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STRATEGIC GOAL A:

To contribute to the improvement and enhancement of the university system in Spain through the development and application of quality assurance and the accreditation of university programmes and teaching, by bringing added value to both processes and results.
Evaluation/Accreditation of academic staff

Evaluation of teaching activity

Evaluation of research activities (on an individual basis)
ANECA has established threshold criteria for different academic positions to evaluate individual candidates to apply subsequently to the positions offered by the Spanish public universities.

ANECA does not select the academic but identifies those candidates that get a positive evaluation according to:

- Individual research activity
- Teaching and learning experience
- Management experience
- Education
The evaluation of academic staff is made by ANECA through a methodology where the criteria are public and the procedure is run by means of peers grouped in five evaluation committees divided by scientific fields:

- Sciences
- Arts and Humanities
- Health Sciences
- Engineering and Architecture
- Social and Legal Sciences

It is a two-tier process to become professor of university in Spain: an evaluation stage and subsequently a selecting process made by the university before a jury where different candidates with the particular career profile can apply for.
1st stage: Evaluation (CV assessment by discipline committee)

2nd stage: open competition (on-site with a peer committee nominated by the university)
Evaluation/Accreditation of academic staff

Evaluation procedure

The committees include representatives from different disciplines within the wide range of profiles represented under the five scientific field umbrellas, chaired by an academic and one ANECA staff acting as secretary.

The evaluation result in a positive or negative decision based on a report including recommendations for improvement. The candidate with a negative decision has to wait before applying for the procedure again.

It is a threshold evaluation where the candidate is not ranked through marks, grades or any other way to turn. The decision is “yes” or “no” and only includes recommendations in the latter case.
Evaluation/Accreditation of academic staff

The Spanish University Act distinguishes 2 procedures for public universities depending on the nature of the position that the candidate apply for.

- **Academic staff leading to a civil servant position**: the candidate becomes a state professor. The Act gives this competence to ANECA at the national level.

- **Academic staff leading to a non-civil servant position**: it includes the first steps of the academic career, from the equivalent of teaching assistant to a tenure position. The regional QAAs can also make this procedure in their respective jurisdiction.

**For private universities:**
The Act foresees that a percentage of the academic staff of private universities has to be evaluated by ANECA.
### Evaluation criteria:

**TU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation criteria:

**CU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation/Accreditation of academic staff

Registered applications per year and per category

Total 31,249
September, 2014
Evaluation of academic staff (on an individual basis)

Registered applications per year and per category

Period 2006 – September 2014
1. Evaluation/Accreditation of academic staff

2. Evaluation of teaching activity

3. Evaluation of research activities (on an individual basis)
DOCENTIA Programme: supports Universities to create mechanisms to evaluate the teaching performance of the academic staff.

DOCENTIA has been developed and implemented by ANECA, in collaboration with all of the regional quality assurance agencies. Its purpose is to support universities in the design and implementation of teaching quality assessment procedures with the aim of ensuring the teaching quality of their academic staff and encourage the development of academic staff and recognition of their expertise.

Characteristics

- Voluntary process
- Tool for continuous improvement

70 universities participate (86% of the total number)

Actually in last phase: certification of the evaluation procedure.
The DOCENTIA Programme proposes a comprehensive model that will enable universities to **develop a methodology to assess the teaching performance** of the academic staff. Consequently, the basis is a model that takes into consideration the actions performed outside and inside the classroom, the results derived from them, and their subsequent review and improvement in terms of academic training and innovation.

The model that underpins this Programme considers three **dimensions** as the object of evaluating teaching activities:

- **planning teaching activities**
- **developing teaching**
- **results**
The different phases

**Phase I Design:** the agency assess the compliance with the basics of the assessment policy

**Phase II Monitoring implementation:** agencies follow the implementation of the designs that have passed Phase I

**Phase III Certification:** The agencies certify the implementation by the universities of the acknowledged assessment procedure, thus endorsing the results
Evaluation of teaching activity

Assessment procedures as presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS TO BE EVALUATED</th>
<th>EVALUATION SOURCES AND PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Programme planning** dimension would include information on the course programme design, teaching activities and methodology.

The **Programme development** dimension would include information on the teaching duties of the professor.

The **results** dimension would provide information on the extent to which students achieve educational objectives and on their opinion of teaching performance.
1- Evaluation/Accreditation of academic staff

2- Evaluation of teaching activity

3- Evaluation of research activities (on an individual basis)
Since **1989**, the Spanish National Research Assessment Commission (CNEAI) evaluates research productivity of Spanish university teachers over a six-year period (‘sexenio’) to establish an salary supplement.

The establishment of the evaluation of the research productivity in 1989 represented a big step forward in the improvement of the **scientific production** and in the **internationalization** of Science in Spain.

In the last 25 years there has been an exponential growth of the scientific contribution of the Spanish Science and Technology to through the publication in scientific journals.
- **Object of evaluation**: research activity of tenured university staff during, at least, a 6-year period.

- **Purpose**: regular recognition of productivity in terms of quality research accomplished.

- **Result**: In case of a positive one, the grant of a 6-year research period (“sexenio”), resulting in a salary increase for the candidate, besides other indirect consequences affecting not only his/her personal career, but also his/her environment (research group, department, teaching involvement, etc). In case of a negative result, the candidate will not obtain the so-called “sexenio” and its incentives.
Evaluation of research activities (on an individual basis)
After 25 years of existence (1989-2014),

CNEAI has generated reference criteria for **14 knowledge areas**. This criteria is published in each call, and it has evolved smoothly throughout the years.

Every year approximately **6000-8000 evaluations of civil servant academic staff** are made and another **1500-2000** applications are received from people holding other academic positions.
Scientific fields

Field 1. Mathematics and Physics.
Field 2. Chemistry.
Field 3. Cellular and molecular Biology.
Field 4. Biomedical Sciences.
   6.1. Mechanical and Production Technologies.
   6.3. Architecture, Civil Engineering, Construction and Urbanism.
Field 7. Social, Political, Behavioral and Educational Sciences.
Field 9. Law and Jurisprudence.
Field 10. History, Geography and Arts.
Field 11. Philosophy, Philology and Linguistics.
Field 0. Knowledge Transference and Innovation (recently added).
In each call at least **95 specialists** are mobilized

- All of them are **University professors or researchers** from CSIC (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, the Spanish Council of Scientific Research) with at least 3 six-year periods ('sexenios') granted.

- The maximum time of permanence for the members of the advisory committee is 2 years, although presidents can work in the committee for 3 years.

- Every year a 45-65% of the advisory committee is renewed.

- Members of the advisory committees are selected among renowned researchers from all over the Spanish territory.
Evaluation of research activities (on an individual basis)

Example of assessment criteria

Field 6. Engineering and Architecture
Subfield 6.1. Mechanical and Production Technologies

Among the contributions, there will be preferably assessed:

• Exploitation patents
• The articles published in renowned journals, being accepted as such the ones that hold important positions in the corresponding list of scientific category in the Journal Citation Reports (JCR) Science Edition
• The important technological development that involve innovating aspects and are also acknowledged as such by the scientific and technical community
• Books or book chapters
• ...
Example of assessment criteria

Field 6. Engineering and Architecture
Subfield 6.1. Mechanical and Production Technologies

As guidance, it is considered that to obtain a positive assessment in the fields of Mechanical and Production Technologies it is needed to make at least four contributions that are either patents or articles published in high-level journals included in the JCR Science Edition.
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