

***UBT College***

# **QUALITY ASSURANCE MANUAL**

Prishtina, 07.03.2024

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	2
1. PURPOSE OF QUALITY ASSURANCE MANUAL .....	3
2. QUALITY ASSURANCE AT COLLEGE UBT.....	4
2.1. INTRODUCTION .....	4
2.2. QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMISSION.....	4
2.3. QUALITY ASSURANCE FACULTY SUB-COMMISSION .....	5
2.4. BRANCH QUALITY CIRCLE.....	6
2.5. QUALITY MANAGEMENT OFFICE .....	7
2.6. QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM .....	9
3. INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM .....	9
3.1. QUALITY MANAGEMENT .....	10
3.2. QUALITY REVIEW .....	10
3.3. QUALITY IMPROVEMENT .....	11
3.4. MONITORING .....	11
4. UBT College Internal Quality Assurance Review Standards For Program and Faculty Evaluation	12
Chapter 1: Mission, Objectives, and Administration of the Faculty .....	12
1.2 Academic Integrity and Freedom.....	12
1.3 Information management.....	13
1.4 Administrative Support.....	13
Chapter 7: Infrastructure and Resources.....	25
7.1 Adequate Premises and Equipment.....	25
7.2 Library Resources .....	25

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 ASSURANCE FACULTY SUB-COMMISSION**

The Quality Faculty Sub-Commission at College UBT is part of the organizational structure of UBT and operates within each faculty to handle and implement internal quality assurance processes and activities at the faculty and departmental levels.

The Quality Faculty Sub-Commission of each faculty is composed of the following members:

1. Head of the Quality Faculty Sub-Commission, member of academic staff of the faculty;
2. Member of the Quality Faculty Sub-Commission, member of academic staff of the faculty;
3. Member of the Quality Faculty Sub-Commission, member of academic staff of the faculty;
4. Member of the Quality Faculty Sub-Commission, member of the industrial board relevant to the faculty;
5. Member of the Quality Faculty Sub-Commission, Faculty Quality Coordinator;
6. Member of the Quality Faculty Sub-Commission, student representative;
7. Member of the Quality Faculty Sub-Commission, alumni representative;

8. Where applicable, member of the Quality Faculty Sub-Commission, academic staff from UBT branches delivering programs of the respective faculty.

The duties and responsibilities of the members of the Quality Faculty Sub-Commission are as follows:

- a. To outline and monitor internal quality criteria at the faculty and departmental level, ensuring continuous enhancement of quality assurance processes.
- b. To approve the annual quality reviews at course, program, department, and faculty level conducted by the Faculty Quality Coordinator, incorporating data and reports supplied by Branch Quality Coordinators where faculty programs are delivered at branches.
- c. To outline and review internal quality assurance benchmarks at the faculty level, ensuring alignment with benchmarks of national and international accreditation (Kosovo Accreditation Agency and relevant international accreditation bodies).
- d. To disseminate and nurture the quality culture among all academic and non-academic units of the faculty, including branches delivering programs under the faculty.
- e. To support constructive self-criticism in the self-assessment of learning outcomes achievement carried out at course, program, and faculty level.
- f. To ensure that branch-level academic staff delivering programs of the faculty are fully involved in the self-evaluation process, quality reviews, and quality improvement plans.

## **2.4. BRANCH QUALITY CIRCLE**

The Branch Quality Circle at College UBT is part of the organizational structure of UBT and functions as the quality assurance body at branch level, responsible for internal self-evaluations, thematic reviews, and quality monitoring specific to the branch.

The Branch Quality Circle also plays a coordinating role with Faculty Sub-Commissions to ensure that branch-specific inputs are incorporated into program and faculty-level reviews, especially when adopting Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs) that cover programs delivered at branches.

The Branch Quality Circle is composed of the following members:

1. Head of the Branch Quality Circle, member of academic staff at the branch;
2. Member of the Branch Quality Circle, member of academic staff at the branch;
3. Member of the Branch Quality Circle, member of academic staff at the branch;
4. Member of the Branch Quality Circle, Branch Quality Coordinator;
5. Member of the Branch Quality Circle, student representative at the branch;
6. Member of the Branch Quality Circle, alumni representative from the branch;
7. Member of the Branch Quality Circle, industry/community representative from the region where the branch operates.

All academic staff members of the Branch Quality Circle are drawn from the branch.

The duties and responsibilities of the Branch Quality Circle are as follows:

- a. To prepare and approve the Annual Branch Internal Self-Evaluation Report in cooperation with the Quality Management Office and Faculty Sub-Commissions.
- b. To conduct branch-level thematic self-evaluation reviews (e.g., student services, teaching resources, infrastructure, or specific areas of improvement identified by the branch).
- c. To act as the branch-level equivalent of the Quality Assurance Commission, ensuring systematic quality assurance processes are in place at the branch.
- d. To collect and analyze branch-specific data on teaching, research, student services, and stakeholder feedback, integrating findings into branch reports and thematic reviews.
- e. To engage students, staff, alumni, and local industry partners from the branch region in quality assurance processes, ensuring that their perspectives are reflected in improvement measures.
- f. To coordinate with Faculty Sub-Commissions when program reviews involve courses or study programs delivered at the branch, ensuring that branch-specific quality data and feedback are included.
- g. To support the development and monitoring of Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs) for faculty programs delivered at the branch, in alignment with faculty-wide improvement strategies.
- h. To disseminate quality culture within the branch by organizing information sessions, workshops, and awareness activities on QA for staff and students.
- i. To report to the Quality Management Office and cooperate with Faculty Quality Coordinators in ensuring that branch-level results contribute to faculty and institutional QA processes.

## **2.5. 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.

Duties and Responsibilities of Branch Quality Coordinators are as follows:

- Implement quality assurance processes at the branch level, ensuring consistency with institutional and faculty objectives.
- Act as the primary liaison between the Quality Management Office, Faculty Quality Coordinators, and branch leadership for all QA-related activities.
- Coordinate the preparation of the Annual Branch Internal Self-Evaluation Report, aligning it with faculty and institutional reporting requirements.
- Supply branch-specific data and analysis to Faculty Quality Coordinators for integration into Annual Faculty Self-Evaluation Reports and thematic reviews.
- Collect and analyze data on teaching, research, student services, and administrative processes within the branch.
- Facilitate branch-level stakeholder engagement through surveys, focus groups, and meetings with students, staff, alumni, and community partners.
- Ensure branch stakeholder feedback is systematically integrated into faculty and institutional self-evaluation processes.
- Support branch staff and faculty in implementing Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs) by monitoring progress and reporting outcomes.



- Disseminate QA policies, reports, and improvement actions within the branch to ensure transparency and stakeholder awareness.
- Organize training sessions, workshops, and awareness activities on quality assurance for branch faculty, staff, and students.
- Report regularly to the Quality Management Office and Faculty Quality Coordinators on branch QA activities, challenges, and progress toward improvement goals.

## **2.6. 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		
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		

Indicator	Rating (1-10)	Comments
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		

Indicator	Rating (1-10)	Comments
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		



Indicator	Rating (1-10)	Comments
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		
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		
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		
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		
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		
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 th 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-Centered 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		
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		

Indicator	Rating (1-10)	Comments
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		

Indicator	Rating (1-10)	Comments
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		

Indicator	Rating (1-10)	Comments
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		

Indicator	Rating (1-10)	Comments
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		



Indicator	Rating (1-10)	Comments
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		

Indicator	Rating (1-10)	Comments
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	