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Block I.
General information about the study
The satisfaction measurement survey of l`Agència Valenciana d`Avaluació i Prospectiva (from now on, AVAP) aims to analyse and know the satisfaction of the Evaluators and Applicants who collaborate with AVAP.

A survey is sent out in which, for both groups, there is a common question on general satisfaction with the service provided by AVAP at the beginning of the survey and a final question to collect suggestions or comments. In addition, different questions have been launched for each group related to satisfaction with different aspects of the user’s experience with AVAP. The questions for each group are detailed below:

### EVALUATOR GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General experience in dealing with AVAP during the evaluation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication and management by AVAP staff have been satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AVAP employees have assisted you correctly in any aspect related to the evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The information provided by AVAP on the evaluation process has been clear and concise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Compliance with the legal deadlines has been adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The functioning of AVAP’s virtual platform for carrying out the work has been correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The instructions provided by AVAP for the evaluation process have been clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AVAP’s attention in resolving any queries has been effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I consider AVAP to have a good reputation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Suggestions for improvement of the process or comments to be added (optional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPLICANT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General experience in dealing with AVAP during the application process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The communication and management by AVAP staff have been satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AVAP employees have assisted you correctly in all aspects of the application process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The information provided by AVAP on the application process was clear and concise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The functioning of AVAP’s virtual platform for carrying out the work has been correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The resolution of doubts or possible incidences, if any, have been solved efficiently and on time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The instructions provided by AVAP for the application process have been clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Compliance with the legal deadlines has been adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I consider AVAP to have a good reputation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Suggestions for improvement of the process or comments to be added (optional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DATA COLLECTION**

**Assessment of questions**

For data collection, the surveyed groups were asked to rate each of the above-mentioned aspects on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the least favourable and 5 the most favourable. It is also possible to add suggestions for improvement or comments on the process at the end of the survey.

**Modalities of data collection**

The data collection has been carried out telematically.

**Questionnaires**

Two different types of questionnaires were used depending on the group to which the users belonged, although all of them provided for the assessment of the above-mentioned aspects.

---

**DATA PROCESSING**

**Statistical variables**

The data collected through the different modalities and supports mentioned above have been consolidated in an application that has made it possible to obtain the particular and aggregated results that are the object of the study.

The processing of these data has made it possible to obtain the results shown throughout this report. For this purpose, different statistics have been used, with the mean being the most widely used statistical variable due to the ease with which it makes it easier to understand the results and draw conclusions:

> The arithmetic mean (average or mean) of a finite set of numbers is the characteristic value of a series of quantitative data under study based on the principle of mathematical expectation or expected value obtained from the sum of all its values divided by the number of addends.

**Satisfaction indicators**

It should be noted that in the specific case of the general satisfaction attribute, two approaches have been applied for its analysis:

- **Average general satisfaction (SAT)**: This is the data obtained directly from the first question asked for the two large groups regarding the evaluation of the general satisfaction perceived with regard to the service provided by AVAP as a whole. It is calculated by applying the arithmetic mean of the ratings obtained in this question.

- **Calculated satisfaction (CS)**: This is an indicator obtained as a result of applying the arithmetic mean to the evaluations obtained from the rest of the questions asked in the survey and which have a direct impact on perceived satisfaction.
The result of both indicators can be analysed for each of the two groups and their different profiles.

The analysis of the deviation between the average overall satisfaction and the calculated satisfaction allows us to draw conclusions related to the degree of impact of the aspects consulted on satisfaction perceived by the customer.

REPORT STRUCTURE

This report presenting the results obtained in the satisfaction survey has the following structure of chapters and sections:

 ✓ **Block I. General overview of the study**
   It includes the **presentation of the study and its main characteristics**.

 ✓ **Block II. Statistical data and results**
   It includes data related to the **distribution of the population and the sample** (users of the two main programmes and participants in the study).
   It presents the **overall and specific results** of satisfaction and conclusions.

 ✓ **Block III. Conclusions**
   The general conclusions of the study are presented.
The data analysis was carried out by processing 100% of the completed questionnaires. Below is a summary table of the main technical characteristics of the study carried out:

**TECHNICAL DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the survey</th>
<th>Survey to measure the satisfaction of Evaluators and Applicants of l’Agència Valenciana d’Avaluació i Prospectiva (AVAP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates of implementation</td>
<td>January 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators and Applicants (users) grouped into the profiles</td>
<td>Reaccreditation Evaluators, Accreditation Committee, R+D Evaluators, Outreach Sexenios Evaluators, Degree Monitoring Evaluators, Teaching Staff Accreditation and University Quality Units, carried out by AVAP in the period in question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universe</td>
<td>Users of one or more actions included in the above-mentioned AVAP services. TOTAL NUMBER 1444 OF DELIVERIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of recipients of</td>
<td>1030 questionnaires. OPENINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of clients participating</td>
<td>563 in the survey. RESPONSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of consultation</td>
<td>Telematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Block II. Results of Satisfaction
**GLOBAL CUSTOMER DISTRIBUTION**

This section presents the results of user participation in the different groups, as well as the number of participants in the study.

The clients under study are divided into two groups, according to the type of service they use at AVAP. Each of the groups is divided into different profiles according to the activity they use performed. The division of users into groups and profiles can be seen below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATORS ACCREDITATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCREDITATION COMMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators R&amp;D EVALUATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXENIOS EVALUATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE MONITORING EVALUATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANTS FOR TEACHER ACCREDITATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY QUALITY UNITS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of questionnaire recipients together with the responses obtained can be seen in the table below, together with a percentage distribution of mailings by groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of recipients of questionnaires (population) 1444</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of clients participating in the survey (sample size) 563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Response 39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of the general data reveals that the level of participation in the survey was very positive, reaching a value of 39%, bearing in mind that this is the first satisfaction survey carried out by AVAP. This value is calculated taking into account the total number of mailings that have been made. If we take as a reference the users who have reacted to the communication, this percentage increases to a value close to 55%.
The number of openings for each profile in relation to the total number of deliveries for each profile is shown in the graph below:

A high openness index is evident for the group of evaluators, exceeding the value of 70% for all profiles, while for the group of applicants a lower openness index value is obtained, being below 70% in the profile of applicants for teacher accreditation and below 70% in the profile of applicants for teacher accreditation and below 70% in the profile of applicants for teacher accreditation, and 50% in the case of university quality units.
The number of responses received for each profile in relation to the total number of submissions for each profile is shown in the graph below:

The percentage of openness with respect to the total varies in a range between 63% and 31%, with the profile Evaluadores Reacreditación having the highest value. At the other end of the spectrum is the profile for applicants for teacher accreditation, which has the lowest value. The rest of the profiles are in the range of around 50% response rate.
OVERALL SATISFACTION RESULTS

The table below shows the average and calculated satisfaction values for the two large groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL RESULTS</th>
<th>EVALUATORS</th>
<th>APPLICANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERCEIVED SATISFACTION (SAT)</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALCULATED SATISFACTION (SC)</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, the average overall satisfaction results show very high values, with those obtained for the group of evaluators standing out.

When analysing the study as a whole, no significant differences are observed in the analysis of the results obtained for the average overall satisfaction value and calculated satisfaction. It can therefore be deduced that all aspects under study show similar satisfaction values, both in the group of evaluators and in the group of applicants. Therefore, there is no evidence of disparate satisfaction values in any of the aspects analysed.
RESULTS OF THE EVALUATORS GROUP

The values obtained for average satisfaction and calculated satisfaction for the group of Evaluators reach the values of 4.68 and 4.65 respectively.

The following table shows the results of these indicators for each of the profiles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFILES</th>
<th>AVERAGE SATISFACT</th>
<th>CALCULATED SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreadita Evaluators</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Commission</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D Evaluators</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators Sexenios</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Monitoring Evaluators</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the deviation between the mean satisfaction and satisfaction values calculated for each profile in particular indicates that all the profiles of the group of Evaluators have a similar assessment in terms of satisfaction with the different aspects to be analysed compared to the overall mean satisfaction value.

The average number of responses obtained for each profile of the group of Evaluators is presented below:

If we analyse the graph, a high degree of satisfaction is evident for all profiles, and it is worth noting that the **Accreditation Commission** profile rates more positively than the rest of the profiles in this group. However, the profile of **Reaccreditation Assessors users** has the lowest values, although they show a high degree of satisfaction.
The average values per question obtained for this group can be seen in the following graph:

It can be seen that in this group, satisfaction for each of the aspects analysed independently shows very high values, with satisfaction with AVAP employees and AVAP’s attention to the resolution of any questions standing out.

The results for each of the profiles are detailed below.
The answers given to the open questions for this profile are detailed below:

**OBSERVATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My recognition and congratulations to AVAP in its quest to stimulate excellence in Valencian systems of higher education, innovation and public services, through evaluation and foresight, in order to improve the society it serves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My experience has been very satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no suggestions because the treatment, the information and the efficiency in the management have been formidable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe it is done correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVAP's technicians did a great job at all times, despite the fact that there were only a few members and that they had a heavy workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My assessment is very positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In all the processes in which I have been involved, the information and support received from AVAP have been fully satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The change in the evaluation process so that each evaluator only expresses his or her opinion on certain points in the assessment of a qualification can lead to confusion and inconsistencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My experience has always been very satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing to suggest. All very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the number of characters allowed in comments. Sometimes it is not enough. There is a need to improve telephone support for evaluators' queries before and during the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The last evaluation was complicated by the lengthy COVID, but it is true that the processes have improved significantly. More training in the use of the web-based evaluation application would be appreciated. Although it is new, it creates problems and there are evaluators who do not know how to use it, causing problems. Also, more follow-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything has been perfect. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has been a very pleasurable and rigorous process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation process was satisfactory and AVAP's professionalism and treatment was very good. Due to the pandemic, the assessment of the degrees had to be done online. Although everything worked and went well, I think that face-to-face attendance, when possible, allows for a more accurate assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Everything has worked perfectly, even at times like the present one, when it was not possible to realise the face-to-face visit to the university, and a virtual visit had to be opted for. In general, I consider both the platform for carrying out the degree evaluation and the system followed to be valid and sufficient.

All good thanks
Everything is perfect

Negative comments

- The schedule for telematic visits should be extended because they are sometimes limited.
  - The financial compensation for the evaluation carried out is very low, barely covering the work done. Especially in comparison to other evaluation agencies.
  - Information was provided several times and it was confusing to know which information was necessary and which was supplementary. The volume of documentation was excessive, it would be better to receive more precise instructions. Fortunately the live staff were very efficient and friendly.
  - I found the process itself to be somewhat superficial, quick and automated. It does not allow you to go deeply into the evaluation.
  - The platform has a problem because it often hangs when I issue a report and try to access it again. It doesn't let me access it for a few hours. I have never been able to explain why this happens to me. Another problem is that in the documentation files the title is kind of shortened and you are never sure where to click on it.
  - The distribution of indicators is adequate, however, the IT procedure for validating the preliminary report and the subsequent final report is not very intuitive.

Suggestions and other comments

- AVAP responds to e-mails. That each EWC has an AVAP technician assigned for direct communication.
  - Payments for each evaluator's work should be transparent and public before accepting evaluations.
  - New evaluator training courses on the process and especially on the application.
  - Improve the processing of information, the website, the dialogue with the universities, the relationship with the evaluators, among other aspects.
  - Continue to improve computer applications. It is becoming increasingly easier to carry out the evaluation.
    - The selection of employers for degrees should be more rigorous, especially in the case of professionally oriented Master's degrees. Unfortunately, it is very common to meet staff from the same university.
  - More training for panels.
  - More space to include assessments in the reports.
  - A specific section on the visit and incidents should be included.
  - Improved remuneration.
  - Defence by the Agency and hearing of the interested parties challenged by the Universities.
  - A 24-hour contact from the Agency is needed.
  - Improve access procedures and make more information available on assessed degrees (student work, specific assessment systems, etc.).
    - Depending on the experience of the EWC members, the evaluation is more or less demanding. It would be highly recommendable to train evaluators in order to homogenise this level, as well as to provide key instructions to apply to each criterion and to have a person from AVAP guide and belong to the EWC as in other agencies.
  - Face-to-face visits provide better knowledge than online hearings, which have been necessary in 2020 due to the circumstances of the pandemic. There should be a return to face-to-face visits as soon as possible.
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ACCREDITATION COMMISSION

The average value of responses obtained for this profile is 4.93, the highest in the group of Evaluators, and above the average value for the group (4.7). It is worth noting that all aspects, except for that relating to the functioning of the virtual platform, reached the maximum score.

The answers given to the open questions for this profile are detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions and other comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R&D EVALUATORS

The average response value obtained for this profile is 4.69, which is close to the average for the group (4.7). It should be noted that the aspects with the lowest scores are those relating to the **information provided by AVAP**, the **functioning of the virtual platform** and the **instructions provided by AVAP**, coinciding in this case with the profiles of the **Sexennial Evaluators and Degree Monitoring Evaluators**.

The answers given to the open questions for this profile are detailed below:

**Observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>° I think AVAP works very well. The platform works very well and speeds up the evaluation process. The technical staff is very professional and very attentive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° In the evaluation processes I have been involved in, it seems to me that everything has been well organized. I am very satisfied with the IT platform itself and the service provided by AVAP's managers and technicians with whom I have dealt. In my case, I am very satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° I am very satisfied with the treatment received. Thank you very much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° Congratulations on the excellent management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° My recognition and congratulations to AVAP for stimulating excellence in Valencian systems of higher education, innovation and public services, through evaluation and foresight, to improve the society it serves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° I think the functioning of the agency is adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° Overall, the evaluation process is working well, thanks to the work and collaboration of the AVAP staff, the information available and the computer application - which can be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° I believe that everything is correct. The truth is that I find the processes run very smoothly. I have nothing remarkable to comment on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° Modernise the computer application for a more agile and interactive evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° I consider it necessary to improve the evaluation form, sometimes the criteria are not very precise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° None at all, a great deal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° Perfect everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° I haven't had any major incidents and when I did, they were quickly resolved. I think the evaluation system, at least in the programmes I have taught, works well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° Thank you for your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° Molt bé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° Congratulations on the excellent work done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° Very good professionals, attentive and friendly at all times and facilitating the work, especially taking into account the period of confinement in which it was carried out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation processes are carried out normally and in accordance with the established rules and regulations provided.

I have no suggestions. My experience has been very good.

I think everything is working properly. My satisfaction with the process is complete.

Communication with the agency was excellent in all aspects.

Satisfied with the Agency.

It has been a luxury to work with this team. Thank you very much for counting on me.

I am fully satisfied with the process, the information received and the evaluation tools on-line.

No suggestions.

No suggestion necessary.

Thank you, happy to help.

All correct.

Nothing to report.

**Negative comments**

- They pay very, very late.
- It is difficult to find those assessed on the platform.
- The fees for evaluators are very low in relation to the work required of them.
  - The remuneration for each evaluation is by far the lowest in Spain. We evaluate because it is our obligation and commitment to research, but never because of the remuneration received.
  - Some of the documents I have to fill in and sign come in Excel format, which is tedious to sign, especially now that they have to be done in digital format (portafirmas) on pdf files. The conversion from xis to pdf does not save the formats properly (A4).
  - Excessive delay in remuneration and token amounts for the effort required.

**Suggestions and other comments**

- The website for the evaluation of applications could be improved.
- Consider the different disciplinary fields in the instructions.
- Survey analysis and Improvement Plan
  - It would be useful to have some kind of mechanism to be able to put the evaluation to be carried out in context. As a suggestion, number of dossiers submitted and how many can be granted.
  - Some online communication would help to resolve immediate queries.
  - If possible, obtain feedback on the results of the evaluation.
  - In some evaluations, only one candidate has been assessed, making it difficult to assess the suitability of a single candidate.
  - Allow more time for evaluations.
  - It would be interesting for new recruits if a brief online meeting could be held in order to consult doubts and give a more personal welcome.
  - The deadlines for the evaluation of project reports and CVs should be lengthened somewhat.
  - Perhaps an effort should be made to simplify the platform somewhat more.
  - For each assessment, the specific regulatory framework to be taken into account should be specified.
  - Provide compressed files for each person to avoid loss of information.
  - Maybe update the website
    - The only improvement that I consider relevant is to make available to the evaluators the certificates of the task performed as other platforms of this type do (e.g. ANEP).
  - Improve the platform.
  - More rapid payment of assessments is lacking.
  - A little more time would be advisable
    - The process for assessing the merits of candidates is too thorough, too much is asked of them, and too much is asked of them concrete and could be a disincentive. Otherwise, the experience has been very good. Thank you very much
  - Ask for the OK when sending evaluations to confirm their arrival.
  - Increase the cost paid per assessment
    - There is clearly room for improvement on the website. More specific guidelines for the assessment would be desirable also.
    - Sometimes the regulations cannot come in another language, when the evaluator is not Valencian and does not understand them.
**SEXENNIAL EVALUATORS**

The average response value obtained for this profile is 4.73, which is close to the average for the group (4.7). It should be noted that the aspects with the lowest scores are those relating to the information provided by AVAP, the functioning of the virtual platform and the instructions provided by AVAP, coinciding in this case with the profiles of R+D Evaluators and Degree Monitoring Evaluators.

---

**Observations**

**Positive comments**

- Personally, I am very happy with the management and functioning of AVAP.
  - Overall, the evaluation process works well, thanks to the work and collaboration of AVAP staff, the information available and the computer application, which could be improved. There is a lack of speed in the payment of evaluations.
  - In this particular procedure, I have not encountered any difficulties. And I think that the approach and the focus is optimal, even if I was surprised that no reference was made to any academic coordination body, which seems essential to discern the proper application of the standards, even if we have the CNEAI criteria.
  - I believe that everything is correct.
  - Thank you.
  - As an evaluator I am very satisfied with AVAP.
  - My collaboration went smoothly and I found everything rational, easy, intuitive, professional and complete. One suggestion: in this questionnaire there is no “not applicable” box, and as some of the questions were not applicable to me I put a 3 (which I understood to be neutral). This should be corrected in a questionnaire. I am pointing this out in case it is useful to you.
  - It has been very pleasurable to participate in the process, as well as rigorous.
  - I am very satisfied with all the evaluations I have done for AVAP. Thank you.
  - Exceptional agency relationship.
  - The treatment received by AVAP’s technicians and support staff has been excellent. The process of
  - The six-year assessment is well explained, but the application, which is not bad, is sometimes a bit complex.

**Negative comments**

- The platform is very old.
  - Sometimes the information that arrives is incomplete.
  - The assessment procedure is too complicated and requires a lot of work on the part of the procedure that determines the score tends to raise it, so that very questionable applications end up being acceptable. On the other hand, the scoring procedure tends to raise the score, so that very questionable applications end up being acceptable.
Suggestions and other comments

- The survey should include the possibility to leave questions blank. For example: I do not know whether or not the legal deadlines have been respected (I do know that I have respected the deadlines given to me, but I do not know what the legal deadlines are) and I do not have enough information about AVAP’s reputation.
- They should provide a file in Word to write the evaluation.
- More coordination between administration staff would be desirable.
- Allow more time for evaluations.
- Add a final table to quantify and compare the merits of the subset of candidates analysed by an evaluator.
- Include dossier information on a single page. In some evaluations the data are on two pages and misleading.
- Perhaps it would be interesting to specify the remuneration of any AVAP assignment before it is made and to indicate in what instalments the payment for the assignment is expected to be made.
The answers given to the open questions for this profile are detailed below:

**OBSERVATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The different years that I have been collaborating with AVAP have provided me with very valuable training and information that I have incorporated into all my previous learning (ANEP and CNEAI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I feel very honoured to be part of this team. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Just hope that everything stays as good as it has been so far. Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congratulations on your excellent management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All very well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• My recognition and congratulations to AVAP for stimulating excellence in Valencian systems of higher education, innovation and public services, through evaluation and foresight, to improve the society it serves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All Ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In general, the whole evaluation process works well, thanks to the work of AVAP staff, the information available and the IT application - which could be improved. The speed of assessment payments should be improved where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I believe that everything is correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In general I found everything easy and well organised, I consider that the functioning is adequate, although it is always possible to make small improvements in the programme to help in the execution of the evaluations, especially with the recording of comments, which should be automatic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In general, the operation of the new platform is adequate, although not very intuitive. A time interval should be considered between the different telematic sessions programmed in the virtual visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I would like to highlight the treatment received by the staff who send us the evaluations, as well as the quick response when questions are raised. Thank you very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thank you for your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No comments, everything seems fine to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I have nothing new to contribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I would like you to provide me as soon as possible with the certificate of the evaluations carried out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congratulations on the excellent work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Everything has been adequate and efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The evaluations were carried out normally and in accordance with the regulations provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exceptional relationship with the agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proper functioning and proper care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The evaluation process is correct. I note my complete satisfaction in participating in this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I don't think there is any room for improvement, as it works perfectly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have no suggestions, I am satisfied with the functioning of the agency and the relationship established.
Everything is perfect. Thank you for your confidence in my work
All correct
I can't think of any suggestions for improvement. Thank you

Negative comments

- In the process of monitoring the degrees we have not always been given clear instructions, which has led to some problems when carrying out the evaluation.
- AVAP's request to teachers to fill in and provide certificates and to sign consents involved in evaluation is enormous and tedious.
- Digital signature of xls documents is not possible. Conversion from xls to pdf does not save the physical format (A4) appropriately
  - Of all the agencies I work with, AVAP is the one that takes the longest to pay the evaluations and also the financial compensation of often 30 or 40 € is lower than in other agencies. I think these are suggestions for improvement for AVAP that I have also heard from other evaluators.
- Increasing the amount of payment per assessment
- They should pay more than they do...
- The bank's certification requirements for cashing out are a nuisance: any branch office
  - The banking system is full of people waiting and it takes a long time, which does not pay off. On the other hand, the payment for project evaluation and grants is very low and takes time if you want to do it right. It also does not pay off
  - The dossiers are not completed correctly by the applicants. AVAP should check that the publication databases of the CV articles and the corresponding quartiles are included. The criteria should distinguish between

- I participated in several processes and received several links, without knowing which process each one corresponds to. Moreover, it is almost a year since I carried out the evaluations. I suggest that for the future, the survey should be done right after the evaluation process and indicate in which process it refers to, as the answers may be different.
- Currently, given the number of evaluations and reviews of scientific articles, which we receive, it is
  - It is essential to simplify the questionnaires in order to save time for those being evaluated. It should be assessed which aspects do not provide relevant information for the objectives of the evaluation and eliminated or replaced by others.
- The platform can be improved.
- I don't know if it would be possible to know the resolution of the evaluated dossiers, as own feedback in the task of the evaluator.
  - The main efforts should focus on information, platform, methods, etc. the first time that an assessment is carried out. The information is clear and precise, but as each agency varies, time is lost in this first phase. I think that the different agencies in Spain should unify more criteria and platforms.
- Improve IT system
  - The application submission and evaluation platform could be more user-friendly and the font size could be a little more regular.
- I would review the models for those being assessed. It would avoid repetition and difficulty in finding information important.
  - Provide together with the dossiers the published call for proposals and any other evaluation criteria to be taken into account. This has been the case in recent evaluations and I believe that this issue has been corrected by putting these calls on the web for access by the evaluators.
  - There are some questions on which I do not have an opinion because I have not needed advice or the AVAP service to carry out the assessment. Therefore, I suggest including in future surveys such as this one an additional response category indicating that a certain question is "not applicable".
  - I think it could all be done more like the State Investigation Agency. They pay you directly, you don't have to make minutes, they say exactly how much money they pay for each evaluation, and everything is clearer.
- Send notifications when payments are made. At this stage it is not known when they are executed.
- Improvement of the evaluation guides for the different programmes, adapting them to the calls for proposals.
RESULTS OF THE APPLICANT GROUP

The values obtained for average satisfaction and calculated satisfaction for the Applicant group are 4.14 and 4.10 respectively.

The following table shows the results for each of the profiles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFILES</th>
<th>AVERAGE SATISFACT</th>
<th>CALCULATED SATISFACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher accreditation</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Quality Assurance Units</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed that the deviation between the values of average satisfaction and satisfaction calculated for the profile Accreditation of teaching staff is very small, so it can be deduced that for this profile of the Applicant group a similar assessment is made with regard to the satisfaction of the different aspects to be analysed.

However, the deviation between the two satisfaction indicators for the profile University Quality Units is quite significant. In the subsequent analysis of the profile in particular, it can be detected that the aspects information provided by AVAP, operation of the platform, compliance with deadlines and AVAP's reputation obtain lower satisfaction values than the rest, causing the calculated satisfaction to drop substantially compared to the average general satisfaction.

The average number of responses obtained for each profile in the Applicant group is presented below:

Analysing the graph, a good degree of satisfaction is evident for this group and a fairness for both profiles, taking into account the differences in the assessment between different aspects, as evidenced by the difference between the overall average satisfaction and the satisfaction calculated for one of the two profiles. However, this is not significant in the overall assessment, due to the small number of responses obtained by this profile compared to the total number of responses received for the group of applicants.
The average per question obtained for this group can be seen in the following graph:

Satisfaction for each of the aspects analysed independently shows more negative values for the functioning of the virtual platform and the information provided by AVAP. The most positive aspects were AVAP employees and compliance with legal deadlines.

The results for each of the profiles are detailed below.
Survey to measure the satisfaction of l’Agència Valenciana d’Avaluació i Prospectiva. February 2021

TEACHER ACCREDITATION

The average value of responses obtained for this profile is 4.11, which is close to the average for the group (4.1). It is worth noting that two aspects poorly rated by this profile are those relating to the information provided by AVAP and the instructions provided by AVAP. The worst rated aspect was the functioning of the virtual platform, which received a score of less than four points.

The answers given to the open questions for this profile are detailed below:

OBSERVATIONS

Positive feedback
- Speed of resolution.
- Overall, I am very satisfied with the AVAP staff, who are excellent, patient and diligent. The computer and management system should be improved.
- I think it is correct the way it is
- All correct
- The treatment of the staff has been exquisite.
- The speed of the evaluation has been very satisfactory.
- The accreditation process was quick and easy and the treatment was more than correct, attentive and very professional. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for all the help you gave me, despite the pandemic situation you were impeccable. Greetings,
- Thank you for your interest
- Excellent management, very satisfied.
- I am very satisfied with the process, both this last one and the one in 2017 when I applied for accreditation as a doctoral assistant.
- Although queries can be made via email, I would like to have a telephone number (and one that I can call) for direct queries and shortening response times.
  - I suggest that in the future the simulator should be able to save the data in each field of accreditation, because this saves time and resources if we want to simulate several scenarios.
- I am very happy with the whole evaluation process.
- Thank the agency for its impeccable performance and response.
- Less documentation to provide
- Shorter timeframe for the examination of each dossier
- En primer lloc, m’hauria agradat fer aquesta enquesta en valencià, i també rebre l'email per fer l'enquesta en valencià. Secondly, I would like the accreditation processes to be always open, instead of having to wait for the few calls for applications.
- All correct, very friendly telephone service to confirm the registration of the request.
- I have not given a mark of 5 in many cases, not because of the platform, but because of the learning curve I had to go through. Once I knew the grade would be 5
- Tot correcte
- I have no suggestions for improvement. I think it is all very correct.
- Very satisfactory process in form and time
- The response to my complaint was concise and prompt.
I think the staff did a very good job given the confinement situation due to COVID.

It is incomprehensible that by presenting the same documentation to ANECA and AVAP at ANECA, it is possible to get 3 accreditations: Private University, Ayudante Doctor and Contratado Doctor and in AVAP none.

The possibility of submitting the CVN in the accreditation process makes the process much easier. It is a success.

Don’t be so restrictive with minimum limits

Please forgive me if I cannot propose any improvements to the process, but I honestly thought it was very well presented and easy to deal with. Thank you very much.

To congratulate Francisco López García for his attention, accompaniment and diligence during the process. Thanks to all the team and to Francisco.

Professional and positive experience

Details of teaching credits

I have no suggestions for improvement. The process was very quick and easy. Thank you for the facilities provided.

More clarity in the scoring of the research

I am very satisfied with the work done by the entire AVAP team, especially during the pandemic and the State of Alarm. My sincere congratulations

To congratulate all AVAP members, staff and collaborators for their professionalism and thoroughness.

Thank you very much for everything.

The treatment received by the staff before incidents has been exceptional.

Careers depend on this for many.

Keep it up

All very much to the point

Tot correcte.

Thank you for the phone call which, in the midst of my confinement, allowed me to clarify some questions that were needed. Thanks to all of you

Thank you very much.

The documentation process involves having to upload a large number of files and the upload exceeds the number of files allowed on the platform. This issue would need to be expanded.

I did not receive the mail with the resolution.

The platform is old, unintuitive, slow.... I was very surprised at how obsolete it is and the number of simple improvements that should be made.

The process is opaque, you don’t know what you have or haven’t been scored, no report or feedback is given. At least in some detail to have some guidance on how your merits have been scored.

Digital certificate for access does not work in MAC environment

The resolution came out in June 2020, but I have not had access until January 2021. I don’t know where the problem has been, as I have been looking every month, maybe I haven’t known, or the website doesn’t make it easy, or we don’t receive notification via email. The only alarm notification has come with this evaluation email. Thank you

The evaluation panel does not follow the rules of the call for applications because, as I could see in the report of detailed evaluation of my evaluation. In the research section it says that all scientific articles published in JCR and SJR indexed journals will be evaluated. In my case, only articles published in JCR were evaluated.

The criteria for evaluating medical teachers are totally inappropriate. It is not possible to evaluate the same applies to a doctor as to a teacher, just as we would not measure the distances between planets in metres. The metre is legal but the useful thing is to use the year/light. If you have fibre and a cough you will see how useful a doctor is, even if he has no articles in JCR.

When you send an application, you should be able to return to it, not automatically create a new one.

The result of my accreditation was surprising to say the least. I will undoubtedly tell the story for the rest of my life. About a reviewer (anonymous, of course) who did not even give me a mark as an Assistant Doctor (a post I currently occupy).

Teaching is not sufficiently valued, only up to 18 credits. Experience in cooperation

The only area that is assessed is health, because experience in accredited cooperation in the field of human rights or violence against women is not assessed. Professional experience should be given a higher score

It has not reached me on paper.
• The process should not be more demanding than ANECA. On the contrary, its accreditation is only valid for universities in the VC."
• What type of CV should be harmonised between the ministry and the avap?
• Longer and/or more frequent deadlines for submission of applications would be appreciated, and that to be known earlier. Thank you
• "Donat que la llengua cooficial és el Valencià, podrien vostés donar l’opció a fer aquest qüestionari en Valencià. Els recordo que l’estatu d’autonomia així ho exigeix. A banda, el procés de tramitació a la plataforma i la resolució d’incidencies en l’últim convocatòria va ser horrible. The platform only accepted one of the digital certificates".
• It should be open all year round and not just for 15 days. It is very hasty.
• The platform and the signature system does not work properly. It was a pain to submit the application on time. In addition, the evaluation was incorrect, many merits were not taken into account and I had to complain. It was when I complained that all the merits were taken into account. It seems unbelievable that we have to pay for a deficient management.
• More evaluation calls (in 2019 there were none, in 2020 only one).
• Keep to the announcements you make, the last call was long overdue.
• I understand that there is a minimum limit which is how long it takes for the evaluators to respond, a lot of delay in the last call.
• Reviewers penalising University of Valencia candidates
• It is not logical that accepted publications cannot be admitted, as is the case with ANECA. And that you have to pay for accreditation, in addition to the fact that the process is not permanently open.
• You cannot go in a different direction from ANECA. And you should not give preferential treatment to the Valencians, to the detriment of other people who would like to work in the Valencian Community (I speak Valencian, C1). The fact that researchers from other parts of the state want to work in your community enriches you far from being a problem.
• The final assessment is not clear; in my case I do not agree with the result of the accreditation (too much ambiguity).
• There has been no contact with AVAP staff. Have a contact person to resolve doubts would help a lot in processing the documentation. In any case, the telematic experience has been a good one, especially considering that it coincided with the state of alarm. Thank you.
• The structure of the website is not intuitive, especially for people who use a Mac.
• The platform could work better...
• The digital certificate login process is complex (on a Mac and using Firefox) and requires too many permissions (I think the problem is the use of Flash). It could (and should) be simplified.
• On the other hand, AVAP’s interface is somewhat outdated, although it works quite well.
• Correctly apply the ranking and scoring processes.
• It is true that the call in which I have been involved has been affected by the confinement concerning SARS-Cov-2, but at no time have we been told the approximate timeframe in which it would be resolved.
• The platform is simple, but the "Java" language creates compatibility problems with other browsers.
• The documentary justification in PDF of publications that are online on official journal websites is questionable".
• Please improve the application so that it is accessible from any browser and any signature or permanent password. Thank you very much.

Suggestions and other comments
• Put less limitations on file size, have to list extra publications.
• Give more advance notice of the opening of the call and open it more often.
• Improve the platform.
• Open more calls or leave it open all year round.
• NS/NC can be added to the rating scale because there are points that may not have occurred (incidents, contact with staff...)
• I think that negative evaluations should be more detailed to help the applicant to recognise which aspects of his or her scientific and teaching output need to be improved. On the other hand, I think that the replies to complaints should be more reasoned, and not just a simple "we have seen your file".
• The process should not be limited to a single period per year, but should be a year-round process.
• Enlarge the space (Mb) to send documentation
• Online tutorials
• Easier delivery system
• Modernisation of the platform for sending documents
• I suggest that the mock test that you are obliged to do before filling in the application form should be a bit more intuitive, i.e. that it should have more sub-sections that fit with the different merits that the applicant can provide and that do not always fit perfectly into the sections that appear in the mock test.
• The telematics platform needs to be improved as it is rather rudimentary. The deadline
• The application form could be more comprehensive. The e-mail support from AVAP staff was very good and they helped me at all times.
• In general I am happy with the treatment and the process, but if I have to suggest something, the truth is that I would like a quicker resolution, both for accreditations and in the case of lodging an appeal, as job opportunities are lost due to not having a response in time.
• The curriculum filling in should allow importing data from other platforms to make it less cumbersome to enter all the data again.
• Its electronics need to be improved.
• While difficult, it would improve the process if the deadlines were shortened.
• Logging in with a particular version of Firefox makes access to the intranet very difficult.
• Irrespective of the positive or negative outcome of the assessment, the person concerned could be informed about the score obtained in order to know their level for further evaluations. Thank you
• I think it may be useful for positive resolutions to specify the score as well obtained by the applicant.
• Increase file capacity
• They could open a further period for teacher accreditation, because in short periods of time they can
• publications and further merit
• A period of accreditation could be opened after the end of the academic year, in order to count teaching taught in the same year. In February-March we are still in the middle of the academic year and this teaching cannot be counted”.
• Perhaps further extend the deadline for submission of applications
• A better argumentation of the resolution
• The website should be improved considerably because it gives many problems with the digital signature and the simulators it is not clear whether credits, hours, etc. have to be entered.
• Improving web management and access
• Possibility of continuous accreditation throughout the year.
• Obir més convocatòries a l’any. There are many merits of humanity that cannot be put in stone and
• s’haurien de considerar importants.
• Opaque process in the evaluation, and unresponsive in the provision of information. Unfriendly treatment
• In the event of having to ask for accreditation to two figures, it would be good not to have to duplicate the sending of documentation.
• I think it would be very interesting if the self-assessment tool could be open all year round, and not only when the call for evaluation is opened
• Increased capacity for uploading files
The SIAVAL platform is too rigid, and any small change in the procedure does not allow for a quick and satisfactory solution.

Suggestions and other comments:

- The SIAVAL platform is too rigid, and any small change in the procedure does not allow for a quick and satisfactory solution.

In the case of the platform, the evidence of the external visit would have to be reviewed and could include information by subject.

- Some deadlines and the computer application should be improved (including the possibility to increase the size of attachments allowed). There is also a lack of training/experience of committee secretaries in some cases.

- Establish clear criteria for the External Evaluation Committees to agree on the evaluation criteria applied.

- It would be good to try to improve the performance of the evaluation committees, making them more in line with the evaluation protocols. Training them and establishing mechanisms for standardising criteria and coordination with the agency could be some of the actions that could help in this regard.
Block III.
Conclusions
The analysis of the average assessment results by programme shows more positive results for the Evaluators group, with an average of 4.7 out of 5, compared to an average of 4.1 for the Applicants group. Even so, the data are very positive since the average for both programmes is 4.5 out of 5, which conveys a very positive assessment for AVAP.

The distribution of recipients shows a similar percentage of users for both groups (43% applicants vs. 57% evaluators). These similar numbers allow a rough comparison of results for both groups allowing to identify common aspects where the assessment is high or low.

With regard to the degree of participation in the survey, 39% of the initial respondents have returned a response. This percentage can be taken as a reference as this is the first edition of the study.

If only users who have opened the survey are considered, the response rate is 55%, a value that can also be taken as a reference in terms of response once the survey has been viewed.

Survey, making it possible to estimate the number of responses to be obtained in future editions.

The overall average general satisfaction scores (SAT) obtained correspond to 4.68 for the group of evaluators and 4.14 for the group of applicants. Both values show a high degree of satisfaction with the service provided by AVAP in general by both groups of users, although the group of evaluators shows a higher overall satisfaction.

The calculated satisfaction scores (Sc) are 4.65 for the group of evaluators and 4.65 for the group of evaluators, and 4.14 for the applicant group, repeating the previous pattern.

No significant differences are observed in the analysis of the results obtained for the values of average overall satisfaction and calculated satisfaction, so that, taking the group as a whole, the evaluations of the different aspects are similar.

The analysis of the average assessment results by programme shows more positive results for the Evaluators group, with an average of 4.7 out of 5, compared to an average of 4.1 for the Applicants group.

Even so, the data are very positive since the average for both programmes is 4.5 out of 5, which conveys a very positive assessment for AVAP.
General experience in its dealings with the AVAP: The average rating for this question is 4.7, which is around the group average (4.66). The excellent evaluation by the Accreditation Commission profile is highlighted, reaching the maximum evaluation value.

Communication and management of the AVAP staff: The average rating for this question is 4.7, which is around the group average (4.66). Once again, the Accreditation Commission profile again rates this aspect with the highest possible value.

Attention of AVAP employees: The average value for this question is 4.8, which is above the group average (4.66). Once again, the Accreditation Commission profile again values this aspect with the highest possible value and the rest of the profiles increase their value compared to other questions. It can be deduced from this that the service provided by AVAP employees is an aspect that is highly valued by this group.

Information provided by AVAP: The average rating for this question is 4.5, which is slightly below the group average (4.66). The assessment shows a slightly lower value for this question coinciding with some suggestions for improvement.

Compliance with legal deadlines: The average rating for this question is 4.7, which is around the group average (4.66).

How AVAP’s virtual platform works: The average rating for this question is 4.6, which is around the group average (4.66). It is worth noting the drop in satisfaction on the part of the Accreditation Commission profile and the rest of the profiles, coinciding with the negative comments in relation to this aspect.

Instructions provided by the AVAP for the evaluation process: The average rating for this question is 4.5, which is slightly below the group average (4.66). Comments and suggestions made by users can be related to the previous aspect.

Attention on the part of the AVAP in the provision of loans: The average rating for this question is 4.8, which is above the group average (4.66). High satisfaction is perceived for this question by all profiles.

The analysis of the average assessment results by programme shows the most positive results for the Accreditation Committee profile, with a value of 4.93 out of 5, while the worst assessment comes from the Re-accreditation Evaluators, with a value of 4.47 for this profile. For the rest of the profiles, R&D Evaluators, Sexennial Evaluators and Degree Monitoring Evaluators, the values are evenly distributed, with values of around 4.7 for all of them.

It can be concluded that this group is highly satisfied with AVAP’s management.
The large number of positive comments towards the Agency stands out.

Among the negative comments, they are noteworthy and should be taken into account:

- The malfunctioning of the platform.
- The delay in the financial remuneration of Evaluators.
- The low remuneration for Evaluators for each evaluation.

Suggested actions include:

- Better handling of information
- A less complicated Assessment procedure to complete
- Better completion of the dossier by the applicants
- Rethink the management of document signatures, as this cannot be done in certain formats.

SATISFACTION RESULTS BY APPLICANT GROUP PROFILE

The analysis of the average assessment results by programme shows the most positive results for the profile of University quality units, with a value of 4.5 out of 5, while the profile of Accreditation of teaching staff shows an average value of 4.1, which is significantly lower than the previous ones.

It can be concluded that this group is satisfied with AVAP’s management, but has more demands and on some points more disagreements, detailed below, than the group of Evaluators.

SATISFACTION RESULTS BY QUESTION FOR THE APPLICANT GROUP

General experience in dealing with the AVAP: The average rating for this question is 4.1, which is around the group average (4.1).

Communication and management of the AVAP staff: The average rating for this question is 4.2, which is around the group average (4.1).

Attention of AVAP employees: The average rating for this question is 4.3, which is above the group average (4.1).

Information provided by AVAP: The average rating for this question is 4.0, which is slightly below the group average (4.1).

How AVAP's virtual platform works: The average rating for this question is 3.8, below the group average (4.1), and the most negative figure of the entire survey.
Resolution of doubts or possible incidents: The average rating for this question is 4.2 remaining around the group average (4.1).

Instructions provided by the AVAP for the evaluation process: The average rating for this question is 4.0, which is around the group average (4.1).

Compliance with legal deadlines: The average rating for this question is 4.3, which is above the group average (4.1).

AVAP Reputation: The average rating for this question is 4.0, which is around the group average (4.1).

The large number of positive comments towards the Agency stands out, although it should be noted that there are also more negative comments and suggestions than in the Evaluators’ group.

Among the negative comments, they are noteworthy and should be taken into account:

- The malfunctioning of the platform.
- The malfunctioning of the MAC environment.
- There is no coordination with ANECA.
- The platform’s JAVA language generates incompatibilities with other browsers.

Suggested actions include:

- Enlarge space (MB) for sending documentation
- Extension of the deadline for the submission of applications
- A less complicated Assessment procedure to complete
- Improving the performance of the committees of evaluators to better comply with the evaluation protocol.