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Block I. General information on 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:

**GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N O.</th>
<th>EVALUATION GROUP</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 has 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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N O.</th>
<th>APPLICANT GROUP</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>Communication and management by AVAP staff has 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 from 0 to 15, with the least favourable and the most favourable score being the lowest. It is also possible to add suggestions for improvement or comments on the process at the end of the survey.

Collection modalities

The data collection has been carried out telematically.

Collection questionnaires

Two different types of questionnaires were used depending on the group to which the users belonged, although all of them included 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 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 conclusions to be drawn regarding the degree of impact of the aspects consulted on the satisfaction perceived by the customer.

**STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT**

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 specific results of satisfaction and conclusions.

- **Block III. Conclusions of the study**
  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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of clients receiving AVAP services. TOTAL NUMBER 1185 OF DELIVERIES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of recipients of questionnaires. OPENINGS 755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of clients participating in the survey. RESPONSES 683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:
Block II. Satisfaction Results
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 customers 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 carry out. The division of users into groups and profiles can be seen below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td>EVALUATORS REACCREDITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCREDITATION COMMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R&amp;D EVALUATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEXENIOS EVALUATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEGREE MONITORING EVALUATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>APPLICANTS FOR TEACHER ACCREDITATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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)</th>
<th>1185</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of clients participating in the survey (sample size)</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Response</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of the overall data reveals that the level of participation in the survey has been much more positive than in the previous period, reaching a value of 58% compared to 39% in 2021. As can be seen in the graphs above, for the group of evaluators there has been a response rate of 64% and for applicants a response rate of 49%.

These values are calculated taking into account the total number of shipments that have been made.
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### DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPATING USERS BY GROUP AND PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>PROFILE</th>
<th>Number of users benefiting from AVAP services</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Response as % of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EVALUATORS</td>
<td>EVALUATORS REACCREDITS</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCREDITATION COMMISSION</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>R&amp;D EVALUATORS</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>SEXENIOS EVALUATORS</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>DEGREE MONITORING EVALUATORS</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>APPLICANTS</td>
<td>APPLICANTS FOR TEACHER ACCREDITATION</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNIVERSITY QUALITY UNITS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of responses for each profile relative to the total number of submissions for each profile is shown in the graph below along with the comparative trend for the 2021 period:

![Shipping Response - Trends Graph](image-url)
As can be seen, the percentage of response increases for each profile with respect to the previous period, with the exception of *Reaccreditation Evaluators*, which drops from 63% to 43%. The two profiles that show an increase in the number of responses are *Accreditation Commission* and *University Quality Units*.

These are very positive data, since in just one year there has been a clear increase in the interest of Assessors and Applicants in responding to AVAP as opposed to their satisfaction with it.
OVERALL SATISFACTION RESULTS

The table below shows the mean and calculated satisfaction values for the two major 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>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALCULATED SATISFACTION (SC)</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, the average results of overall satisfaction show very high values, with those obtained for the group of evaluators standing out. Likewise, the trend with respect to the previous period is very good, and is maintained for both groups.

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.
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RESULTS BY GROUP

RESULTS OF THE PANEL OF EVALUATORS

The values obtained for average satisfaction and calculated satisfaction for the group of Evaluators reach the value of in 4,68 both cases.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFILES</th>
<th>AVERAGE SATISFACTION</th>
<th>CALCULATED SATISFACTION</th>
<th>AVERAGE SATISFACTION</th>
<th>CALCULATED SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreatita Evaluators</td>
<td>4,74</td>
<td>4,69</td>
<td>4,48</td>
<td>4,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Commission</td>
<td>5,00</td>
<td>4,91</td>
<td>5,00</td>
<td>4,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D Evaluators</td>
<td>4,68</td>
<td>4,69</td>
<td>4,70</td>
<td>4,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators Sexenios</td>
<td>4,78</td>
<td>4,73</td>
<td>4,75</td>
<td>4,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Monitoring Evaluators</td>
<td>4,13</td>
<td>4,25</td>
<td>4,71</td>
<td>4,67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the deviation between the average satisfaction values and the satisfaction 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 average overall satisfaction value.

In addition, the trend with respect to the period of the year is 2021 maintained, being positive in the case of Reaccreditation Evaluators, Sexenios Evaluators and Degree Monitoring Evaluators.

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

Promedio de respuestas por perfil y pregunta seleccionada

If we analyse the graph, a high degree of satisfaction is evident for all profiles and it is worth noting, as in the previous year, that the Accreditation Commission profile values more positively with regard to
The results for each of the profiles are detailed below.
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to the rest of the profiles in this group. However, the profile of Degree Monitoring Evaluator users shows the lowest values, although, even so, they still show a high degree of satisfaction.

On the other hand, the Reacredita Evaluators, which in 2021 had the lowest values, recovered this year and increased their average rating.

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 question standing out, with results exactly the same as those of the previous year.

The results for each of the profiles are detailed below.
Survey to measure the satisfaction of the Valencian Evaluation and Foresight Agency. January 2022
Survey to measure the satisfaction of the Valencian Evaluation and Foresight Agency. January 2022

REACCREDIT EVALUATORS

The average response values obtained for this profile are the same as those obtained on average by the group (4.7), with high values in a range of 4.5-4.9. The most highly rated question is, "AVAP employees have attended to you correctly", followed by "communication and management carried out by AVAP staff" and "attention by AVAP in resolving any queries".

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

Positive comments

The process has been excellent
Everything has been correct. Increasing efficiency

Negative comments

There is no training for external evaluators. The people who participate in the committees are often unaware of what to do and how to do it. This is not the fault of AVAP employees, who do what they can, but of the lack of organisation of such training, which results in evaluations that are worse than those of other agencies.
Little prior information, extremely low pay for the hours of work required.
The new platform is confusing when it comes to closing reports.
When working without being present, more time must be allowed between notices, especially if there are changes in the staff of the evaluation committee due to illness or other causes.
I am very unhappy that AVAP has tried to get me to change my assessment in a way that is more beneficial to the university being assessed.

Suggestions and other comments

The new platform is confusing when it comes to closing reports.
Collaborations should be paid more and better.
Clarity and improved remuneration in panels and reallocation of functions.
Provide more defined evaluation rubrics.
Provide feedback to the committee on the performance during the visit and on the report.
Report the final report to the committee.
A return to face-to-face visits is suggested as they are more effective for the evaluation process.
I think that training should be given to all members who participate in a selection board before their first participation, even if they have not assessed for years. Also, I think the remuneration compared to other agencies is quite low.
The amount of evaluation fees is in some cases less than half that of other quality agencies such as Galicia or Madrid.
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ACCREDITATION COMMISSION

The average value of responses obtained for this profile is the same as that obtained in (20214.92), being the highest in the group of Evaluators and also above the average value for the group (4.7). It should be noted that all aspects are rated very highly (4.9-5.0), with the exception of the aspect relating to the clear instructions provided by AVAP for the evaluation process.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive comments</th>
<th>No comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions and other comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadlines for evaluation should be longer, or dossiers should be made available earlier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be good if the evaluators could know the number of applicants to the call and the estimated number of places available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**R&D EVALUATORS**

The average value of responses obtained for this profile remains at a value of 4.68, thus remaining close to the average for the group (4.7). It is worth noting that the worst rated aspects are those relating to the functioning of the virtual platform and the instructions provided by AVAP, while the aspect of the information provided by AVAP is an improvement on the previous year, 2021.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Positive comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation would be improved if instead of giving each evaluator 1-2 projects from 2-3 different programmes, only one type of programme (but 4-5 different projects) would be evaluated. This would reduce the randomness of scoring by the evaluators, and would therefore be fairer for the applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to make an objective assessment, as much information as possible should be sought from both the candidate and the receiving teams/mobile persons; this is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing to add. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is carried out in a correct way and the accompaniment they do in the evaluation process is very close. Congratulations!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is currently well thought out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All perfect with the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the Evaluation agencies I work with, AVAP is one of the most efficient, clear and concise. It is always a pleasure to work on this platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything worked well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you very much for my collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None relevant. The procedures are clear and the platform works perfectly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My sincere congratulations on how well it works thank... you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process has worked perfectly. I see no need for any changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As can be seen from the results, my level of satisfaction is very high, and the capacity for improvement and the constructive spirit on the part of the system and, above all, the people, is appreciated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The whole process was straightforward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No suggestions. overall, everything ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to highlight the speed with which questions are answered and the good treatment given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a first time, the experience has been surprisingly positive. Many congratulations. A great agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider the evaluation processes to be adequate and very well managed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you, glad to have participated
I collaborate with other agencies for similar functions. I am fully satisfied with AVAP.
in general everything is correct and clear
I don’t have any suggestions, it seems right to me
WORKS PERFECTLY
I consider my experience as an AVAP evaluator to be very satisfactory and I would not dare to propose changes to processes that should be agreed in due course.
Excellent professionals
It pays much less than in other evaluation processes.

Negative comments

Considering the high level of dedication required to carry out a good evaluation, I consider that the remuneration paid to evaluators for their work is very low.
Remuneration is quite low for the work done.
AVAP staff often do not answer emails in a timely manner (you have to insist to get an answer).
In relation to other agencies, what is charged for evaluation is about a third of what Avap charged, and there are quite a few hours to invest if you want to do it seriously and well, which is how I like to do my job. That’s why collaborating with Avap is not economically rewarding. Otherwise, everything is fine.
The information provided by researchers is not homogeneous, which makes evaluation difficult, such as participation in projects, where the participants are not indicated and this makes it difficult to see the joint trajectory.
I did not have a very good experience with the process of agreeing scores with another reviewer in a peer review. Doing it telematically gives rise to misunderstandings. Also, it was very inefficient (slow, cumbersome) because of having to wait for the other person’s reaction. Better to do it in a meeting, even if it was telematic?
The scoring criteria for each of the sections of the call for applications were not sufficiently detailed, making it difficult to assess them and leaving a wide margin for the evaluator’s discretion. For the same evaluator to assess different candidates there is no problem, but in a call with so many applications it should be more limited.
The delay in the payment of the collaboration fee is inexplicably excessive: more than four months since the evaluation report was finalised and delivered.
Give evaluators more advance notice that they will be called upon.

Suggestions and other comments

It would be good if payments could also be swift.
I recommend that in the survey process you have the possibility to answer “don’t know or not applicable” as many of the questions I answered needed that answer, as I was not confronted with the problem.
I consider peer review of applications to be a risk, given the possible different backgrounds of those selected for a particular assessment.
Increasing the amounts paid out and doing so more quickly
It would be good to have information about what decision has been taken and to what extent our assessment has been taken into account.
Perhaps the process of interaction between evaluators should be streamlined.
Establish an annual or biannual improvement plan on the evaluation processes.
Several responses were given a score of “3” due to the lack of “Not applicable” options (e.g. those concerning the performance of AVAP staff when it was not necessary to contact them).
Perhaps some calls need a longer period to evaluate the dossiers, if several calls were requested.
The evaluation procedure needs to be improved, as it currently avoids the more than desirable instance of deliberation and discussion between peer evaluators, which would make it possible to better clarify the application of criteria in the broad spectrum of branches, as well as to be able to assess the results of the evaluations as a whole.
After the evaluation give access to the comments of other evaluators, as well as to the final evaluation.
Sometimes we receive applications that are far removed from our academic profiles, which we obviously cannot/should not evaluate as we are not specialists in those areas.

The projects must be evaluated by two or more reviewers, but ONLY ONE must make the final synthesis and once this has been done, send it to the rest of the reviewers so that they can give their agreement or suggest any changes. The final word must correspond to that single rapporteur.

improving the platform would be useful
Increasing the payment of evaluators
Payment for services rendered needs to be streamlined, i.e. in line with the deadlines requested for carrying out file evaluations.
I believe that for new evaluators there should be some introductory training or presentation.

Allow more time for evaluation.
A more streamlined procedure for reviewers to interact with each other needs to be put in place.
The indications on the weighting of items to be evaluated could include a reference to the average quality of applicants in this type of call.
Payment of fees is made with excessive delay.
More agile payments
I would like the evaluators to be informed, when the evaluation process is completed, of the final decision of the process in which we have been involved.
Perfect, can improve more time for the evaluator.
The platform is not intuitive, although it works well.
In the survey, they should add an N.A. (not applicable) box. (not applicable), because some questions should not be answered in certain cases, e.g.: Have we clarified your doubts? This question should not be answered if no questions have been raised.
I would suggest that the final results of the calls be made available to the evaluators involved for their information.
Pay more and earlier.
I suggest a revision of the scale for the evaluation of publications. In my opinion, the relationship of the publications with the field for which the evaluation is requested should be taken into account. By way of example, I think that a Q1 in JCR in a journal that is not relevant in that field should not be valued more highly than a Q4 in a relevant journal.
The deadlines for review seem short in relation to the total time it takes to complete the process.
My only objection is that the deadlines are quite tight and that, generally, the collaboration is requested just when the holiday periods (Christmas,...) are about to start.
It would include a minimum of two reviewers for all calls, to ensure a fairer/consensual evaluation.
I consider the evaluation of the gender perspective in projects in all fields of knowledge to be a very positive development.
Remuneration for the work should be higher and payment for the work done should be commensurate with the promptness required to submit the results.
Overall my experience with the AVAP evaluation process has been satisfactory. As an improvement, the digital platform is sometimes confusing. In addition, the evaluation criteria for the different aspects are not very clear and differ from evaluator to evaluator. Perhaps organising consensus sessions would be a good option to improve the process.
The application could be a bit more intuitive. It's hard to figure out how to follow the process and you have to look at the instructions again.
It is not always feasible for us to meet deadlines. I don't doubt that they are the right ones, but sometimes I have problems meeting deadlines.
The answers given to the open questions for this profile are detailed below: REMARKS

**Positive comments**

Nothing to comment on. I think AVAP is doing a good job, with great kindness and efficiency.

The treatment is excellent and I would like to point out that the focus is on conciseness in the applications, which favours the evaluations by providing greater clarity to the applicants.

I consider it appropriate

**Negative comments**

They do not exist

**Suggestions and other comments**

The submission of the assessment through the platform should be enabled as a valid signature. The digital signature procedure to access the payment for evaluation seems tedious and duplicated.

Review and consult annually on possible improvements to be considered in the protocols of the different evaluation programmes.

Confirmation of communication

In my view it is desirable to broaden the level of qualifications and to differentiate between meeting the minimum and being very good in terms of contribution.
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DEGREE MONITORING EVALUATORS

The average value of responses obtained for this profile is below the value obtained in (20214.67), thus remaining 4.24 below the average for the group (4.7). It should be noted that the lowest rated aspects are those relating to the information provided by AVAP, the communication and management carried out by AVAP staff, the general experience and the attention given by AVAP in resolving any queries.

It is the profile with the worst average satisfaction value for the group of evaluators and, moreover, its trend compared to the previous period is the most negative.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive comments</th>
<th>Negative comments</th>
<th>Suggestions and other comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They do not exist</td>
<td>It is very difficult to contact by phone.</td>
<td>They do not exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESULTS OF THE APPLICANT GROUP

The values obtained for average satisfaction and calculated satisfaction for the group of Applicants are 4.08 and 4.02 respectively, slightly below those of the previous year, although very insignificantly, so it can be said that the trend is maintained.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFILES</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVERAGE SATISFACTION</td>
<td>CALCULATED SATISFACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher accreditation</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Quality Assurance Units</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed that the deviation between the mean satisfaction and satisfaction values calculated for the profile Faculty Accreditation is very small, so it can be deduced that for this profile of the Applicant group a similar assessment is made in terms of satisfaction with the different aspects to be analysed. However, the deviation between the two satisfaction indicators for the profile University Quality Units is more significant.

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

Analysing the graph, it is evident, as in the previous period, a fairness for both profiles, taking into account the differences in assessment between different aspects that shows 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.
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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 compliance with the established legal deadlines (which is lower than in the previous period), the information provided by AVAP in relation to the application process and the instructions provided. The most positive aspects were the attention provided by AVAP and AVAP employees.

The results for each of the profiles are detailed below.
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TEACHER ACCREDITATION

The average value of responses obtained for this profile is 4.03, below that obtained for the period (20214.11), but still close to the average for the group (4.1). It is worth noting that two aspects rated poorly by this profile are those relating to compliance with delivery deadlines, the training provided by AVAP and the instructions provided by AVAP, the latter two negative aspects coinciding with those obtained in the period of 2021. With regard to the aspect of the functioning of the virtual platform, it is rated higher than in the previous period.

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

Positive comments

All good and very fast.
Regardless of my evaluation, which were both positive and APTAS, with respect to my accreditations. I was very pleasantly surprised by the treatment and attention I received. My most sincere congratulations.
Objective and honest evaluators who at least read the merits and if they make a mistake or forget to evaluate something with the ability to correct it.
My evaluation had to be revised in the last two calls for applications until, after two appeals, I was evaluated positively.
Excellent professionals.
Clear and precise rules that help in this complex process. I would like to highlight the telephone support, which is of vital importance when you have doubts. I wish ANECA could learn from you. Thank you very much and keep it up.
My experience has been very positive, the staff have responded to every query or need promptly and efficiently. Thank you very much.
The experience has been satisfactory.

The system is a bit pedestrian and unintuitive, but ultimately effective. The best thing was the staff who answered questions at all times and even contacted me directly by phone when I had a problem uploading the documents with the merits.
Thanks to Ana Anaya for her professionalism and efficiency.
Thank you very much for your efforts
Very good work by AVAP
It is appreciated that the evaluation criteria are objective, and the self-assessment process is very useful in comparison to the ANECA application.

Negative comments

I consider that the process is difficult because of the website itself, the computer requirements (outdated browsers) and it is opaque because the criteria for the evaluation of merits are not justified, although I expressly requested it. Telephone support was not possible either and the resolution of doubts by email took a long time.
The waiting times are long and do not take into account the promotions of teaching staff at Valencian universities.
Review the criteria correctly, as in Anaca I was approved for assistant doctor and avap was not.
The evaluation criteria are confusing.
Evaluation criteria are not clear

I have obtained accreditation by ANECA but not by AVAP with the same contributions with the only explanation that my name does not appear first in the articles I submit. The criteria (and evaluators) should be revised and updated, and the scoring process more transparent, please.

They must necessarily improve the platform, the whole process of including the information, attaching documentation and sending the final documentation is unnecessarily cumbersome and difficult. The usability of the current platform is lamentable.

The platform is unfriendly and unwieldy.

The method of user authentication was somewhat complex and unintuitive.

The assessment of merits is not made explicit and individualised, it is not justified and only a summary table is provided without further detail. The platform is in need of modernisation, has problems with several common web browsers and Java updates or plug ins installed.

They are currently presenting a slow, unclear and not very objective process, I filed a complaint because they had forgotten to evaluate two articles and instead of rectifying something that was simple, obvious and objectively clear, I was forced to file an appeal and in doing so it was dismissed without taking anything into account.

It should be more specific as to what the results are due to. The report provided to the user gives the total score for each section, but does not include sub-sections, so it is not possible to know exactly what you are being assessed and what you are not and with what score. It would be very useful to know this for future calls and less subjective.

It is shameful that no applications can be submitted next year. As much work as the accreditation of degrees is, the accreditation period for teaching staff should be opened up. But of course, we are all fantastic professionals. And if there were a list of valid publications it would be perfect.

Obsolete platform.

Agency well below the level of other regional agencies such as AQU.

There is a lack of explanation as to which category each article belongs to depending on its indexing and position. For example, it should be clearly stated whether a Latinindex is a Category and Scopus Q2 is a Category.

I lodged an appeal after obtaining the decision. And it was partially upheld. Since no revision was made in the research block, having more merits than in the application sent in 2018 and obtaining less score in the research block, 2021. I have not been able to be accredited to the figure requested.

Suggestions and other comments

The default language in a Valencian agency should be Valencian and, although it is possible to translate the website, the form is not and there are serious errors. The instructions for documenting merits are clear, but they could be unified with ANECA or leave more freedom so as not to waste time editing the same pdfs.

A more detailed report of the evaluations, especially if dismissed.

Improving the platform

Professional experience in the field should be more highly valued. Similarly, work in the field of development cooperation is valued positively in the case of medicine, but not for other accreditations such as human rights, violence against women or other fields.

Shorter resolution time

It would be ideal if the periods of the evaluation processes were more clearly defined in advance.

You could send more detailed feedback on your assessment. It is not clear why the grade is given, nor what is missing to get a PASS.

The evaluation criteria, i.e. the score they give to each merit, are not clear. Moreover, I “suspect” that they do not have the same criteria for one applicant as for another.

They should accept articles with a letter of acceptance from the journal or publisher, even if they have not yet been published.
Modernise the platform for submitting applications and make it compatible with current browsers.

Humbly, in my case it all worked fine. Perhaps, I would lower the rate.

Holding more than one assessment session per year.

Modernise the platform now. It’s a piece of shit and gives a lot of problems because it’s outdated.

To allow information on the same person to be transferred from one figure to another.

Improve the way merits are included and the management of documentation on the platform.

The web platform and access via certificate could be improved.

There is little relationship between one year’s evaluation and the next. It gives the impression that the parameters are not homogeneous. Thank you.

I found the application process a bit complicated.

Open the whole year as aneca

Improvements to the software application are urgently needed. A longer availability of the simulation application would be appreciated.

The minimum requirements for the different accreditations should be clearer (e.g. minimum amount of teaching required, minimum amount of research required, etc.). The cost for the evaluation is high, taking into account that the evaluation is only effective in Valencian territory and ANECA’s evaluation (valid at national level) is free of charge.

Send this assessment survey at the end of the data entry process and another one at the end of the whole accreditation process.

The platform for the inclusion of merits sometimes crashed, without saving the latest modifications.

I would try to avoid duplication of documentation in case the same applicant wants to apply for different accreditations.

Browser update for accessing and uploading the required documentation

The file size limit is sometimes too low and it is difficult to attach everything correctly.

The possibility of accessing a pdf with a practical example of how to enter the data in each of the sections. Initially, the information available to me was insufficient until I gradually got to know how it worked. The best thing was the speed in providing the resolutions. Thank you very much.

A very efficient agency. As an improvement, establish a joint financing system with the Valencian public universities for the payment of fees.

It would be good to know the assessment of the evaluation afterwards, in order to be able to know what areas have been scored or assessed, with a view to improving in subsequent evaluations (or in evaluations of other figures).

Give more constructive feedback to help applicants know what steps to take next. Facilitate the exact scoring of each of the merits, as they are assessed differently depending on who is assessing them.

It would be advisable to justify the reasons for scoring in more detail, as they give rise to subjectivity.

Generally speaking, it is more than adequate. As a suggestion I think it is important to allow a certificate of acceptance of a paper and not only its publication.

Improving access to the virtual platform

That there is a correspondence between the documentation requested and the platform.

Possiblement l’AVAP a nivell informàtic puga ser millorable, des de la perspectiva d’incidències informàtiques. Per a un millor servei. Thank you.

The evaluation process could be open without interruption and without costs for precarious teachers on very low salaries.

More details should be provided on the evaluation, as it is not possible to know how it has been carried out in detail, nor what is necessary to obtain a positive evaluation, in terms of inputs.
scientific. The context of the person being assessed is also not taken into account, leading to inefficiencies in the system, dissatisfaction and mistrust.
The application should be mac compatible and simpler.
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UNIVERSITY QUALITY UNITS

The average value of responses obtained for this profile is 4.11, which is 0.07 also lower than in 2021, but still close to the group average (4.1). It is worth noting that the aspects rated worst by this profile are those relating, once again and as last year, to the information provided by AVAP and compliance with legal deadlines, with both values being particularly low compared to the overall results for the Agency. The most positive aspect is the functioning of the virtual platform.

It is these particularly low ratings that are evident in the calculated satisfaction value referred to above.

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

---

Positive comments
They do not exist.

Negative comments
It is necessary to adapt the SIAVAL platform to the additional evidence requirements requested by the EWCs and to those established in the Agency’s protocol.

Suggestions and other comments
EWCs more educated.
Block III. Conclusions
SUMMARY OF STUDY FINDINGS

CONCLUSIONS ON DISTRIBUTION AND CUSTOMER PARTICIPATION

The distribution of recipients shows a similar percentage of users for both groups (43% applicants versus 58% evaluators). These similar numbers allow for a rough comparison of results for both groups, allowing for the identification of common aspects where the assessment is high or low.

With regard to the degree of participation in the survey, 58% of the initial respondents returned a response. This percentage has increased significantly with respect to the previous year, when 39% of the initial respondents returned a response, which is a very positive trend.

CONCLUSIONS ON CUSTOMER SATISFACTION RESULTS

GLOBAL RESULTS

The overall average general satisfaction scores (SAT) obtained correspond to 4.68 for the group of evaluators and 4.08 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 group of evaluators maintains the positive trend compared to 2021, while the group of applicants has a slightly lower score compared to the previous period (4.14).

The calculated satisfaction scores (Sc) are 4.68 for the group of evaluators and for 4.02 the group of applicants. With regard to these values, for the group of evaluators there is an increase compared to the previous period, but for the group of applicants the same pattern is repeated as for the SAT and there is again a slightly negative trend compared to the previous period (4.14).

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.

SATISFACTION RESULTS BY PROGRAMME (EVALUATORS/APPLICANTS)

The analysis of the average evaluation results by programme shows more positive results for the Evaluators group, with an average of over 4.7 compared to the average value 4.0 for the Applicants group. The trend is very similar to that of the previous year, and maintaining the degree of satisfaction is considered to be very positive.

Even so, the data is very positive as the average for both programmes is at a value of above 4.55, which conveys a very positive assessment for AVAP.
SATISFACTION RESULTS BY EVALUATOR GROUP PROFILE

The analysis of the average assessment results by programme shows the most positive results for the Accreditation Committee profile, with a value of 4.92 out of 5, while the worst assessment comes from Degree Monitoring Evaluators, with a value of 4.24 for this profile. For the rest of the profiles, R+D Evaluators, Sexennial Evaluators and Re-accreditation Evaluators, there is a fairness in the values, with values of around 4.24 for all of them.

The most significant difference with respect to the previous period is that the worst performers were the re-accredited evaluators.

It can be concluded that this group is highly satisfied with AVAP’s management and maintains the positive trend.

SATISFACTION RESULTS BY QUESTION FOR THE GROUP OF EVALUATORS

Overall experience in dealing with AVAP: The average rating for this question is 4.7, which is around the group average (4.7). The excellent evaluation by the Accreditation Commission profile is highlighted, reaching the maximum evaluation value.

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

Attention from AVAP employees: The average rating for this question is 4.8, which is above the group average (4.7). Once again, the Accreditation Commission profile once again values this aspect with the highest possible value and the rest of the profiles increase their evaluation compared to other questions. It can be deduced from this that the service provided by AVAP employees is an aspect that highly valued by this group.

Information provided by AVAP: The average rating for this question is 4.6, slightly below the group average (4.7) but improving its trend with respect to the previous year (4.5). The evaluation 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 4.6, which is around the group average (4.7). It is slightly lower than in the previous period.

Functioning of AVAP’s virtual platform: The average rating for this question is 4.6, which is around the group average (4.7).

Instructions provided by AVAP for the evaluation process: The average rating for this question is 4.7 equalling the group average (4.7) and remaining above the results obtained last year (4.5). The comments and suggestions made by users can be related to the previous aspect.
Attention by AVAP in the resolution of questions: The average rating for this question is above 5.0 the group average (4.7) and the values obtained for the previous year. A high level of satisfaction is perceived for this question by all profiles.

AVAP’s reputation: The average rating for this question is 5.0, which is above the group average (4.7) and above the values obtained for the previous year.

RESULTS OF THE COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS OF THE EVALUATION GROUP

The large number of positive comments towards the Agency is noteworthy. Among the negative comments, the following are noteworthy and should be taken into account:

- The delay in the financial remuneration of Evaluators.
- The low remuneration for Evaluators for each evaluation. Both are repeated from the previous period.

Suggestions include:

- Deadlines for evaluation should be longer, or dossiers should be made available earlier.
- Better completion of the dossier by applicants.
- Training for all members participating in a panel before their first participation, even if they have not assessed for years.

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

Overall experience in dealing with AVAP: The average rating for this question is 4.1, which is above the group average (4.0).

Communication and management by AVAP staff: The average rating for this question is above the group average (4.0)/4.1

Attention from AVAP employees: The average rating for this question is above the group average (4.0)/4.2
Information provided by AVAP: The average rating for this question is 3.9, slightly below the group average (4.0).

Functioning of AVAP's virtual platform: The average rating for this question is 4.0, within the group average (4.0), and considerably higher than the previous year (3.8), indicating an improvement in this aspect.

Attention by AVAP: The average rating for this question is 4.0, which is well above the group average (4.0) and has a positive trend compared to the previous period.

Instructions provided by AVAP for the evaluation process: The average rating for this question is 3.9, little below the group average (4.0).

Compliance with legal deadlines: The average score for this question is 3.8, well below the group average (4.0) and the most negative data of the survey, with the surprising drop in score compared to the previous period (4.3).

AVAP's reputation: The average rating for this question is 4.0, which is around the group average (4.0).

RESULTS OF COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FROM THE APPLICANTS' GROUP

The number of positive comments towards the Agency is remarkable.

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

- Improve the platform, the whole process of including the information, attaching documentation and sending it to the end is unnecessarily cumbersome and difficult.
- The malfunctioning of the MAC environment.

As in the case of the Evaluators, both are repeated from the previous period.

Suggestions include:

- The periods of the evaluation processes should be more clearly defined in advance.
- Extend 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.