


Content

PURPOSE	2
SCOPE	2
RELATED DOCUMENTATION	2
PROCESS DEVELOPMENT	2
SPECIFICS BY CENTRE	11
School of Architecture, Engineering and Design.	11
N/A	11
Faculty of Sports Sciences	11
N/A	11
Faculty of Social Sciences and Communication	11
N/A	11
Faculty of Biomedical and Health Sciences	11
N/A	11
School of Doctoral Studies and Research	12
N/A	12
RECORDS (evidence)	12
INDICATORS	12
RESPONSIBILITIES	12
ANNEXES	14

MODIFICATIONS			
EDITION	DATE	REASON FOR MODIFICATION	PAGES
01	10/10/2008	INITIAL VERSION	
02	19/09/2012	Adaptation of Procedure	2, 3, 7
03	09/03/2014	Adaptation of Procedure	
		- Update of purpose and scope	2
		- Update of definitions	2
		- Update of process development	2-4
		- Update of process diagram	5
		Inclusion of communication and indicators section	6
		- Update of records	7
04	20/02/2015	Adaptation of procedure	2
05	18/03/2018	Review of procedure and adaptation	3-7
06		System review	
07	04/07/2019	Unification of SGIC I and II	All
08	26/04/2021	Update of content, and Director of Quality and Academic Compliance	All

	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 2 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

Approved by: Olga Castelao Director of the Academic Quality and Compliance Department Date: 26/04/2021	Approved by: Eva Icarán Vice-Rector for Teaching Staff and Research Date: 26/04/2021	Approved by: Elena Gazapo Rector Date: 26/04/2021
--	--	--

PURPOSE

The purpose of this procedure is, on the one hand, to ensure that Universidad Europea de Madrid measures and analyses the key results related to the performance of the Internal Quality Assurance System (SGIC) processes overall and, on the other, to establish decision-making mechanisms related to the conclusions drawn, in order to continuously improve the quality of its degree programmes.

SCOPE

This procedure encompasses all the procedures that form part of the Internal Quality Assurance System. It applies to all official degree programmes and, through accountability mechanisms, to professors and students.

RELATED DOCUMENTATION


- Internal Quality Assurance Manual (MAGIC)
- PGC 1.2 Strategic planning
- PGC 11.1 Stakeholder group satisfaction
- PGC 12.2 System Review and Documentary Control

PROCESS DEVELOPMENT

1. Selection of results, definition of indicators and other sources of information:

Based on the results obtained and conclusions drawn in the previous academic year, prior to the first review of the system the person in charge of the Quality Assurance System and Quality Management will assess the results obtained from the indicators relating to the different procedures that form part of the Quality Assurance System, taking the University's Quality Policy and Strategic Plan as a point of reference. Based on the results obtained, a decision is taken as to whether the indicators are to be considered valid, and if not, a proposal is put forward for their modification.

The indicators are included in a master document called List PGC_Records_indicators, which is

 Universidad Europea Madrid	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 3 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

kept by the Academic Quality and Compliance Department.

After approval by the Management Committee, the Academic Quality Management and Compliance Department decides on the most appropriate methods of data collection and analysis to establish the organisation's performance indicators.

In all cases the results to be measured will be based on the development of indicators in accordance with SMART guidelines, and therefore will be:

- Specific
- Measurable
- Achievable
- Relevant
- Timely

The KPIs associated with faculties and degree programmes are clearly explained, and are shared with the heads of the degree programmes or centres via the **Academic Dashboard**, which since academic year 2017/2018 has been hosted on SharePoint in Office 365. This includes a dictionary of indicators, information on the performance of each indicator at different levels (degree programme, faculty or university) comparing it with historical data, and segmentation based on certain profile variables. The Dashboard is linked to the Degree Programme Indicator Sheet, with information on performance, satisfaction, employability and professors.


In general terms, the academic data/results/KPIs and other relevant information regarding the satisfaction of the different stakeholder groups will be taken into account, as will the results of the analysis of the Student Services Department records, and reports from the University Ombudsman.

- Results of performance measures and other indicators/ratios (enrolment, first and subsequent enrolments, dropout, efficiency, assessment and performance) for each faculty/school/degree programme.
- Learning outcomes (obtained from the systematics described in PGC 5.4 Learning Assessment Procedure).
- Work placement results and satisfaction data for graduates, and internship locations.
- Results of training, assessment, promotion and recognition of teaching and non-teaching staff (PGC 1.5 HR Policy Management, PGC 8.1 Recruitment and Selection, PGC 8.3 Training of Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff, PGC 8.4 Talent Management and Internal Mobility and PGC 8.5 Staff Performance Management).
- Stakeholder group satisfaction results (PGC 11.1 Stakeholder Group Satisfaction).
- Results in terms of the resolution of grievances, complaints and suggestions (PGC 9.2 Student Services).

2. Programme Review:

The Programme Review ensures the implementation and roll-out of the SGIC, and is articulated through the following evaluation and decision-making mechanisms:

Mechanisms for coordination between different levels of analysis

 Universidad Europea Madrid	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 4 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

To facilitate the implementation of the system, there are three coordination mechanisms operating at different levels within the institution: The Degree Quality Committees, the Faculty Board and the Quality Assurance Committee. These three mechanisms are used for reviewing and improving the University at three different levels: degree programme, faculty (centre) and the University as a whole.

Degree Quality Committee

The Degree Quality Committees are a series of meetings held over the course of the academic year.

At least one meeting will be held at the beginning of a degree programme, and one at the end of that programme, with an interim monitoring of the improvement plans. It is recommended that the initial committee be held during the first two months of the academic year, and the final one during the last month of the academic year.

Beginning of the academic year.

The following information will be provided at this meeting:

- Indicator sheet report, which includes quantitative information on satisfaction results from surveys, student grades and rates.
- Annual Degree Monitoring Report
- Learning assessment results.
- Information from the Degree Programme Coordinator or Programme Director on key factors affecting the degree programme in question.
- Information from the Academic Advisor on incidents, or complaints submitted by students.


As a minimum, the following will be discussed during the meeting:

- Incidents at the start of the academic year.
- Analysis of learning assessment data.
- Compliance with the legal requirements set out in the Verified Report.
- Analysis of the information provided by the Degree Coordinator.

Any member of the university staff considered appropriate may join the committee, but attendance by the following is always required:

- Vice-Dean or Undergraduate/Postgraduate Studies Director
- Degree Programme Coordinator or Programme Director
- Department Director
- Students
- Professors (GP Coordinator and Internship Coordinator) or for other subjects.
- Quality Partner (Quality and Compliance)
- Academic Advisor
- Academic Director

If any of the proposed attendees should be unable to attend for a justifiable reason, they will

	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 5 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

subsequently be sent the minutes, and will be able to make observations on the matters discussed. They may also make suggestions prior to the meeting so that they can be considered for inclusion on the agenda.

Meetings may be held in person, by telephone or by videoconference.

Once the meeting has ended an attendance sheet will be signed, and the minutes will be sent to invitees for their approval. See Annex I_Initial CCT Template. The reasons behind the decisions taken at the meeting should be stated in the minutes.

If an annual improvement plan has been drawn up, it should be attached to the minutes. In any case, an improvement plan must be drawn up in the days following the meeting and the drafting of the minutes, in order to guide the work to be carried out with a view to improving the degree programme over the course of the academic year.

Interim monitoring.

The following information will be provided at this meeting:

- Improvement plan. See Annex IV Improvement Plan Template
- Degree Programme Compliance Information (if relevant). Address issues that jeopardise the degree programme's regulatory compliance.
- Possible input from the regulator.

As a minimum, the following will be discussed during the meeting:

- Review of improvement plan.
- Review of the factors that may jeopardise the effective delivery of the degree programme

The following people would be required to attend, but others may also be invited to the meeting if necessary:

- Vice-Dean or Undergraduate/Postgraduate Studies Director
- Quality Partner (Quality and Compliance)
- Degree Programme Coordinator or Programme Director

If any of the proposed attendees should be unable to attend for a justifiable reason, they will subsequently be sent the minutes, and will be able to make observations on the matters discussed. They may also make suggestions prior to the meeting so that they can be considered for inclusion on the agenda.


Meetings may be held in person, by telephone or by videoconference.

Once the meeting has ended an attendance sheet will be signed, and the minutes will be sent to invitees for their approval. See Annex II_CCT Monitoring Template. The reasons behind the decisions taken at the meeting should be stated in the minutes. An update of the improvement plan must be attached, in line with the fields specified in the template Annex IV_Improvement Plan Template.

End of academic year.

The following information will be provided at this meeting:

- Information from the Degree Programme Coordinator or Programme Director on the

 Universidad Europea Madrid	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 6 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

overall delivery of the course.

- Information from the Academic Advisor
- Information on the teaching staff: The Degree Programme Coordinator or Programme Director will compile a list of the key problems encountered during the academic year (survey of professors, minimum of 5)

As a minimum, the following will be discussed during the meeting:

- Annual closure of the Degree Quality Committee
- Analysis of the academic year
- Assessment of the Improvement Plan and proposals

The following people will be required to attend, but others may also do so if necessary:

- Vice-Dean or Undergraduate/Postgraduate Studies Director
- Degree Programme Coordinator or Programme Director
- Department Director
- Professors (GP Coordinator and Internship Coordinator) or for other subjects.
- Quality Partner (Quality and Compliance)
- Students
- Academic Advisor
- Academic Director

If any of the proposed attendees should be unable to attend for a justifiable reason, they will subsequently be sent the minutes, and will be able to make observations on the matters discussed. They may also make suggestions prior to the meeting so that they can be considered for inclusion on the agenda.

Meetings may be held in person, by telephone or by videoconference.

Once the meeting has ended an attendance sheet will be signed, and the minutes will be sent to invitees for their approval. See Annex III_Final_CCT_Templates The reasons behind the decisions taken at the meeting should be stated in the minutes. An update of the improvement plan must be attached, in line with the fields specified in the template Annex IV_Improvement Plan Template.


The minutes should aim to include:

- Conclusions of the results of the implementation of the ongoing Improvement Plan.
- Analysis of the issues that have been identified, and that could be included in the Improvement Plan for the following academic year.

Students who are employed by the University, who are connected with the organisation through a commercial agreement, or have any other type of commercial interest in the University, will be excluded.

At the Degree Quality Committee that deals with the assessment of learning outcomes for degree programmes (for bachelor's degrees, in the case of Postgraduate Degrees, only for the MP), the person responsible for the Institutional Learning Plan (Degree Innovation and Learning Assessment) will also take part.

In order to serve as a guide for the meetings, by default the meeting will seek to address the following issues related to the quality of the degree programme, based on the re-accreditation

 Universidad Europea Madrid	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 7 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

process assessment criteria:

Planning and Strategy: Alignment of the strategic challenges facing the faculty/school with the course syllabuses.

Syllabus design: On the basis of what information the innovation/modification of a degree programme has been decided upon. The introduction of the degree programme is reviewed.

Compliance with the report: Teaching staff | Syllabus | Recognitions and Accreditations | Admission | Mode, language and number of places, etc.

Internships: Coordination between the internal and external tutor | Student follow-up | Evaluation | Satisfaction of the external tutor and the student.

GP / MP Regulations and Learning Guide | Selection of topics | Assessment rubrics | Selection of the examining board.

Degree results: key performance and satisfaction indicators

Public Information: WEBSITE updated with available and relevant information (as a minimum that needed to comply with regulatory requirements)

Information Management: Evidence duly catalogued and identified, available in the information repository.

Faculty/School Board


The Faculty/School Board is a coordination mechanism that allows cross-centre issues to be addressed. It serves as a link that permits issues affecting the degree programme to be aligned with higher level decisions taken within the University.

Main functions of the Faculty/School Board (Centre):

- Define, implement and assess the strategy of the centre, with the collaboration of the Vice-Deans, Directors of Undergraduate Degrees or Directors of Postgraduate Degrees and Department Directors.
- Establish, promote and assess the centre's performance with regard to cross-cutting quality criteria.
- Uphold and improve the SGIC
- To take the lead, together with the Academic Quality and Compliance Department, in the process of data collection and the processing of key information for the proper management of the centre.
- To take the lead in the process of the introduction of the degree programme improvement plans, and to ensure that the objectives set are in line with those established by the University.
- To spearhead the attainment of distinctions, certifications and accreditations at both national and international level by the centre.

Present:

- Dean/Director. Presides over the Faculty Board. Submits any problems, suggestions or good practices identified to the Academic Council. Ensures the proper functioning of the centre, with regard to the tuition of students at all educational levels, and their overall

	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 8 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

satisfaction with course provision.

- Vice-Deans, Degree Directors, Postgraduate Directors, the Vice-Dean of International and Cross-Cutting Projects. Report progress and any problems detected in the implementation of improvement actions for each course to the Faculty/School Boards (Centre). Act as quality managers for each of the centres, and are responsible for the different fields of knowledge that are part of each of the centres.
- Department Directors: Bring issues to the Board that mainly affect the work of the teaching staff.
- Students or student representatives are invited to participate in the Faculty Boards if necessary.
- Plus any other member of the university staff who may be required, depending on the issues to be dealt with.

Development:

At the request of the Dean or Director, the dean's secretariat invites interested parties to attend the meeting, and requests items to be included on the agenda.

The interested parties propose topics to be discussed at the meeting. Time slots for each item to be presented are allocated.

Minutes are drafted on the appointed day and time, and are subsequently circulated to all meeting attendees.

Based on the analysis of the data presented and the decisions taken, action plans are drawn up, proposing lines of action to be developed. If it is not possible to implement the actions proposed immediately, they will be taken into account during the organisation and planning for the new academic year, as well as being included in the improvement plans for the following academic year.

The strategic plan, the proposal for its implementation, as well as the assessment of its implementation and progress, is carried out by the Faculty/School Board (Centre). Final approval is granted by the Academic Council. Based on the results achieved in the performance and satisfaction indicators, and in conjunction with the University's strategic plan, each faculty will draw up an improvement plan, which will serve as the foundation for the development of the action plan for each degree programme.


Faculty Board meetings are held every 15 days.

Quality Assurance Committee

The Quality Assurance Committee (CGC) is a cross-cutting body that acts as one of the vehicles for the internal communication of the University's policy, objectives, plans, programmes, responsibilities and achievements in terms of quality.

The Quality Assurance Committee is a meeting that is held at least once a year, coinciding as far as possible with the end of one academic year, and the beginning of another. In this way as much information as possible can be made available, making it possible to address issues related to quality and the way the University works overall.

Functions:

	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 9 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

- Verify the SGIC planning for Universidad Europea de Madrid, so as to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Internal Quality Assurance System Manual (MAGIC), the quality policy and the quality objectives.
- Coordinate the formulation of Universidad Europea de Madrid’s annual quality objectives, and monitor their implementation.
- Identify cross-cutting actions for the improvement of the University that affect both the academic and service areas.
- Monitor the efficiency of processes, updating these where necessary, as well as communicating changes related to SGIC documentation.
- Study, and approved as required the implementation of the SGIC improvement proposals put forward by the other members of the University community.

The CGC comprises the following people:

- The Vice-Rector for Teaching Staff and Research, who acts as chairperson for the Committee and/or the Director of Quality Assurance on their behalf.
- Representatives from different departments within the University, who participate by providing information from their respective departments and, at the same time, obtain information to be communicated to their colleagues. These representatives may vary depending on the subjects addressed by the Quality Assurance Committee, but will always include:
 - Teaching Department Staff: Vice-Deans, Undergraduate or Postgraduate Programme Directors; Degree Programme Coordinators or Programme Directors; Professors.
 - Non-Teaching Department Staff: Student Experience; Academic Coordination; Admissions; Human Resources; Finance; Library; Operations; Career Guidance; Marketing. Website; ICT.
- Other stakeholder groups
- Students or student representatives
- Employers


Development:

At the approach of the beginning or end of an academic cycle, the Academic Quality and Compliance Department will gather information on the level of compliance with the quality objectives, the key results obtained over the course of the year, and any other strategic considerations to be addressed in the agenda of the meeting, through the Quality Director.

The Quality Director summons the interested parties, sending out an agenda with the topics to be discussed. The interested parties may then suggest additional points to be included.

The day and time arranged for the meeting. In the event that an invitee should be unable to attend, they must advise that this is the case, and if possible delegate someone else to attend in their absence.

During the meeting, the agenda will be followed, minutes will be taken and subsequently circulated to the attendees. The conclusions to be submitted to the Academic Council will be submitted by the meeting chair, the Vice-Rector for Teaching Staff and Research. If these

 Universidad Europea Madrid	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 10 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

conclusions are to be submitted to the Management Committee, the Vice-Rector for Teaching Staff and Research will pass them on to the Rector.

Improvement plans

The improvement plans are reports that describe the actions planned with a view to improving the quality of degree programmes offered, and the fulfilment of commitments acquired, based on different reports and objective data generated by the Degree Quality Committee, from the monitoring and re-accreditation processes, internal audits and compliance processes.

The person in charge of each degree programme, together with the Q partner associated with it, will be responsible for monitoring the improvement plan established by the Degree Quality Committee.

The vice-deans, undergraduate degree directors or postgraduate degree directors will submit the actions included in the degree improvement plans that require decisions to be taken by the dean's office to the Faculty/School Boards, so that they can either be dealt with via these forums, or incorporated into the faculty/school's strategic plans.

To facilitate the drafting of improvement plans, and to ensure that these deal with the issues that need to be addressed in a systematic way, a template has been created, and can be found in Annex IV Improvement Plan Template.

Improvement plans must include objectives that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound, and that are if possible related to the quality performance indicators described in PGC 11.2_Academic Performance.

They should include the reasons behind the definition of the objectives (drop in student satisfaction levels, changes in the graduation rate, etc.)

The monitoring of the improvement plans is recorded in the minutes of the initial Degree Quality Committee, at which the improvement measures proposed for that academic year are included. Progress on the implementation of these measures will be reviewed at the interim Degree Quality Committee, and the result will be recorded in the Final Committee minutes.


Compliance/Quality Control Processes.

On an annual basis, the Quality Management and Compliance Department conducts quality control studies (known as 'Compliance') at degree programme level, identifying possible critical points or threats that may affect the smooth running of the courses in the degree programme report. This study is detailed in IT01-PGC 12.3 Academic Compliance Study.

These reports are shared with the academic managers at each level and centre. The relevant aspects of these studies are included on the agenda of the Degree Quality Committees, Faculty/School Board or Quality Assurance Committee, as appropriate.

Internal Audits

Every two years, at each faculty/school (centre) the Academic Quality and Compliance Unit, together with those responsible for the centre, will lead internal auditing processes to ascertain to what degree the SGIC has been implemented (PGC 12.2 Review of the System and Documentary Control), as well as to assess whether or not degrees have been correctly

 Universidad Europea Madrid	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 11 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

introduced in accordance with the proposal committed to when the degree was validated.

Audits can be performed at any time of the year, but it is preferable for them to be conducted on dates when consolidated data is available, and at the end of a cycle, so that the evolution of different aspects related to quality can be observed over time.

The Academic Quality and Compliance Unit will draw up a proposed list of auditors (external and internal) who have substantial experience in quality assurance related roles. This group of auditors will form a panel that will be assigned a contact person from the Quality Management and Compliance Department who will provide them with general support.

Together with the panel, the contact person from the Quality Management and Compliance Department, who will liaise with the University, will (if applicable) draw up an agenda of visits and a list of documentation requested that will be needed in order to perform the assessment.

The Quality Management and Compliance Department and Academic Compliance, together with the departments to be audited, will gather the information requested by the panel.

The audit may or may not include a visit. If a visit is arranged, all those invited must attend punctually. The panel must be provided with all the material necessary for the performance of its functions (printer, computer, projector, etc.)

The results of these audits will be shared with those responsible for the centre and the associated degree programmes. Aspects identified for improvement will be shared with those responsible for each degree programme, and will serve as input to be dealt with via the established channels (Quality Assurance Committee, Degree Quality Committees, Faculty Boards, Academic Council, Management Committee), and mechanisms will be introduced to include them in the improvement plans for each degree programme or subject area.

Annual Degree Monitoring Report

Between the end of one academic year and the start of the next, the faculty/school will complete a report containing an analysis of the degree programme results during the past academic year, in collaboration with the Academic Quality and Compliance Department.

This will include the analysis of the results of satisfaction surveys, academic indicators, data received on ratios calculated, learning outcomes and grades; and an analysis of the results of the actions implemented as part of the annual improvement plan, monitoring each action, analysing its implementation and the result.

SPECIFICS BY CENTRE

School of Architecture, Engineering and Design.

N/A

Faculty of Sports Sciences


N/A

Faculty of Social Sciences and Communication

N/A

Faculty of Biomedical and Health Sciences

N/A

	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 12 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

School of Doctoral Studies and Research

N/A

RECORDS (evidence)

RECORDS		
RECORD NAME	CONTROLLER	MEDIUM and LOCATION
Degree Quality Committee minutes and improvement plans	Degree Programme Coordinator	Sharepoint. Faculty Folder/ Academic year/ Degree Programme/ Quality/ CCT
Quality Assurance Committee Minutes	Q Partner	Shared file quality/ Communication Plan/ Year; Quality Management Department File Sharepoint. Faculty Folder/ Academic year/ Degree Programme/ Key Degree Programme Indicators
Indicator sheet or satisfaction reports	Vice-Dean	Shared file quality/ Communication Plan/ Year; Quality Management Department File Sharepoint. Faculty Folder/ Academic year/ Degree Programme/ Key Degree Programme Indicators
PGC List Records_Indicators	Q Partner	Quality/ Q Management /SGIC/ 2019 Edition
Annual Degree Monitoring Report	Degree Programme Coordinator	Sharepoint. Faculty Folder/Academic year/Degree Programme/Quality

INDICATORS

IND01-PGC12.3 Indicators included on the Indicator Sheet

IND02-PGC12.3 Key ratios included on the Indicator Sheet for the degree programme


IND03-PGC12.3 NPS (Net Promoter Score) for the University overall, and for each degree programme

RESPONSIBILITIES

Management Committee:

Review the adequacy of the outcomes proposed by the Academic Quality and Compliance Department for Universidad Europea de Madrid's strategic plan and Quality Policy, approving these once they are satisfied that these are appropriate.

Vice-Rector for Teaching Staff and Research:

	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 13 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

Preside over the Quality Assurance Committee and, if appropriate, refer matters to the Academic Council and the Management Committee.

The University's Director of Quality Assurance:

Define the most appropriate methods for collecting and analysing results.

Ensure that the collection of data by those responsible is performed in an objective manner and in representative quantities.

Establish, on the basis of previous results obtained, those results that Universidad Europea de Madrid should prioritise for study.

Coordinate the preparation of the indicator scoreboard, and the collection and analysis of data.

Analyse the results, and determine the principal conclusions that can be drawn from them.

Communicate the actions to be implemented in the approved improvement plans to those responsible for those plans.

Q Partner:

Act as a link between the faculty/school and the Academic Quality and Compliance Department. Coordinate the development of the indicator scoreboard, and the collection and analysis of data; analyse the results, and identify the main conclusions that can be drawn from them.

Collaborate in the completion and analysis of the Annual Degree Monitoring Report.

Members of the Academic Quality and Compliance Department:

Prepare the minutes of the Quality Assurance Committee meetings and distribute them to the members of the Committee, support the Quality Assurance Committee in the maintenance, development and improvement of the SGIC, update the register of SGIC monitoring and measurement indicators, and monitor the evolution of the SGIC objectives.

Vice-Deans:

Transfer information dealt with by the Degree Quality Committees to the Faculty/School Boards, and gather information that needs to be dealt with by the Degree Quality Committees.

Degree Programme Coordinators:

Collaborate with the Vice-Dean on the coordination of the degree programmes to ensure that the decisions taken on quality are implemented in each of them.

Coordinate the compilation of evidence, the participation of those involved, and the monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations in the reports, in the Compliance studies and in the internal audits on the degree programmes.


Are responsible for archiving the evidence of the quality of the degree programme (CCT minutes, improvement plans and annual monitoring report).

Professors:

Participate by contributing their perspective on teaching, expressing needs and proposing improvements that can be introduced based on their own experience of what happens in the classroom.

Academic Advisors:

Provide information on recurrent needs –both their own needs, and those of students– based on their day-to-day experience, and put forward suggestions for change in order to improve the

 Universidad Europea Madrid	PROCEDURES MANUAL	Page 14 of 14
	PGC 12.3 Analysis and Improvement	EDITION 08

processes in which they are involved.

ANNEXES

Annex I_Initial CCT Template

Annex II_CCT Monitoring Template

Annex III_Final CCT Template

Annex IV_Improvement Plan Template

Annex V_Annual Degree Monitoring Report Template

IT01-PGC 12.3 Academic Compliance Study.