*UBT College*

# QUALITY ASSURANCE MANUAL

Prishtina, 07.03.2024

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Quality Assurance Manual (QAM) of College UBT is a written document exhibiting the commitment of College UBT to quality, which includes the following:

1. A comprehensive set of policy framework of quality assurance for the purpose of guiding the processes of quality assurance at College UBT;
2. A full narrative description of conditions, instruments and procedures in place at College UBT for the implementation and interaction of various respective quality assurance processes at College UBT.

## 1. PURPOSE OF QUALITY ASSURANCE MANUAL

The sole purpose of Quality Assurance Manual is the following:

1. To provide a document, which describes the quality assurance system and quality assurance processes at College UBT, including the statements identifying the commitment of College UBT to uphold and apply the highest international and European academic standards;
2. To provide a full description of quality assurance processes and specific activities that are aimed at implementing the quality assurance processes at UBT, including the tools that are used to carry out the respective processes and activities within those processes;
3. To foresee the procedures for quality assurance planning and improvement in teaching, learning, academic programs, research, and quality management and audit;
4. To provide a description of all control mechanisms used to carry out separate components of Quality Assurance System at College UBT;
5. To secure a working document, which contains adequate control mechanisms that enable the retention of functionality of Quality Assurance System;
6. To outline the fundamental characteristics of College UBT's strategic approach to quality management system;
7. To provide a description of quality assurance framework and outline the standards that guide academic processes, activities, and services at College UBT;

8. To ensure mechanisms of commitment of senior management of College UBT to the establishment and maintenance of effective quality management system;

## 2. QUALITY ASSURANCE AT COLLEGE UBT

### 2.1. INTRODUCTION

In a today's global economy characterized by highly competitive dynamics, the quality assurance in higher education institutions has become an imperative both at a national Kosovo level but also international level.

The Quality Assurance is not a novice concept in Kosovo, it is becoming a norm every day in both public universities and private bearers of higher education. The quality assurance concept is an unquestionable issue, which guides the quality in universities and colleges and directly impacts on the balance of power dynamics among universities and colleges at both national and international level.

The quality assurance system outlines all activities and processes which are aimed at providing qualitative and effective services to students in all aspects such as teaching, learning, research, community service, and international cooperation.

The Quality Assurance concept determines the procedures of quality assurance system widely adopted by higher education institutions, national education system in Kosovo and other international accreditation agencies and mechanisms, which collectively aim to enhance and maintain the quality at higher education institutions.

Quality assurance is successful only if it becomes the widely accepted norm in the society and higher education institutions and it becomes inherent in the quality culture of the institution, which must be nurtured at all times in the institution.

### 2.2. QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMISSION

The Quality Assurance Commission at College UBT is a part of organizational structure of College UBT aiming to handle and implement internal quality assurance processes and activities of UBT.

The Quality Assurance Commission of College UBT is composed of the following members:

1. Head of Quality Assurance Commission, Member of academic staff;
2. Member of Quality Assurance Commission, Member of academic staff;
3. Member of Quality Assurance Commission, Member of academic staff;
4. Member of Quality Assurance Commission, Member of industrial board;
5. Member of Quality Assurance Commission, Director of Quality Office;
6. Member of Quality Assurance Commission, Student representative;
7. Member of Quality Assurance Commission, Student representative;
8. Member of Quality Assurance Commission, Member of Alumni Council;

The duties and responsibilities of the members of Quality Assurance Commission are as follows:

a. To outline the criteria of internal quality audit that ensures the enhancement of quality assurance processes;
b. To approve the annual quality reviews at program, department, faculty, and institutional level conducted by Quality Assurance Office and develop and approve quality improvement plans and annual development plans based on quality reviews;
c. To outline and review internal quality assurance benchmarks based on benchmarks of national and international accreditation (Kosovo Accreditation Agency and international accreditation agencies);
d. To disseminate and nurture the quality culture among all academic and non-academic spheres of the College;
e. To support self-criticism in self-assessment of achievement learning outcomes carried out at course, program, departmental, and institutional level.

## 2.3. QUALITY MANAGEMENT OFFICE

Duties and Responsibilities of the Quality Management Office are as follows:

- Ensure quality standards are upheld across all faculties and departments.
- Work closely with Faculty Quality Coordinators to implement quality assurance processes tailored to specific faculties.
- Coordinate and implement policies adopted by the Quality Assurance Committee.
- Ensure alignment of quality assurance policies with institutional and strategic goals.
- Collect, analyze, and disseminate data on key quality indicators, such as academic performance, research outputs, and stakeholder feedback.

- Facilitate systematic data collection through surveys, focus groups, and self-evaluation reports.
- Act as a liaison between the institution and stakeholders, including students, staff, alumni, and industry partners.
- Ensure stakeholder feedback is integrated into quality improvement processes.
- Develop and publish Annual Internal Self-Evaluation Reports and Thematic Self-Evaluation Reports.
- Prepare institutional reports for external evaluations and accreditations.
- Monitor and evaluate the implementation of Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs) at the institutional level.
- Conduct regular audits and quality checks to ensure compliance with national and international standards.
- Organize training workshops and quality assurance awareness sessions for faculty, staff, and students.

Duties and Responsibilities of Faculty Quality Coordinators are as follows:

- Implement quality assurance processes at the faculty level, ensuring consistency with institutional objectives.
- Coordinate the preparation of the Annual Faculty Internal Self-Evaluation Report.
- Collect feedback from students, staff, and stakeholders to identify areas for improvement.
- Engage with students, alumni, and industry representatives to ensure their input informs faculty-specific quality assurance measures.
- Facilitate focus groups and distribute surveys for quality evaluation.
- Collect and analyze data related to student performance, academic success, and program delivery.
- Maintain records of stakeholder feedback and integrate findings into self-evaluation reports.
- Produce Annual Faculty Self Evaluation Reports and any thematic review;
- Monitor the implementation of Quality Improvement Plans within their faculty.
- Collaborate with the Quality Management Office to produce monitoring and improvement reports.
- Disseminate quality assurance findings and action plans to faculty members and stakeholders.

## 2.4. QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

The Quality Assurance System at College UBT is designed to achieve the quality objectives of College UBT and offer a roadmap on what constitutes a good quality educational service.

The Quality Assurance System handles the four pillars:

- Quality Management;

- Quality Review;
- Quality Improvement;
- Quality Monitoring

The features of Quality Assurance System at College UBT are:

- Internal Quality Assurance;
- External Quality Assurance;
- Quality Assurance and National and International Accreditation

## 3. INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

The Internal Quality Assurance System at College UBT is the responsibility of the institution itself, including all academic staff, students, non-academic staff, and other stakeholders involved in providing and assuring the internal quality.

The purposes of internal quality assurance system are:

- Internal Purpose, which aims to improve and further develop all educational processes as well as hold accountable all related stakeholders in ensuring effective achievement of the College mission and its strategic objectives.
- External Purpose, which follows-up on national and international quality assurance standards and national and international accreditation processes and procedures;

### 3.1. QUALITY MANAGEMENT

The Internal Quality Assurance System at College UBT must have all the tools to perform the effective monitoring, evaluation, and quality improvement based on the elements of planning, doing, checking, and acting upon it.

The Internal Quality Management system is responsible for the following:

- Maintaining and enhancing the standards of teaching, learning, research, and contribution to the society and private sector;
- Evaluating the quality assurance instruments, which aim at improving the quality services at the institutional, faculty, department, and program level;
- Managing quality reviews and internal audit processes, which are carried out on all levels and are part of total quality management concept

## 3.2. QUALITY REVIEW

The Internal Quality Review is made based on the following evaluations as set forth by the Regulation on Internal Self-Evaluation and External Self-Evaluation of College UBT:

- Program and Faculty quality reviews based the internal standards laid out in this Quality Assurance Manual which are carried out annually for programs that are running longer than six years and every two years for the programs that are running less than six years. Faculty review is done annually and includes all the programs in the Faculty
- Comprehensive Internal Institutional Quality Review based on the internal standards for institutional review as laid out in this Quality Assurance Manual, which is carried out every three years;
- Program and Faculty Quality Review is carried out by the Quality Office of the respective Faculty;
- Comprehensive Institutional Review is carried out by the Quality Management Office of the UBT College;
- Thematic quality analysis in teaching and learning, research, and administration carried out every three years at Faculty level and institutional level.
- The Faculty thematic quality analysis is carried out by Faculty Quality Office.
- The Institutional thematic quality analysis is carried out by UBT's Quality Office.

## 3.3. QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Upon the approval of Internal Quality Report prepared at Faculty or institutional level by the Faculty Quality Sub-Committee or central Quality Committee, the quality improvement strategy is drafted and approved by the respective Faculty Quality Assurance Sub-Committee or Quality Assurance Committee, in which strategic objectives are set based on the standards set forth by the Quality Assurance Manual.

The Quality Improvement Strategy contains specific strategic goals and sub-goals based on the findings for improvement in the Internal Quality Review Report. The strategic goals are grouped together based on the internal standards set forth by the present Quality Assurance Manual.

Upon approval of Quality Improvement Strategy, the action plan for implementation of Quality Improvement Strategy is drafted and approved, which contains strategic objectives for

improvement of quality, activities performed for their fulfilment, timeframe, responsible actors, and performance metrics to measure the fulfilment of quality improvement strategic goals.

### 3.4. MONITORING

Quality Office at Faculty level independently monitors the implementation of Faculty Quality Improvement Strategy and prepares an annual monitoring report on the implementation of the strategy.

Quality Management Office at UBT level independently monitors the Institutional Internal Quality Improvement Strategy and prepares the monitoring report on the implementation of the strategy every two years.

## 4. UBT College Internal Quality Assurance Review Standards For Program and Faculty Evaluation

### Chapter 1: Mission, Objectives, and Administration of the Faculty

**Standard 1.1:** The study program aligns with the higher education institution's mission, strategic goals, and societal needs and they are made publicly available.

**Matrix for Self-Evaluation:**

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Program's content and structure alignment with the institution's mission and goals | | |
| Study program's recognition of HEI's specifics | | |
| Intended learning outcomes alignment with the institution's mission and goals | | |
| Delivery of study program supported by a needs analysis | | |
| Justification of student enrollment numbers in the study program | | |
| Facilities and equipment adequacy for student enrollment | | |

### 1.2 Academic Integrity and Freedom

**Standard 1.2:** The study program adheres to policies and procedures on academic integrity and freedom that prevent all forms of unethical behavior. These policies are publicly available, and all stakeholders are informed.

**Matrix for Self-Evaluation:**

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Presence of written procedures addressing unethical behaviors | | |
| Implementation evidence of anti-plagiarism procedures | | |
| Ethical standards awareness among students and staff | | |
| Efficiency of mechanisms monitoring potential unethical behaviors | | |

### 1.3 Information management

**Standard 1.3:** Relevant information is collected, analyzed, and utilized to ensure effective management of the study program and other activities. This information is publicly available.

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Adequacy of the information management system | | |
| Ethical and government policy considerations for data protection | | |
| Involvement of students and staff in information provision and analysis | | |

### 1.4 Administrative Support

**Standard 1.4:** The study program is bolstered by appropriate and sufficient administrative support to achieve its goals in teaching, learning, research, and community service.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Adequacy of policy and review process for study program activities | | |
| Sufficiency of administration for teaching and learning needs | | |
| Presence of a professional development plan for administrative staff | | |
| Structural involvement of administrative staff in professional development | | |

### 1.5 Implementation of Quality Improvement Recommendations

**Standard 1.5:** Recommendations from previous internal and external quality assurance procedures are actively implemented for the study program's quality enhancement.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Analysis and action based on previous QA recommendations | | |

## Chapter 2: Quality Management

### 2.1 Internal Quality Assurance System

**Standard 2.1.:** The delivery of the study program is governed by a robust internal quality assurance system, involving all pertinent stakeholders.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Conformance of internal QA system with national, ESG, and international standards | | |
| Availability of a public quality assurance policy covering all program delivery aspects | | |
| Presence and definition of internal QA procedures for the study program | | |
| Support from institution's/academic unit's quality assurance coordinators | | |
| Continuous improvement cycle (PDCA) formation by QA policies and processes | | |

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Adequacy of monitoring plan for QA procedures and inclusive stakeholder participation in revisions | | |

### 2.2 Design and Approval Process

**Standard 2.2:** The study program adheres to a design and approval process established by the HEI.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Alignment of study program development with institution's mission and goals | | |
| Transparency and adequacy of internal QA process and approval from strategic management bodies | | |
| Definition and inclusiveness of development and approval process | | |
| Regular monitoring of key performance indicators for program delivery quality | | |
| Inclusion of all stakeholders during approval process (staff, students, alumni, industry, civil society) | | |

### 2.3 Periodic Monitoring and Review

**Standard 2.3.:** Regular monitoring and reviews are conducted for the study program to ensure objectives are met, with stakeholder participation.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Regular monitoring for societal needs alignment of the program | | |
| Checks on workload (ECTS) allocation and learning outcomes achievability | | |
| Involvement of stakeholders in monitoring processes, including feedback mechanisms | | |
| Regular stakeholder questionnaires and integration of feedback into improvement processes | | |
| Defined processes for monitoring and improvement of student practices, if applicable | | |
| Analysis of collected information and action-taking for program currency | | |
| Communication and publication of monitoring results and action plans | | |

### 2.4 Information Transparency

**Standard 2.4:** All vital information about the study program is transparent, accurate, updated, and publicly available.

**Matrix for Self-Evaluation:**

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Public availability of all policies, regulations, and guidelines related to the program | | |
| Publication of admission criteria, recognition, syllabuses, learning outcomes, credits, assessment methods, and final qualification | | |
| Public availability and objective presentation of pass rate, dropout rate, and graduate employment | | |
| Accuracy, reliability, and regular updating of publicly available information on the program | | |

## Chapter 3: Academic Staff

### 3.1 Recruitment of Teaching Staff

**Standard 3.1:** The teaching staff recruitment for the study program adheres to national legislation and internal regulations, ensuring an objective and transparent procedure.

**Matrix for Self-Evaluation:**

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| National and international advertisement of vacancies | | |
| Clarity and transparency of staff recruitment and employment conditions | | |
| Adequacy of procedures for optimal candidate selection | | |
| Provision of complete job descriptions and employment conditions to candidates | | |

### 3.2 Adequacy and Qualification of Academic Staff

**Standard 3.2:** The study program is delivered by adequately qualified academic staff ensuring effective knowledge transfer.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Adequacy of staff number and qualifications for program delivery | | |
| Limitations on academic staff covering multiple teaching positions | | |
| Appropriate student-teacher ratio and academic staff workload | | |
| Relevance of academic staff qualifications to courses taught | | |
| Efficiency of mentorship and guidance provided to students | | |

### 3.3 Advancement and Reappointment of Staff

**Standard 3.3.:** The study program's academic staff undergoes advancement and reappointment based on transparent and objective procedures, reflecting excellence.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Transparency and objectivity of teacher advancement procedures | | |
| Basis of staff promotion on excellence and significant achievements | | |
| Consideration of feedback in staff advancement and contract renewals | | |

### 3.4 Professional Development Support

**Standard 3.4:** Academic staff involved in the study program is entitled to institutional support for their professional growth.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Presence of an annual plan for staff professional development | | |
| Evidence of staff participation in professional development programs | | |
| Institutional support for skills development related to assessment methods | | |
| Encouragement and support for staff's international mobility and collaborations | | |
| Organization of training on teaching preparation and delivery methods | | |
| Onboarding and training provisions for newly employed staff | | |
| Support mechanisms for staff research programs | | |

### 3.5 **Involvement of External Associates**

**Standard 3.5:** External associates involved in the study program possess suitable qualifications and work experience, ensuring the program's intended learning outcomes.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Integration of latest research and market trends by external associates | | |
| Provision of specific training for external associates | | |
| Encouragement of external associates in supervising final theses | | |
| Clarity in workload and quality expectations from external associates | | |

## Chapter 4: Educational Process Content Delivery

### 4.1 Formulation of Learning Outcomes

**Standard 4.1**: The study program's intended learning outcomes are meticulously formulated, ensuring alignment with the institution's mission and strategic goals.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Alignment of learning outcomes with institutional mission and goals | | |
| Compatibility of intended learning outcomes with program goals | | |
| Student-centric formulation of intended learning outcomes | | |
| Adoption of best practices in defining intended learning outcomes | | |
| Classification of outcomes as knowledge, skills, and competences | | |

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Comparison of learning outcomes with similar EHEA programs | | |

### 4.2 Compliance with National and European Frameworks

**Standard 4.2:** The program's intended learning outcomes are consistent with the National Qualification Framework and European Qualifications Framework level descriptors.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Alignment with National and European Frameworks | | |
| Distinction of undergraduate and graduate level outcomes | | |
| Absence of overlapping outcomes across different programs | | |

### 4.3 Curriculum Content and Structure

**Standard 4.3**: The study program's curriculum content and structure are coherent, facilitating smooth student progression and achievement of intended outcomes.

**Matrix for Self-Evaluation:**

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Logical flow of courses within the curriculum | | |
| Rules defining the order of student progression | | |
| Coverage of core disciplines for competency development | | |
| Comparability with similar foreign study programs | | |

### 4.4 Compliance with Regulated Professions

**Standard 4.4**: If applicable, the study program meets the requirements of EU Directives and adheres to guidelines set by national and international professional associations.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Compatibility with EU Directives | | |
| Integration of professional association recommendations | | |

### 4.5 Student Practice Period Outcomes

**Standard 4.5:** If applicable, the outcomes of the student practice period are clearly defined, with effective processes ensuring students understand the intended outcomes and associated learning strategies.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Presence of a comprehensive regulation for student practice | | |
| Mentorship provision for students during practice | | |
| Allocation of ECTS credits to practical work | | |
| Collaboration with external entities for student practice | | |

### 4.6 Delivery through Student-Centered Teaching

**Standard 4.6**: The study program adopts a student-centered teaching approach, promoting active engagement and effective learning.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Presence of a didactic concept supporting learning outcomes | | |
| Use of varied pedagogical methods aligned with outcomes | | |
| Implementation of interactive and research-based learning methods | | |
| Continuous evaluation and adaptation of teaching methods | | |
| Tailoring of teaching methods for diverse student populations | | |
| Integration of modern technology in program delivery | | |

### 4.7 Assessment and Evaluation

**Standard 4.7:** Assessments within the study program are objective and consistent, ensuring the achievement of intended learning outcomes.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Clear mapping of learning outcomes to program components | | |
| Systematic assessment of all relevant areas of knowledge, skills, and competences | | |

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Publication and dissemination of assessment and grading criteria | | |
| Ensuring objective and reliable grading | | |
| Timely feedback provision to students post-evaluation | | |
| Presence of an efficient student appeals procedure | | |
| Achievement of course learning outcomes | | |
| Clear assessment rubrics linked to each learning outcome | | |

### 4.8 Evaluation in terms of ECTS

**Standard 4.8:** Learning outcomes are assessed based on student workload and are expressed in ECTS.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Translation of assessment criteria into learning outcomes | | |
| Workload calculation and ECTS assignment for all learning activities | | |

## Chapter 5: Students

### 5.1 Admission Policies

**Standard 5.1:** The study program's admission policies, including requirements, criteria, and processes, are transparent, comprehensive, and publicly available.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Clarity and comprehensiveness of admission requirements | | |
| Adherence to national prerequisites for various levels | | |
| Fair and consistent application of admission criteria | | |
| Established procedures for recognition of study periods | | |

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Feedback from student surveys on the admission process | | |

### 5.2 Monitoring Student Progression

**Standard 5.2:** The study program consistently collects and analyzes data on student progression, ensuring measures are in place to facilitate completion.

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Effectiveness of the student progress monitoring system | | |
| Regular analysis of student progression and completion rates | | |
| Dissemination of monitoring results to staff and students | | |
| Defined progression possibilities and student awareness | | |
| Feedback from student surveys on progression support | | |

### 5.3 Support for National and International Students

**Standard 5.3:** The study program provides adequate conditions and assistance for both outgoing and incoming students, whether national or international.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Information dissemination about international mobility programs | | |
| Support and encouragement for student involvement in mobility programs | | |
| Adequacy of ECTS credit recognition regulations | | |
| Availability of foreign language information on admissions | | |
| Active attraction and support mechanisms for foreign students | | |
| Feedback from student surveys on international exchange experiences | | |

### 5.4 Resource Provision for Diverse Student Support

**Standard 5.4:** The study program provides adequate resources for student support, considering the diverse needs of various student populations.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Sufficiency and qualification of staff for student support | | |
| Transparency and availability of student services information | | |
| Availability of guidance on study and career opportunities | | |
| Clarity of structures and procedures for appeals and complaints | | |
| Provision and promotion of extracurricular activities | | |
| Feedback from student surveys on support services and resources | | |

## Chapter 6: Research

### 6.1 Alignment with Institution's Mission and Research Goals

**Standard 6.1:** The delivery of the study program is in congruence with the institution's/academic unit's mission and its research strategic objectives.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Presence of clear research objectives that mirror the institution's research strategy | | |
| Adequate provision of financial, logistic, and human resources for research objectives | | |
| Clarity and adherence to policies defining recognized research standards | | |

### 6.2 High-Quality Research Commitment by Academic Staff

Standard 6.2: Academic staff involved in the study program is motivated and facilitated to undertake high-quality research or professional activities.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Validation of staff research through diverse outputs (publications, projects, etc.) | | |
| Frequency and quality of staff publications in renowned venues | | |

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Relevant qualifications and professional experience of staff in professional bachelor study programs | | |

### 6.3 Collaboration and Partnership in Research

**Standard 6.3:** Academic staff associated with the study program is encouraged and supported to collaborate with both national and international partners in their research endeavors.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Engagement of staff in community-related research and development services | | |
| Establishment and maintenance of collaborative research ties with other HEIs | | |
| Involvement and support for collaborations with local business partners | | |
| Active participation in technology transfer and knowledge sharing with industry and the public sector | | |

### 6.4 Integration of Research into Teaching

**Standard 6.4:** Academic staff involved in the study program integrates their research outcomes into their teaching methodologies and topics.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Incorporation of research results into teaching by the academic staff | | |

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Active engagement of students in research activities alongside the academic staff | | |

## Chapter 7: Infrastructure and Resources

### 7.1 Adequate Premises and Equipment

**Standard 7.1:** The higher education institution provides suitable infrastructure, including premises and equipment, to facilitate educational and research activities.

**Matrix for Self-Evaluation:**

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Adequacy of premises and equipment for educational and research activities | | |
| Equipped laboratories with IT technologies for necessary curriculum activities | | |
| Access to necessary software with valid licenses | | |
| Functionality of infrastructure for enrolled student capacity | | |
| Facilities adapted for students with special needs | | |

### 7.2 Library Resources

**Standard 7.2:** The higher education institution ensures that library resources are ample and suitable for the study program.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Availability of reading rooms, group work rooms, and relevant book stock | | |
| Extended operating hours for library services | | |
| Adequate seating in reading and group work rooms based on student population | | |
| Stock of recent and relevant books and electronic resources | | |
| Subscriptions to local and international publications and periodicals | | |

### 7.3 Funding for Educational Activities and Research

**Standard 7.3:** The study program receives adequate funding to support its intended educational and research objectives.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Existence of a sustainable financial plan for the study program | | |
| Acquisition of additional funding through projects, partnerships, and community collaboration | | |
| Utilization of extra financial resources for program enhancement | | |

**UBT College Internal Quality Assurance Manual For Comprehensive Internal Institutional Evaluation**

## 1. Institutional Mission, Vision, and Objectives

Standard 1.1: The institution's mission statement is well-defined, encompassing teaching, research, and community engagement, and is available to all stakeholders.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Clarity and comprehensiveness of the mission statement | | |
| Alignment with national and European higher education standards | | |
| Stakeholder engagement in mission formulation | | |
| Regular review mechanism for mission statement | | |

**Standard 1.2:** The institutional mission is actively embodied in strategic planning, decision-making, and long-term goals.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Integration of mission in strategic planning | | |
| Alignment of institutional objectives with the mission | | |
| Influence of mission in operational planning | | |
| Reflection of mission in curriculum and quality assurance | | |

## 2.Strategic Planning, Governance, and Administration

**Standard 2.1:** College UBT adheres to Comprehensive Strategic Planning

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Elaboration and regular update of the strategic plan | | |
| Comprehensiveness of the strategic plan (goals, finances, etc.) | | |
| Distribution of action plan to all management levels | | |
| Linkage of strategic plan to information management system | | |
| Monitoring of key performance indicators | | |

## Standard 2.2: The institution aligns the budget and financial resources in support of Strategic Planning

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Effective reporting and management system in place | | |
| Implementation of risk assessment in planning strategies | | |

## **Standard 2.3:** College UBT has an efficient Organizational Structure and Stakeholder Involvement

**Matrix for Self-Evaluation:**

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Transparency of procedures for election processes | | |
| Public availability of internal policies regulating work scope | | |
| Distinct roles of owners from academic decision-making | | |
| Inclusion of staff and students in decision-making bodies | | |
| Encouragement of active student membership in committees | | |
| Fair and transparent process for electing student representatives | | |

## Standard 2.4: College UBT has an effective central administration

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Specialization and clarity of administration responsibilities | | |
| Use of digital platforms for efficient communication | | |
| Opportunities for administrative staff competency enhancement | | |
| Performance evaluation of administrative staff | | |

## 3. Financial Planning and Financial Management

### Standard 3.1: College UBT has a strong financial Sustainability and resources

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Reliability of financial provisions and diversity of financing sources | | |
| Realism of annual and five-year budget plans | | |
| Financial sustainability and efficiency across operations | | |
| Transparency of funding sources and related conditions | | |

### Standard 3.2: College UBT has an adequate funding for educational activities

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Financial sustainability of study programs for at least five years | | |
| Acquisition of additional funding for study programs | | |
| Investment of extra financial resources in study program development | | |
| Allocation of financial resources for enhancing teaching and learning resources | | |

### Standard 3.3: College UBT has an adequate research budget and support

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Verification of funds allocated for research purposes | | |
| Policies to improve quality of education and research through investments in facilities and training | | |

Standard 3.4: College UBT has an adequate budgeting and accounting oversight

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Implementation of internal auditing protocols | | |
| Monitoring of expenditures and commitments against budgets | | |

**4. Academic Integrity, Responsibility, and Public Accountability**

Standard 4.1: College UBT has adequate policies and mechanisms for Ethical Behavior

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Promotion and prioritization of academic integrity and freedom | | |
| Presence and effectiveness of an Ethics and Academic Integrity Policy | | |
| Support and assessment structures for ethical standards (e.g., Ethics Committee) | | |
| Mechanisms for preventing and addressing intolerance, discrimination, and conflict resolution | | |
| Implementation and effectiveness of plagiarism detection software | | |
| Clear procedures for intellectual property rights concerning the commercialization of academic staff and student ideas | | |

**Standard 4.2:** College UBT has strong transparency in institutional activities

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Transparency in communication about academic staff, research, and teaching activities | | |
| Comprehensive information on program offerings, student enrollment, services, research projects, fees, etc. | | |
| Public accessibility of students' final theses | | |
| Communication to stakeholders about outcomes of previous evaluations | | |

## 5. Quality Management

Standard 5.1: College UBT maintains a structured Quality Assurance System

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Presence of a publicly available quality assurance policy | | |
| Efficiency of monitoring, evaluation, and enhancement of the quality assurance system | | |
| Comprehensive coverage of institutional activities by the quality assurance system | | |
| Establishment and clarity of roles for the Quality Committee and Quality Management Office | | |
| Resource allocation for the quality assurance system | | |
| Use of results from external reviews for institutional improvement | | |

Standard 5.2: College UBT has established effective Quality Policies and Procedures

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Mechanisms for data collection and analysis | | |
| Effectiveness of data collection related to student profile, progression, satisfaction, etc. | | |
| Accessibility and use of statistical data by departments and units | | |
| Involvement of all academic and administrative units in quality assurance procedures | | |
| Active student participation in quality assurance processes | | |

Standard 5.3: College UBT has established a Formal Process for Program Design and Approval

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Internal quality assurance of study programs | | |
| Defined procedures for program development and approval | | |
| Defined procedures for monitoring the quality of program delivery | | |

### Standard 5.4: College UBT conducts Periodic Monitoring and Review of Study Programs

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Defined procedures for program monitoring and improvement | | |
| Evaluation of ECTS allocation, learning outcomes, and workload estimates | | |
| Stakeholder involvement in program monitoring | | |
| Defined procedures for monitoring and improving the quality of student internships | | |
| Regular collection and analysis of program information | | |
| Communication of monitoring results and action plans to stakeholders | | |
| Updated study programs are published on the HEI website | | |

## 6. Teaching and Learning

### Standard 6.1: College UBT has established Policies and Procedures Monitoring System

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Establishment of KPIs for every study program and their annual evaluation | | |
| Effective monitoring of study programs by internal structures | | |
| Presence of effective and innovative pedagogical technologies | | |

### Standard 6.2: College UBT has formulated Clear and Aligned Learning Outcomes

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Alignment of study program's intended learning outcomes with the HEI's mission and strategic goals | | |
| Learning outcomes written from a student perspective | | |
| Use of good practices in defining intended learning outcomes | | |
| Distinction of competencies into skills, knowledge, and values | | |
| Comparability of learning outcomes with similar programs in the EHEA | | |

## Standard 6.3: College UBT achieves effective Correlation of Outcomes, Methodology, and Assessment

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Comprehensive documentation for study programs | | |
| Collaborative approach for interdisciplinary study programs | | |
| Flexibility in the structure of study programs | | |
| Regular updating of study program content with latest research | | |

## Standard 6.4: College UBT has established an appropriate ECTS Allocation

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| ECTS allocation in line with "ECTS Users' Guide" guidelines | | |
| Allocation of ECTS credits based on actual student workload | | |

## Standard 6.5: College UBT has achieved effective compliance with National and European Frameworks

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Alignment of learning outcomes with National Qualification Framework and European Qualifications Framework descriptors | | |
| Distinction of undergraduate and graduate level learning outcomes | | |
| Alignment of learning outcomes with level and profile of qualifications | | |

## Standard 6.6: College UBT has achieved the Alignment with National and EU Directives

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Compatibility of study programs with EU Directives | | |
| Consideration of recommendations from professional associations | | |

## Standard 6.7: College UBT implements Student-Cantered Teaching and Learning

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Encouragement of diverse pedagogical methods | | |
| Use of teaching methods promoting interactive and research-based learning | | |
| Continual evaluation and adaptation of teaching methods | | |
| Adaptation of teaching methods for diverse student populations | | |
| Modern technology usage in executing study programs | | |

## Standard 6.8: College UBT has established an Objective Evaluation and Assessment

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Publication of assessment criteria and methods in advance | | |
| Support provided to academic staff for assessment methods | | |
| Ensured objectivity and reliability of grading | | |
| Provision of feedback to students on evaluation results | | |

## Standard 6.9: College UBT has established an effective Student Appeals Procedure

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Timely information and consistent implementation of the student appeals procedure | | |

## 6. Research

### Standard 7.1: College UBT has adopted an Integrated Research Strategy

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Alignment of the research strategy with the HEI's mission and vision | | |
| Integration of academic, research staff, and students in the research strategy | | |
| Adequacy of researchers in terms of number and profile for the strategic research agenda | | |
| Establishment and effectiveness of research and development units | | |
| Regular publication of institutional research performance reports | | |

### Standard 7.2: College UBT exhibits Commitment to High-Quality Research

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Presence of an internal policy regulating the research work and activities of academic staff | | |
| Recognition of academic staff's contributions to scientific and applied research | | |
| Consistency of academic staff publications in high-quality scientific or professional publications | | |
| Active promotion of research achievements at national and international conferences | | |
| Encouragement and support for applied research projects | | |

### Standard 7.3: College UBT implements Research Relevance in Teaching Activity

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Inclusion of research results and scholarly activities in teaching | | |
| Mechanisms for recognizing and rewarding academic staff excellence based on research productivity | | |
| Engagement of students in research activities with academic staff | | |
| Support mechanisms for junior teaching staff in developing research programs | | |

## 8. Staff, Employment, Promotion Process, and Professional Development

### Standard 8.1: College UBT has established an effective Teacher Recruitment

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Effective advertisement of vacancies both nationally and internationally | | |
| Clarity, objectivity, and transparency in the staff recruitment process | | |
| Adequacy of methods for selecting the best candidates | | |
| Provision of complete job descriptions and conditions to candidates | | |
| Accessibility of policies and regulations for both teaching and administrative staff | | |

### Standard 8.2: College UBT maintains at all times a Qualified Academic Staff

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Adequacy of qualified academics for study programs and scientific activities | | |
| Compliance with standards for academic workload and teaching positions | | |
| Ratio of full-time academic staff in the HEI | | |
| Alignment of academics' workload with relevant regulations | | |
| Adequacy of qualified academic staff for mentoring the final thesis | | |

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Appropriate qualifications of staff for professional bachelor study programs | | |

## Standard 8.3: College UBT has established a system of Promotion and Re-Appointment of Teaching Staff

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Presence of a long-term operational plan for developing academic staff | | |
| Transparency and objectivity in teacher promotion procedures | | |
| Basis of staff promotion on excellence and significant achievements | | |
| Timeliness of the promotion process | | |
| Implementation of a comprehensive staff performance evaluation system | | |

## Standard 8.4: College UBT has established an effective Professional Development of Academic Staff

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Presence and adequacy of a plan for the professional development of academic staff | | |
| Participation of academic staff in professional development programs | | |
| Participation of academic staff in international mobility programs and other relevant initiatives | | |
| Training of academic staff on methods of preparation and delivery of teaching | | |
| Adequate training for newly employed teachers | | |
| Effective onboarding procedure for new staff members | | |

### Standard 8.5: College UBT has established a system of Qualifications advised by External Associates

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Inclusion of latest research, trends, and know-how from the labor market by external associates | | |
| Training of external associates on methods of preparation and delivery of teaching | | |
| Encouragement of external associates' participation in thesis supervision | | |

## 9. Student Administration and Support Services

### Standard 9.1: College UBT has established and maintains an effective Admission Policy

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Clarity and comprehensiveness of admission requirements and process | | |
| Transparency of admission requirements for international students | | |
| Provision of thorough information about the institution to prospective students | | |
| Ensuring student qualifications align with MESTI requirements | | |
| Fairness and consistency in admission processes | | |
| Procedures for recognizing periods of study | | |
| Adequacy of procedures for recognition of study periods | | |

### Standard 9.2: College UBT effectively monitors Student Progression

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Presence of a system for monitoring students' progress and providing assistance | | |
| Availability and accessibility of teaching staff for students | | |
| Monitoring of student progression and completion rates | | |

### Standard 9.3: College UBT has established Support for Outgoing and Incoming Students

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Support for students in international exchange mobility programs | | |
| Regular provision of information about international exchange mobility programs | | |
| Clarity in ECTS credit recognition and student awareness | | |
| Publication of application procedures and study program admission in foreign languages | | |
| Support and provision of resources for foreign students | | |
| Provision of foreign language courses for international students | | |
| Collection and analysis of feedback from national and international students | | |
| Information on student participation in international mobility (both outcoming and incoming) | | |

### Standard 9.4: College UBT has established Adequate Resources for Student Support

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Adequate number and qualifications of staff providing student support | | |
| Accessibility and comprehensiveness of student information and resources | | |
| Support and guidance for students with special needs | | |
| Availability and effectiveness of guidance on study and career opportunities | | |
| Clarity and accessibility of student complaint procedures | | |
| Offering of scholarships and financial assistance to students | | |
| Support and resources for student extracurricular activities | | |
| Oversight and development of student support services | | |

## 10 Facilities and Learning Resources

### Standard 10.1: College UBT has sufficient and adequate Premises and Equipment for Education and Research

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Adequacy of premises and equipment for educational activities and research | | |
| Validity of documents on premises and equipment for at least five years | | |
| Adequacy of equipment in laboratories and IT technologies for compulsory courses | | |
| Availability and validity of software licenses for study programs | | |
| Appropriate infrastructure for the delivery of study programs and achievement of learning outcomes | | |
| Adjustments to premises and equipment for students with special needs | | |
| Sufficient office space for academic staff | | |
| Facilities for extracurricular activities (cultural, sporting, etc.) for students | | |
| Availability of adequate food service facilities for staff and students | | |
| Senior staff responsibility for infrastructure and resources oversight and development | | |

Standard 10.2: College UBT has adequate Library Resources

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Equipped library with reading rooms, group work rooms, and relevant book stock | | |
| Adequate number of seats in reading rooms (at least 10% of total students) | | |
| Adequate number of seats in group work rooms (at least 10% of total students) | | |
| Library's up-to-date book stock (at least 50% from recognized publishers in the last 10 years) | | |
| Sufficient book stock to cater to all students' needs | | |
| Adequate subscriptions to relevant domestic and foreign electronic resources | | |
| Accessibility of library services beyond regular class hours | | |
| Equipped library with reading rooms, group work rooms, and relevant book stock | | |

## 11. Institutional Cooperation

Standard 11.1: College UBT has an effective Institutional Collaboration Plan in line with the Overall Strategy of UBT

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Defined strategy for choosing institutions for partnership agreements | | |
| Well-defined section on internationalization in institutional strategy | | |
| Acknowledgement of the HEI's accomplishments on national, regional, or international levels | | |
| Hosting of international events like conferences and summer schools that attract large audiences | | |

### Standard 11.2: College UBT has established adequate Mechanisms for Collaboration with Other Higher Education Institutions

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Encouragement of international cooperation and mobility of staff | | |
| Support for staff participation in international activities (study mobility, events, etc.) | | |
| Dedicated resources or units for international cooperation | | |

### Standard 11.3: College UBT has established effective Relationships with Local Industry and Community

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Established partnerships with local/regional industries and employers | | |
| Promotion of collaboration with nearby industries and research organizations | | |
| Creation of community support/professional service agencies | | |
| Communication and collaboration with local schools | | |

### Standard 11.4: College UBT maintains proper Relationships with Alumni

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Consistent communication with alumni | | |
| Support for the alumni association | | |

**Internal Procedure for Program Evaluation at the Faculty Level**

**1. Frequency of Evaluation**:

Programs that have been running longer than six years should be internally evaluated once every academic year.

Programs that have been running less than six years should be evaluated every two years.

A comprehensive institutional evaluation are performed once every three years.

Thematic quality analysis are performed once every three years.

**2. Leadership**:

A Faculty Quality Assurance Committee (FQAC) should lead the internal faculty evaluation and thematic analyses at Faculty level. This committee should consist of:

- Chairperson (a senior faculty member, preferably with experience in quality assurance).
- Representatives from each department or program within the faculty.
- A student representative.
- An administrative staff member.
- An external expert or alumni (for comprehensive evaluations).

Quality Assurance Office at central institution leads the evaluations at central level. The findings of the internal institutional and thematic evaluation are approved by the UBT's Quality Committee.

**3. Evaluation Procedure**:

a. **Preparation**:

- Set clear objectives for the evaluation.
- Define the scope of the evaluation.
- Gather all necessary documents and data related to the programs.

b. **Self-Evaluation**:

- Distribute the Self-Evaluation Matrix to all programs.
- Programs complete the matrix, providing evidence for each indicator.

c. **Data Collection**:

- Collect feedback from students, staff, alumni, and employers using surveys and focus groups.
- Gather data on student performance, graduation rates, employment rates, etc.

d. **Analysis**:

- The Faculty Quality Assurance Sub-Committee reviews the completed matrices and collected data.
- Identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats for each program.

e. **Recommendations and Action Plan**:
- Based on the analysis, the Faculty Quality Assurance Sub-Committee makes recommendations for each program.
- An action plan is formulated to address areas of improvement.

f. **Feedback**:
- Share the findings, recommendations, and action plan with all stakeholders.
- Use the feedback to refine the action plan.

g. **Implementation**:
- Programs implement the action plan.
- The Faculty Quality Assurance Sub-Committee monitors progress.

h. **Review**:
- After the academic year, review the progress and impact of the action plan.
- Make necessary adjustments for the next cycle.

## Appendix: Quality Improvement Plan and Monitoring Template

**Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) Template**:

**Program Name**:

**Date**:

**Objective of the Improvement**:

**Areas of Improvement** (Based on Self-Evaluation Matrix):

**Actions to be Taken**:

Action 1:

Action 2:

...

**Resources Required**:

**Responsible Person/Team**:

**Timeline**:

**Expected Outcome**:

**Review Date**:

**Thematic Analysis on Teaching and Learning**

## 1. Curriculum Development and Review

### 1.1. Curriculum Development and Alignment

**Standard 1.1:** The curriculum should be developed in alignment with the institution's mission, strategic goals, and societal needs. It should be regularly reviewed to ensure its relevance and responsiveness to the changing needs of students and the community.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Alignment of curriculum with institution's mission | | |
| Curriculum's relevance to societal needs | | |
| Regular review and update of curriculum | | |
| Inclusion of stakeholders in curriculum development | | |
| Adequacy of resources for curriculum development | | |
| Effectiveness of the Curriculum Committee | | |
| Responsiveness to feedback from external reviewers | | |

### 1.2. **Curriculum Implementation and Delivery**

Standard 1.2: The curriculum should be delivered in a manner that ensures the achievement of intended learning outcomes. The institution should provide adequate resources, including faculty, facilities, and technology, to support effective curriculum delivery.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Effectiveness of teaching methodologies | | |
| Alignment of learning resources with curriculum | | |
| Faculty preparedness for curriculum delivery | | |
| Student feedback on curriculum delivery | | |
| Integration of technology in curriculum delivery | | |
| Adequacy of facilities for curriculum delivery | | |

## 2. **Faculty Development**

### 2.1. **Faculty Professional Development**

**Standard 2.1:** Faculty members should be provided with continuous professional development opportunities to enhance their teaching skills, stay updated in their fields, and contribute to the institution's mission and goals.

**Matrix for Self-Evaluation:**

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Availability of professional development opportunities | | |
| Faculty participation in workshops and seminars | | |
| Relevance of professional development topics | | |
| Funding support for faculty development | | |
| Integration of professional development in faculty evaluation | | |
| Effectiveness of mentoring programs for new faculty | | |

2.2. **Faculty Evaluation and Promotion**

**Standard 2.2:** Faculty evaluation should be comprehensive, transparent, and aligned with the institution's mission and goals. It should consider teaching effectiveness, research contributions, and service to the institution and community.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Clarity and transparency of evaluation criteria | | |
| Feedback mechanism for faculty evaluations | | |
| Alignment of promotion criteria with institutional goals | | |
| Recognition of faculty contributions in evaluations | | |
| Student feedback in faculty evaluations | | |
| Peer reviews in faculty evaluations | | |

3. **Student Support Services**

3.1. **Student Advising and Counseling**

**Standard 3.1:** The institution should provide effective advising and counselling services to support students' academic and personal well-being.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Effectiveness of academic advising | | |
| Availability and accessibility of counselors | | |
| Relevance of counseling services to student needs | | |
| Student feedback on advising and counseling services | | |
| Training and development of advisors and counselors | | |
| Integration of advising in student academic planning | | |

3.2. **Student Resources and Facilities**

**Standard 3.2:** The institution should provide adequate resources and facilities to support students' academic success and overall well-being.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Adequacy of study spaces and computer labs | | |
| Availability and relevance of learning resources | | |
| Effectiveness of tutoring services | | |
| Student feedback on resources and facilities | | |
| Integration of technology in student support services | | |
| Accessibility of resources for students with disabilities | | |

## 4. Assessment and Outcomes

### 4.1. Program Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Standard 4.1: The institution should have a systematic and data-driven approach to assess program effectiveness and use the results for continuous improvement.

Matrix for Self-Evaluation:

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Regularity and comprehensiveness of program assessments | | |
| Use of assessment results in decision-making | | |
| Alignment of assessments with institutional goals | | |
| Inclusion of external stakeholders in assessments | | |
| Transparency in sharing assessment results | | |
| Integration of assessment results in curriculum development | | |

## 5. Teaching methodologies and strategies

**Standard 5.1:** Implementation of diverse and innovative teaching methodologies that cater to various learning styles.

Matrix for self-evaluation

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Integration of technology in teaching | | |
| Use of active learning techniques | | |
| Incorporation of collaborative projects | | |
| Regular workshops on modern pedagogical approaches | | |

### 6. Learning environments

Standard 6.1: Provision of conducive physical and virtual learning environments that support effective learning.

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Classrooms equipped with modern technology | | |
| Regular infrastructure maintenance | | |
| User-friendly online platforms | | |
| Seamless remote learning experiences | | |

### 3. Student feedback and participation

Standard 7.1: Active involvement of students in the feedback process and decision-making related to academic matters.

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Regular feedback sessions and surveys | | |
| Inclusion of student representatives in committees | | |
| Focus groups for in-depth feedback | | |
| Prompt action on feedback received | | |

### 4. Academic integrity and ethics

Standard 8.1: The program, faculty, and institution uphold the highest standards of academic integrity and ethics.

Matrix for self-evaluation

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Clear policies on plagiarism and cheating | | |
| Regular education sessions on academic ethics | | |
| Mechanisms for reporting academic misconduct | | |
| Consequences for violations | | |

**Standard 8.2: Integration of current research findings into the teaching process.**

Matrix for self-evaluation

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Faculty bringing research into classrooms | | |
| Student-faculty research collaborations | | |
| Curriculum updates based on latest research | | |
| Workshops on research-informed teaching | | |

## 5. Continuous professional development

Standard 9.1: Ongoing professional development opportunities for faculty are offered to enhance both subject matter expertise and teaching skills.

Matrix for self-evaluation

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Regular internal training sessions | | |
| Encouragement to attend external conferences | | |
| Access to online courses and resources | | |
| Feedback mechanism for training effectiveness | | |

## 6. Technology integration in teaching

**Standard 10.1:** Effective use of technology to enhance the teaching and learning experience.

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Investment in e-learning platforms | | |
| Training for faculty on technology tools | | |
| Regular updates to technology resources | | |
| Feedback mechanism for technology effectiveness | | |

## 7. Internationalization and global perspectives

**Standard 11.1:** Providing students with a global perspective in their education.

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Collaborations with international institutions | | |
| Promotion of student exchange programs | | |
| Inclusion of global case studies in curriculum | | |
| Workshops on global perspectives in teaching | | |

## THEMATIC ANALYSIS FOR RESEARCH

### Standard 1: Research Performance

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Number of publications | | |
| Publications in high-impact journals | | |
| Number of patents filed | | |
| Amount of research funding received | | |
| Number of researchers receiving awards | | |

### Standard 2: Research Environment

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Availability of research facilities | | |
| Levels of internal and external collaboration | | |
| Effectiveness of mentoring programs for junior researchers | | |

### Standard 3: Research Support

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Availability of funding opportunities | | |
| Effectiveness of research services (e.g., data management) | | |
| Comprehensive training and professional development opportunities | | |

### Standard 4: Research Impact

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Societal impact of research | | |
| Economic impact of research on local and regional economy | | |
| International impact of research | | |

### Standard 5: Research Ethics and Integrity

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Adherence to ethical guidelines in research | | |
| Training on research ethics for staff and students | | |
| Handling and resolution of research misconduct cases | | |

### Standard 6: Research Dissemination and Outreach

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Frequency of research seminars and workshops | | |
| Engagement with the wider community through public lectures | | |
| Collaboration with industry and other institutions | | |

### Standard 7: Research Infrastructure

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Availability and quality of research labs and equipment | | |
| Access to research databases and journals | | |
| Maintenance and upgrade of research facilities | | |

### Standard 8: Research Student Experience

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Quality of supervision and mentorship | | |
| Opportunities for research students to present and publish | | |
| Support services for research students (e.g., funding, training) | | |

### Standard 9: Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Research

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Number of interdisciplinary research projects | | |
| Collaborations with other departments and faculties | | |
| Engagement in national and international research networks | | |

### Standard 10: Research Innovation and Commercialization

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Number of research projects leading to commercial products | | |
| Engagement with industry partners for research translation | | |
| Support for startups and spin-offs from research projects | | |

## THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES

### Standard 1: Administrative Leadership and Governance

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Effectiveness of leadership at all administrative levels | | |
| Transparency in decision-making processes | | |
| Inclusivity in governance structures | | |

### Standard 2: Administrative Efficiency

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Timeliness of administrative processes | | |
| Use of technology in administration | | |
| Responsiveness to faculty, staff, and student needs | | |

### Standard 3: Financial Management

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Efficiency in budget allocation and utilization | | |
| Transparency in financial reporting | | |
| Financial sustainability and planning | | |

### Standard 4: Human Resources Management

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Effectiveness of recruitment and retention strategies | | |
| Professional development opportunities for staff | | |
| Employee satisfaction and well-being | | |

### Standard 5: Infrastructure and Facilities Management

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Maintenance and upgrade of physical infrastructure | | |
| Availability and quality of facilities for students | | |
| Environmental sustainability initiatives | | |

## Standard 6: Information Technology (IT) Administration

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Efficiency of IT support services | | |
| Cybersecurity measures and data protection | | |
| Integration of technology in administrative processes | | |

## Standard 7: Stakeholder Communication and Engagement

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Effectiveness of internal communication channels | | |
| Engagement with external stakeholders and partners | | |
| Feedback mechanisms for administrative services | | |

## Standard 8: Strategic Planning and Vision

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Alignment of administrative goals with institutional vision | | |
| Periodic review and update of strategic plans | | |
| Stakeholder involvement in strategic planning | | |

## Standard 9: Risk Management and Compliance

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) |
|---|---|
| Effectiveness of risk management strategies | |
| Compliance with legal and regulatory requirements | |
| Training and awareness programs on compliance | |

## Standard 10: Continuous Improvement and Innovation

| Indicator | Rating (1-10) |
|---|---|
| Initiatives for process improvement in administration | |
| Encouraging innovation and new ideas in administration | |
| Monitoring and evaluation of administrative services | |