



QUACING Agency

Agency for the Quality Certification and EUR- ACE
Accreditation of Engineering Study Programmes

By-laws for International EUR-ACE Accreditations of Engineering Study Programmes

INDEX

- I. Definitions and reference study programmes
 - I.1 EUR-ACE accreditation
 - I.2 Reference study programmes
- II. Accreditation structure (Operative structure)
 - II.1 Bodies
 - II.2 Assembly
 - II.3 Board of Directors
 - II.4 Steering Committee
 - II.5 Director
 - II.6 Technical Secretariat
 - II.7 Appeal Committee
 - II.8 Person in charge of surveillance
- III. Evaluators' Register and Evaluation Teams
 - III.1 Evaluators' Register
 - III.2 Evaluation Teams
- IV. Accreditation process
 - IV.1 Steps of the accreditation process
 - IV.2 Application and signing of the accreditation agreement
 - IV.3 Presentation and exam of the study programme documentation
 - 1. Presentation of the documentation
 - 2. Exam of the documentation
 - IV.4 External evaluation
 - 1. Appointment of Evaluation Team
 - 2. Indication of the reference person of the study programme
 - 3. Preparation of the evaluation visit
 - 4. Evaluation visit
 - 5. Evaluation Report
 - 6. Exam of the Evaluation Report
 - 7. Monitoring of the accreditation procedures
 - IV.5 Approval of the Evaluation Report and formulation of the proposal of the accreditation decision
 - IV.6 Accreditation decision and regular supervision
 - 1. Accreditation decisions
 - 2. Decision making for accreditation
 - 3. Information and Appeals
 - 4. Accreditation document and publication of the accreditation decision

- 5. Validity of the accreditation and surveillance visit
- 6. Use of the EUR-ACE label
- 7. Renewals

IV.7 Costs of the accreditation procedures

V. External revision

VI. Final provisions

VI.1 Protection of data and information

Attachment 1 - Documentation of the accreditation procedures

I. Definitions and reference study programmes

I.1 EUR-ACE accreditation

In the present By-laws ‘EUR-ACE accreditation’ of a study programme is the procedure through which the Agency formally and publicly attests that the study programme is consistent with the national law requirements, that:

- it establishes professional activities graduates are to be prepared for consistent with the mission of the structure the study programme belongs to and with the educational needs of the labour market of reference, and study programme learning outcomes expected in the students at the end of the educational process consistent with the established professional activities and with the QUACING Programme Learning Descriptors¹ consistent with the programme outcomes for the EUR-ACE accreditation;
- it put at disposal of the students a learning environment (educational path, teaching, and infrastructural resources, services) that enables students to achieve the established learning outcomes in the expected times, it establishes assessment methods that enable to evaluate the level of learning by students credibly and monitors the adequacy and effectiveness of the learning environment perceived by students and graduates;
- it monitors the entry, path, and exit data of the students and the working exits of the graduates to verify the adequacy and effectiveness of the educational service offered;
- the structure the study programme belongs to and the study programme adopts an effective organization and establish adequate responsibilities of the quality assurance and the study programme re-examines periodically the educational service offered;

and, therefore, that the study programme offers an educational path adequate to entry for the engineering profession.

I.2 Reference study programmes

The study programmes that may be the object of the EUR-ACE accreditation (hereafter “accreditation”) are:

- First Cycle engineering study programmes,
- Second Cycle engineering study programmes,
- Integrated engineering study programmes,

offered by Universities or equivalent public or private institutions, that have already released study titles for at least one year.

II. Accreditation structure (Operative structure)

¹ QUACING Programme Learning Descriptors are defined in the document ‘QUACING Standards and Guidelines for EUR-ACE Accreditation of Engineering Study Programmes (QUACING Model)’, Annex 1.

II.1 Bodies

The operative structure of the Agency includes the following bodies:

- the Assembly;
- the Board of Directors ;
- the Steering Committee;
- the Director;
- the Technical Secretariat;
- the Appeal Committee;
- the Person in charge of surveillance activity.

II.2 Assembly

The composition, appointment and tasks of the Assembly are defined in the Statute of QUACING Agency.

Concerning the EUR-ACE accreditation process, the Board of Directors approves the By-laws of the Association, and other possible specific regulations on the advice of the Board of Directors.

II.3 Board of Directors

The composition, appointment, and tasks of the Board of Directors are defined in the Statute of QUACING Agency.

Concerning the EUR-ACE accreditation process, the Board of Directors has the following tasks:

- a) to draft the By-laws of the Association, which among other things must also define any technical organism necessary to the operativity of the Agency, such as, in particular, Steering Committee, Director, Technical Secretariat, Appeal Committee, Evaluation Teams, to be submitted to the Assembly for approval;
- b) to submit other possible specific regulations which are deemed necessary to Assembly for approval;
- c) to see to the correct application of the By-laws;
- d) to formulate the programmatic lines and the program of the activities of the Agency, to be submitted annually to the Assembly for approval;
- e) to approve the annual report on the activities of accreditation carried out by the Agency;
- f) to maintain relationships with the *European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education* (ENAE), also in pursuit of the EUR-ACE accreditation;
- g) to make all the decisions relating to accreditation, according to what specified in the By-laws;
- h) to approve the costs of the procedures of accreditation.

II.4 Steering Committee

a) The Steering Committee has the following tasks:

- to draft, approve, and update the:
 - QUACING Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation of Engineering Study Programmes (QUACING Model);
 - QUACING Guidelines on External Evaluation of Engineering Study Programmes (QUACING GLEE);
- to draft the By-laws for international EUR-ACE Accreditation and their modifications, and submit them to the Board of Directors for approval;
- to propose other specific regulations deemed necessary and their modifications to the Board of Directors ;
- to manage the evaluators' Register;
- to approve the Evaluation Reports of the accreditation procedures and to propose the accreditation decisions to the Board of Directors ;
- to design the activity of education and training of evaluators and trainers of self-evaluators, and prepare the training material;
- to support the Director in writing the annual report on the activities carried out by the Agency.

b) The Steering Committee is composed of the Director, of 5 to 11 (five to eleven) experts appointed by the Board of Directors on the proposal of the President, and of 1 (one) representative of the Technical Secretariat appointed by the Director.

The coordinator of the Steering Committee is appointed by the President, after consulting the Director.

The members of the Steering Committee, including the Director, remain in office for three years, which expires on the date of the Assembly convened for the approval of the final balance for the third year of office of the Board of Directors.

II.5 Director

a) The Director has the following tasks:

- to define the tasks and responsibilities of the Technical Secretariat in compliance with this document;
- to appoint the person in charge of surveillance activity;
- to support the Board of Directors in the formulation of the programmatic lines and the program of activities of the Agency to be submitted annually to the Assembly for approval;
- to support the Board of Directors in writing the balance of the business year and the budget for the coming year to be submitted annually to the Assembly for approval;
- to prepare a report on the activities of accreditation of the Agency to be submitted annually to the Board of Directors for approval;
- to propose the costs of the accreditation procedures to the Board of Directors for approval;
- to appoint the Evaluation Teams and their attendants, if any.

b) The Director is appointed by the President.

II.6 Technical Secretariat

a) The Technical Secretariat has the following tasks:

- to call the meetings of the Steering Committee and draw up the minutes;
- to plan and manage educational and training activities for evaluators and trainers of self-evaluators;
- to support the Steering Committee in preparing the training material;
- to keep and to update the evaluators' Register;
- to organize and manage in practice the accreditation procedures;
- to monitor the accreditation procedures;
- to support the Director in writing the annual report on the activities of the Agency;
- to interact with the person in charge of surveillance activity for the management of the reports of internal inspections of the system.

b) The Technical Secretariat is provided by the CNI Foundation, which places secretarial staff, equipment, utilities, and whatever necessary at disposal of the Agency.

II.7 Appeal Committee

a) The Appeal Committee has the task to assess the appeals submitted by the Heads of the structures the study programmes belong to against the decisions of accreditation and to submit his decision to the Board of Directors together with a grounded covering report.

b) The Appeal Committee is appointed by the Board of Directors and is composed of:

- one University teacher, who chairs the Committee.
- two representatives of the world external to University, not belonging either to the Board of Directors or to the Steering Committee.

The teacher representing University shall fulfill the following requirements:

- activity for at least a ten-year-period in University study programmes;
- knowledge of the methodologies and procedures of quality assurance and evaluation in the University context.

The other representatives shall fulfill the following requirements:

- operate in an engineering context for at least ten years and occupy a position of responsibility and/or representation;
- knowledge of the University system;
- knowledge of the methodologies and procedures of quality assurance and evaluation.

The members of the Appeal Committee remain in office for three years and can be re-elected once. In case of vacancy of a place, for any reason whatsoever, the Board of Directors proceeds to the appointment of a substitute for the remaining period of the mandate.

The reports of the Appeal Committee are approved by the majority of its members; minority reports can be presented.

II.8 Person in charge of surveillance activity

a) The Person in charge of surveillance activity has the task to organise and manage internal surveillance activity, to verify the correct and effective application of the procedures established by the system.

b) The Person in charge of surveillance activity is appointed by the Director among subjects who fulfill the following qualification criteria:

- knowledge of the University system;
- knowledge of the accreditation procedures;
- knowledge of UNI EN ISO 9000, UNI EN ISO 19011, and UNI CEI EN ISO/IEC 17021 rules;
- attendance at a course in inspections (40 hours at least);
- participation in 4 complete inspections at least.

III. Evaluators' Register and Evaluation Teams

III.1 Evaluators' Register

a) Access to the evaluators' Register is restricted to the University teachers fulfilling the following requirements:

- to be or to have been full or associate professors in Italian Universities, or teachers comparable to full or associate professor in foreign Universities, with at least ten years of didactic responsibility of course units offered in engineering study programmes;
- knowledge of the methodologies and procedures of quality assurance and evaluation in the University field;

- age less than 75 years;
- and to external experts fulfilling the following requirements:
- exercise of the engineer's profession or in an engineering context for at least ten years, occupying a position of responsibility and/or representation;
 - knowledge of the University system;
 - knowledge of the methodologies and procedures of quality assurance and evaluation;
 - age less than 75 years.

b) The Steering Committee and the Technical Secretariat shall regularly design, plan and manage training courses for University and non-University experts, to be enrolled in the Evaluators' Register after they have passed the course final test. The procedures and evaluation criteria for the final test are indicated in the document *Access to the Evaluators' Register*.

Access to the Evaluator's Register can also take place through the recognition of the qualification of Expert of the National Agency for the Evaluation of the University and Research System (ANVUR) by the Steering Committee. The methods of access are shown in the document 'Access to the Evaluator's Register. The Register is kept up-to-date by the Technical Secretariat.

c) The Steering Committee and the Technical Secretariat shall regularly design, plan and manage the training update meetings for the evaluators in the Register.

Among the subjects to be dealt with in the training update meetings, the following should be included at least:

- general report on the status of accreditation activities;
- presentation of organization and procedure changes introduced or being introduced;
- results of the satisfaction survey carried out on evaluated study programmes;
- results of the supervision activities carried out by the Agency on the activities of evaluators (visits in tutoring, analysis of documents delivered by the Evaluation Teams, etc.);
- overview of quality evolution within University structures;
- overview of the status of evaluation and accreditation activities at national and European levels.

d) An evaluator keeps his/her qualification subject to observance of both the evaluation procedures and the contract provisions regulating the evaluation appointment.

The qualification of evaluator for evaluators who have not participated in assessment visits within the QUACING or ANVUR procedures for more than two years can be maintained if he/she subject participates in the training update meetings.

III.2 Evaluation Teams

a) Evaluation Teams are responsible for external evaluation for the study programme accreditation (hereafter "evaluation").

In particular, for every study programme to be evaluated, the Evaluation Teams shall:

- analyse the study programme documentation;
- prepare the visit on-site;
- perform the visit on-site;
- draw up the evaluation report.

The services requested of Evaluation Teams are specified in specific contracts with each team expert.

b) Evaluation Teams are composed of three members at least one University teacher and one external expert, enrolled in the evaluators' Register of the Agency or of other EUR-ACE authorised

Agency, and a graduate enrolled in a second cycle study programme or a Ph.D. student graduated in engineering or a second cycle graduate since no more than two years, or with previous experiences as a member of University bodies or structures (Academic Senate, Administrative Council, Evaluation Board, Quality Committee, Teacher-Student Joint Commission, Department/School/Faculty Council, Study Programme Council, etc.) and/or with previous experiences of external evaluation of University Study Programmes.

c) As a rule, evaluators cannot perform more than 8 evaluations per year.

IV. Accreditation process

IV.1 Steps of the accreditation process

The accreditation process is organised into the following steps:

- application and signing of the accreditation agreement;
- presentation and examination of the study programme documentation;
- external evaluation;
- approval of Evaluation report and formulation of accreditation decision proposal;
- accreditation decision and regular supervision.

IV.2 Application and signing of the accreditation agreement

1. The accreditation application, for one or more study programmes, shall be submitted to the Technical Secretariat by the requesting University, along with the name of the Coordinator of the accreditation activities for all the study programmes involved, with who the Technical Secretariat will maintain contact with.

In the application, it must be explicitly stated that the Statute and the By-laws of the Agency are accepted and that the study programmes for which accreditation is requested have already released study titles for at least one year.

The accreditation application can be submitted at any time of the year.

2. After the study programme accreditation application has been accepted, the Technical Secretariat drafts an agreement proposal with the requesting University, which specifies the following:

- the terms for submitting the study programme documentation;
- the period indicated for the external evaluation visit;
- the time required for making the accreditation decision;
- the costs of the accreditation procedure.

Usually, the accreditation procedure will start when the Agreement proposal is signed by the requesting University and has to be ended within six months from application.

3. If the preliminary check has a negative outcome, the Technical Secretariat shall indicate the reasons for refusal to the requesting University, and the deficiencies identified. The requesting University can make up the deficiencies identified or submit an appeal against the decision, by providing the reasons for its application and appropriate information on objections raised.

Appeals are assessed by the Director, who, after consultation with the Steering Committee, defines the actions to be taken, and informs the appealing party about the decision made and the reason for it.

IV.3 Presentation and exam of the study programme documentation

1. Presentation of the documentation

The study programme to be evaluated makes available the documentation required in the QUACING Model, i.e.:

- the Documentation File;
- the Review Report.

The documentation has to be transmitted to the Technical Secretariat at least eight weeks before the planned external evaluation visit.

Should any additional or up-to-date documentation be available before the period of the evaluation visit, such documentation shall be provided to either the Technical Secretariat who shall provide it to the Evaluation Team members, or to the Evaluation Team at the beginning of the visit and the Technical Secretariat at the same time.

Within one week from the receipt of documentation by the Study Program, the Technical Secretariat transmits the analytical list of the documentation received to the internal contact person of the Study Program (see IV.4.2).

2. Exam of the documentation

The Technical Secretariat performs a preliminary examination of the presented documentation with the aim to check its coherence with the QUACING Model. Usually, the preliminary examination should be concluded within three weeks after the documentation is received.

If the preliminary examination finds that the documentation presents evident gaps, the Technical Secretariat asks the study programme to integrate the missing information. The study programme shall provide the missing information within two weeks from the request, or else the accreditation process is suspended and the schedule redefined.

Once the consistency of the documentation received with the QUACING Model has been verified, the Technical Secretariat forwards it to the Evaluation Group. The Team Leader of the Evaluation Group communicates the analytical list of the documentation received to the Technical Secretariat and the reference person of the study program (see IV.4.2). All this exchange must be completed within one week after the verification of the consistency of the documentation received with the QUACING Model by the Technical Secretariat.

IV.4 External evaluation

1. Appointment of the Evaluation Team

a) The Evaluation Team and its Team Leader are appointed by the Director, usually, at least eight weeks before the evaluation visit takes place.

Experts are selected among those who are in the Evaluators' Register, who comply with the overriding criterion of independence, i.e. who had no employment or collaboration or consulting connections with the University which the study programme to be evaluated belongs to in the last five years.

In this respect, the Technical Secretariat asks each evaluator to issue a relevant statement (discharging statement). Moreover, evaluators must not accept any collaboration or consulting connections with the University where the evaluation will be performed over the three years following the on-site visit.

The appointment of experts in the Evaluation Teams is subject to the discharging statement issue.

If a conflict of interest is identified after the appointment of the Evaluation Team, the evaluator shall be replaced in the Evaluation Team and even removed from the Evaluators' Register. The decision of removal is the responsibility of the Steering Committee, it is final and the evaluator must be

informed about it.

Also, the student of the Evaluation Team must not have had any collaboration with or have been enrolled in study programmes offered by the University to which the study programme to be evaluated belongs.

b) The Technical Secretariat shall inform the University requesting the accreditation about the composition of the Evaluation Team, as a rule, seven weeks at least before the evaluation visit takes place.

Once the names of external evaluators have been communicated to the reference person of the study programme, he/she has one week to submit any objections to the Technical Secretariat, to ask for substitution of one or more members of the Evaluation Team, and give reasons for it.

Any remarks on the composition of the Evaluation Team shall be dealt with by the Director and the Coordinator of accreditation activities, as a rule within two weeks after reception of the substitution request.

2. Indication of the reference person of the study programme

At least eight weeks before the evaluation visit, the study programme to be evaluated shall communicate the name of the reference person of the study programme to the Technical Secretariat, which in turn will communicate it to the Evaluation Team. The reference person shall maintain connections with the Evaluation Team and during the visit shall be the study programme representative and link with the Evaluation Team.

3. Preparation of the evaluation visit

The preparation of the evaluation visit is organised into the following steps:

a) Analysis of the study programme documentation and definition of the team's pre-visit evaluation report (PVER)

The study programme documentation is analysed by each member of the Evaluation Team, to define the individual PVER, following the indications in the QUACING GLEE.

The Evaluation Team leader shall propose, based on individual PVERs, the team's PVER, which will be the main reference for performing the evaluation visit.

The Team's PVER may be defined through remote communication or during a consensus meeting before the evaluation visit. Such a meeting can also be held during the morning on the first day of the evaluation visit.

b) Date of the evaluation visit

After consulting with the Evaluation team and with the Coordinator of the accreditation activity, the Technical Secretariat shall set the date of the evaluation visit, following deadlines set in the Agreement. The study programme shall be informed about the date four weeks in advance at least.

c) Visit Agenda

After consulting with the other team members, and following the indications of the QUACING GLEE, the Evaluation Team leader shall define the visit Agenda. The visit Agenda shall be transmitted to the Technical Secretariat, who in turn will transmit it to the study programme to be evaluated. As a rule, the visit Agenda should be received by the study programme to be evaluated three weeks at least before the day of the evaluation visit, to allow the study programme to

adequately organize the visit itself.

4. Evaluation visit

a) The purpose of the evaluation visit is:

- to check the fulfillment of the Quality Requirements defined in the QUACING Model;
- to promote the improvement of the study programme quality.

Normally, the visit lasts two days, including the consensus meeting, if any, and must be carried out following the indications provided in the QUACING GLEE.

b) During the evaluation visit, the Evaluation Team can be attended by teachers or non-University trainees and/or representatives of the Agency.

In particular, during the evaluation visits, the representatives of the Agency shall:

- collect information useful for improving the evaluation/accreditation procedures and the QUACING Guidelines, and for training the evaluators;
- monitor the evaluation procedures, to promote evaluation homogeneity among Evaluation Teams.

The Evaluation Team and the study programme shall be previously informed about the presence of those representatives, and they must be on the visit Agenda.

5. Evaluation Report

a) Within four weeks after the end of the evaluation visit, the Evaluation Team leader shall transmit the PVER and the evaluation report (ER) to the Technical Secretariat. The ER shall be drawn up following the indications in the QUACING GLEE.

In particular, the ER contains:

- the attribution to each Quality Requirement and each Standard of an assessment expressed in the following scale:
 - *4-fully fulfilled;*
 - *3-fulfilled;*
 - *2-partially fulfilled;*
 - *1-not fulfilled.*
- a summarized evaluation of the study programme quality concerning the individual sections of the evaluation.

b) The ER is the result of consensus among Evaluation Team experts. In the case consensus is not achieved on some items of the ER, the various opinions of Evaluation Team members and their reasons shall be indicated.

6. Exam of the Evaluation Report

a) Before it is submitted to the Steering Committee for approval, the ER is analysed by one member of the Steering Committee at least and the Technical Secretariat to check for its thoroughness and appropriateness. As a rule, the analysis should be finished within three weeks after it is received.

If the ER is considered as incomplete or inappropriate, the Technical Secretariat shall ask the Evaluation Team to complete it or review it. The Evaluation Team has two weeks' time from the day the request is received to complete or review the report. In that case, the assessment of the ER by the Technical Secretariat shall be finished within six weeks after it is received, including the two weeks' time for its completion or review by the Evaluation Team.

b) The ER is transmitted to the evaluated study programme, which has two weeks from the

transmission date to submit observations on the evaluations reported in the ER.
Any remarks are transmitted by the Technical Secretariat to the Evaluation Team, which has two weeks for the revision of the ER and/or the formulation of counter-remarks.

7. Monitoring of the accreditation procedures

The objectives of monitoring accreditation procedures (follow-up) are as follows:

- to collect indications for continuous improvement of the accreditation process;
- to be aware of any problems with the Evaluation Team during the evaluation visit;
- to know the opinion of evaluated study programmes about the evaluation process, the Evaluation Team, and the management of the evaluation visit.

The follow-up is carried out by the Technical Secretariat, also through a survey on the remarks received by evaluated study programmes, through the use of a customer satisfaction questionnaire.

The "follow-up" is carried out annually by the Technical Secretariat through the use of a customer satisfaction questionnaire to be sent to the evaluated Study Programs for which at least four months have elapsed from the communication of the accreditation decision.

IV.5 Approval of the Evaluation Report and formulation of the proposal of the accreditation decision

The Technical Secretariat shall transmit the ER, any remarks of the study programme, and counter-remarks of the Evaluation Team to the Steering Committee usually within ten weeks at the latest after the first ER has been received.

The Steering Committee can directly approve the ER or identify appropriate actions - in the case the analysis of available documentation identifies the need for further investigations - or even perform a new evaluation visit. In the case the Steering Committee decides to perform a new evaluation visit, it has to be assigned to a different Evaluation Team from the first team.

Within six weeks after transmission of the ER and any other documentation to the Steering Committee the study programme evaluation is usually achieved with the approval of the ER and the formulation of the accreditation decision proposal on the part of the Steering Committee to be transmitted to the Board of Directors.

IV.6 Accreditation decision and periodic surveillance

1. Accreditation Decisions

a) The following accreditation decisions are possible:

- A - accreditation fully satisfactory;
- B - accreditation more than satisfactory;
- C - accreditation satisfactory;
- D - accreditation partially satisfactory;
- E - accreditation not granted.

b) The accreditation decisions are assumed consistently with the following criteria:

- the decision of *accreditation fully satisfactory* is assumed if at least one Standard receives a score *4-fully fulfilled* and all the others receive a score *3-fulfilled*.
- The decision of *accreditation more than satisfactory* is assumed if all the Standards receive a score *3-fulfilled*;
- The decision of *accreditation "satisfactory"* is assumed if Standard C receives a score *2-partially fulfilled* and all the others receive a score *3-fulfilled* or *4-fully fulfilled*.
- The decision of *accreditation partially satisfactory* is assumed if Standard C and another Standard

receive a score 2-*partially fulfilled* and all the others receive a score 3-*fulfilled* or 4-*fully fulfilled*.

- The decision of *accreditation not granted* is assumed in all the other cases.

2. Decision making for accreditation

The decisions of accreditation are the responsibility of the Board of Directors, who ratifies the proposals of the Steering Committee, and are assumed usually within twelve weeks after the formulation of the proposal by the Steering Committee.

If the Board of Directors does not share the evaluations of the Steering Committee, it can ask for the re-examination of the proposals of the decision of accreditation.

The Steering Committee makes a final proposal with specific reference to the elements pointed out in the request for revision within thirty days after the request.

The decisions of the Steering Committee are final.

3. Information and Appeals

a) The Technical Secretariat shall inform the requesting University about the accreditation decision usually within two weeks after the decision is made by the Board of Directors.

At the same time, the Technical Secretariat sends also the ER approved by the Steering Committee to the requesting University.

In the case of accreditation more than satisfactory, satisfactory, partially satisfactory and not granted, the University to which the study programme belongs is allowed to submit an appeal against the Board of Directors decision within two weeks after the information is received. Any appeal must be justified and proper information provided about the claims.

b) In the case of an appeal from the University to which the study programme belongs to against the decision of accreditation, the Technical Secretariat shall transmit it to the Appeal Committee. After it has analysed the reasons for the appeal, after consulting with the Steering Committee and carrying out any further investigation considered necessary, the Appeal Committee can propose the confirmation of the accreditation decision or a different decision among possible ones, usually within six weeks after the Technical Secretariat has received the appeal.

The Board of Directors confirms the proposal of the Appeal Committee within twelve weeks after the formulation of the proposal. The decisions of the Board of Directors are final.

4. Accreditation document and Publishing of the accreditation decision

At the end of the period allowed for submission of an appeal from the university involved, the Technical Secretariat shall issue the accreditation Certificate, signed by the President of the Agency and the Director, and publish the accreditation decision, with the indication of the expiry date of the accreditation (see IV.6.5), on the Internet site of the Agency. In the case of accreditation, the decision is published also on the ENAEE database, with the indication of the accreditation expiry date.

The validity of the accreditation certificates is subordinated to the presence of the study programme in the list of the certified/accredited study programmes on the Agency web site and, in case of accreditation, to the presence of the study programme in the list of the accredited study programmes in the ENAE database.

5. Validity of accreditation and surveillance visit

a) Accreditations fully satisfactory, more than satisfactory and satisfactory are released for six years, starting from the date of the evaluation visit, and are subject to verification through a surveillance visit.

Accreditations partially satisfactory are released for three years starting from the date of the evaluation visit.

b) Study programmes that have been granted with fully satisfactory or more than satisfactory or satisfactory accreditation are subject to a surveillance visit after three years (normally, not before 30 months and not after 40 months from the evaluation visit).

The surveillance visit aims to verify the fulfillment of the Quality Requirements established in the QUACING Model, and in particular the resolution of the signaling and, mostly, of the recommendations formulated after the evaluation visit, and to promote the improvement of the study programme quality.

The documentation to be presented by the study programmes for the surveillance visit is the same listed in § IV.3.

The external evaluation in the context of the surveillance visit has to be carried out according to the indications of § IV.4, with the following exceptions:

- the external evaluation in the context of the surveillance visit of certified/accredited study programmes that at the moment of the evaluation visit had already released study titles for at least one year is carried out by only one evaluator – a University teacher who is in the Evaluators' Register of the Agency –, normally lasts only one day and has to be carried out according to what established in the QUACING GLEE.
- The external evaluation in the context of the surveillance visit of certified/accredited study programmes that at the moment of the evaluation visit had completed the first-course year (the third-course year for Integrated masters) for at least one year but not yet the first cycle for at least one year is carried out by two evaluators – one University teacher and one expert external to University who are in the Evaluators' Register of the Agency –, normally lasts only one day and has to be carried out according to what established in the QUACING GLEE.

The approval of the Evaluation Report of the surveillance visits and the formulation of the proposal of accreditation decisions are carried out according to the indications of § IV.5.

Based on the outcome of the supervision visit, the Steering Committee can propose the confirmation of the accreditation decision assumed after the evaluation visit or propose a different decision of accreditation among the possible ones, decision of accreditation not granted included. In particular, if any recommendations made following the evaluation visit remain, the accreditation proposals can normally be only accreditation partially satisfactory, regardless of the criteria for taking the accreditation decision referred to in § IV.6.1, or accreditation not granted, following the criteria for assuming the accreditation decision referred to in § IV.6.1.

The Steering Committee can also propose the accreditation of study programmes certified but not accredited after the evaluation visit if the supervision visit checks the correspondence of the study programme outcomes with those for the EUR-ACE accreditation.

As for ‘Decision making for accreditation’ and ‘Information and Appeals’ following the surveillance visit, it is valid what is reported in IV.6.2 and IV.6.3.

c) The certificated/accredited study programmes shall immediately inform the Technical Secretariat about any significant change in the management system or process outcomes, which may influence compliance with quality requirements.

In this case, or anyhow when the Technical Secretariat is informed about serious deficiencies in one or more evaluation areas that occurred after the accreditation decision, the Steering Committee is entitled to proceed with a surveillance visit before the expiration of the validity of the accreditation. This surveillance visit shall be performed by one evaluator only and normally lasts one day only.

6. Use of EUR-ACE label

EUR-ACE label and the wording ‘Study Programme accredited EUR-ACE’ or equivalent one can be used only by study programmes or in association to study programmes accredited and registered in the list of the accredited study programmes in the QUACING web site and the ENAEE database.

7. Renewals

a) The Technical Secretariat informs the Study Programs of the approaching deadline for the validity of the certification/accreditation at least nine months before the deadline.

b) The certified/accredited study programmes wishing to request the renewal of the accreditation after the expiry of validity terms shall formulate their request to the Technical Secretariat at least six months before the expiry date, with the same procedures indicated in IV.2.

Upon reception of the request, the Technical Secretariat shall start the accreditation renewal procedure, which complies with the same rules as those for the first accreditation.

c) The decision of accreditation possible for the study programmes with accreditation partially satisfactory can be only those of accreditation fully satisfactory, more than satisfactory, satisfactory, not granted. The decision of accreditation partially satisfactory cannot be renewed.

d) Study programmes for which after the evaluation visit or after the surveillance visit it was assumed the decision of accreditation not granted can submit a new accreditation application not earlier than one year from the date of assumption of the decision of accreditation not granted.

IV.7 Costs of the accreditation procedures

a) The costs of the accreditation procedures are set by the Board of Directors upon the Director's proposal.

b) The expenses relating to the accreditation activities are borne by the Universities requesting accreditation.

V. External revision

Every five years the activities of the Agency are submitted to an external revision carried out by ENAEE.

VII. Annual report

Every year, usually between September and November, the Director - in co-operation with the Steering Committee and the Technical Secretariat - shall draw up a report on the activities carried out by the Agency, which should take into consideration the following subjects at least:

- description of the activities carried out;
- outcomes of the monitoring of accreditation procedures;
- analysis of the incomes and costs of the accreditation procedures.

VIII. Final provisions

VIII.1 Protection of data and information

a) The current privacy provisions are applied to all information and sensitive data managed by the Agency.

b) All members of the accreditation structure shall observe absolute confidentiality for all information they get to know, directly or indirectly, during the performance of their activities within the Structure. It is forbidden for everybody to transmit such information in any way whatsoever (except for the information published on the Agency website).

Attachment 1 - Documentation of the accreditation procedures

Documentation	Title	Current revision
Documents for the process management	Statute of QUACING Agency	Rev. 0
	By-laws for International EUR-ACE Accreditation of QUACING Agency	Rev. 0
	Access to Evaluators' Register	Rev. 0
	QUACING Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation of Engineering Study Programmes (QUACING Model)	Rev. 0
	QUACING Guidelines on External Evaluation of Engineering Study Programmes (QUACING GLEE)	Rev. 0
	Costs of accreditation activities	Rev. 0
Forms	Accreditation application	Rev. 0
	Accreditation agreement	Rev. 0
	Pre-Visit Evaluation Report	Rev. 0
	Visit Agenda	Rev. 0
	Evaluation Report	Rev. 0
	Visit Diary	Rev. 0
	Questionnaire for the evaluation of the customer satisfaction of the evaluated programmes	Rev. 0
	Observer Report	Rev. 0
Accreditation certificate	Rev. 0	