the training activities, the material resources, and the programme's support services.

### 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) level of the programme.

Guideline 6.1: The training activities, their teaching methodologies and the assessment systems used are appropriate and reasonably suited to the objective of acquiring the intended learning outcomes.

Guideline 6.2: The learning outcomes achieved meet the objectives of the programme and are in line with their MECES level.

#### 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 programme and satisfy the social demands of its environment.

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

Guideline 7.2: Satisfaction of students, teaching staff, graduates and other stakeholders is adequate.

Guideline 7.3: The values of the indicators of graduate labour market outcomes are appropriate to the socio-economic and professional context of the programme.

## **6. ASSESSMENT OF THE CRITERIA**

Each of the above-mentioned accreditation criteria and guidelines will be assessed on the basis of four levels, where appropriate:

- It exceeds excellently. The standard corresponding to the criterion is fully achieved and, in addition, it is an example that exceeds the basic requirements.
- Achieved. The standard corresponding to the criterion is fully achieved.
- Partially achieved. The standard is achieved at the minimum level, but specific areas for improvement are identified.
- Not achieved. The criterion does not achieve the minimum level required to reach the relevant standard.

For the purposes of this procedure, these shall be considered serious deficiencies leading to the issuing of a report against the renewal of accreditation:

- Those that have been reiterated in the Unibasq Monitoring Reports and which, although they need to be rectified, have not been carried out.
- Non-compliance with clear commitments and objectives assumed in the verified report on academic staff, support services and infrastructures.

In no case can accreditation be achieved if a score of "not achieved" is obtained for any of the following criteria:

- Criterion 4. Academic staff
- Criterion 5. Material resources and student support
- Criterion 6. Learning outcomes

The identification of serious deficiencies in other criteria may also lead to the issuing of an unfavourable report.

In accordance with the CURSA protocol approved by the General Conference on University Policy, the assessment of a programme that is taught in several centres of the same University, if serious non-compliance is detected by any of the centres where the programme is taught, an interim report may be obtained with aspects that must necessarily be modified, including the elimination of the participation of the centre or centres where these deficiencies occur. The final favourable report will be obtained with a commitment on the part of the university that, once accreditation renewal has been obtained, if applicable, the syllabus will be modified so that, within a reasonable period of time, the centre in question will be excluded from teaching the corresponding programme.

## **7. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RE-ACCREDITATION, AUDIT AND DOCENTIA**

When Universities have a certificate of implementation of the Programme for the Recognition of Quality Assurance Systems for University Education (AUDIT), the content of the Certification Report will be taken into account in the process of renewing the accreditation of programmes, allowing as a general rule that the following guidelines for the renewal of accreditation are not subject to a new evaluation by the Visiting Panels that visit the university centres:

- Criterion 1: Organisation and development.
  - 1.2. The defined graduate profile (and its deployment in the curriculum) maintains its relevance and is updated according to the requirements of its academic, scientific and professional field.
  - 1.5. 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.

- Criterion 3: Quality Management System.
- Criterion 4: Academic staff.

4.3. The teaching staff is updated in such a way that, taking into account the characteristics of the programme, they are able to approach the teaching-learning process in an appropriate manner.

Criterion 5: Support staff, material resources and services.

5.4. The academic, professional and mobility support and guidance services made available to students once they have enrolled are in line with the learning outcomes and modality of the programme and facilitate the teaching-learning process.

When the universities have a DOCENTIA implementation certificate, the content of the certification report will be taken into account in the process of renewing the accreditation of the programmes. During the DOCENTIA certification process, the assessment of the different aspects of the Teaching Quality Assessment System implemented in the centre is reflected in the evaluation report and its content will be taken into account in the accreditation process. This assessment is reflected in the evaluation report and its content will be taken into account in the process of renewing the accreditation of the centre's programmes. Thus, the following guidelines for the renewal of accreditation will not be subject to evaluation by the Visiting Panel when the University has DOCENTIA certification:

- 3.3. The IQAS implemented has procedures that facilitate the evaluation and improvement of the quality of the teaching-learning process.
- 4.3. The teaching staff is updated in such a way that, taking into account the characteristics of the programme, they can tackle the teaching-learning process in an appropriate manner.

Notwithstanding the above, if through different sources of information, Unibasq detects incidents in the programmes taught at the centre, it will evaluate the criteria established in the accreditation model that are affected, regardless of whether the centre has the AUDIT certificate or the University has the DOCENTIA certificate.