



*European  
Polytechnical  
University*

**RULE BOOK**  
ON  
**THE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND  
MAINTAINING THE QUALITY OF  
THE TRAINING**



## **CONTENTS**

1. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION AND MAINTENANCE SYSTEM OF THE QUALITY
2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION AND MAINTENANCE SYSTEM OF THE QUALITY OF TRAINING
3. APPROACHES TO ACHIEVING THE GOALS OF THE SYSTEM
4. FUNCTIONS OF THE EVALUATION SYSTEM AND MAINTENANCE OF THE QUALITY
5. DEFINING TRAINING PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS
6. DEFINING COURSE REQUIREMENTS
7. DEFINING THE REQUIREMENTS TO THE SCHOOL HOLDER
8. CRITERIA AND INDICATORS FOR ASSESSMENT OF ACHIEVEMENT
9. INDICATORS FOR EVALUATING THE QUALITY ACHIEVED
10. QUALITY ASSESSMENT DATA AND THEIR SOURCES
11. ASSESSES - ASSESSORS AND PERIODICITY OF ASSESSMENT
12. SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON THE QUALITY AND MECHANISMS OF EVALUATION
13. PROCEDURES FOR VERIFICATION OF QUALITY ASSESSMENTS AND CORRECTIVE EFFECTS ON ITS IMPROVEMENT
14. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF DISTANCE EDUCATION
15. PROMOTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF QUALITY



*European  
Polytechnical  
University*

Objects of the System for evaluating and maintaining the quality of training in the European Polytechnic University is the teachers, the students, the teaching staff disciplines and the Study Programs. In this system they are placed apart from all others forms of interdependence, in the relationship assessed - assessors.

The system for evaluating and maintaining the quality of education is a subsystem in the management of the European Polytechnic University, which is being built pursuant to Art. 6 para. 4 of the Law on Higher Education:

"The university ensures the quality of education and research through an internal system for evaluating and maintaining the quality of training and the academic staff, which also includes a survey of student opinion. The point of the system is to control, maintain and manage the quality of education in the offered fields of higher education and professional fields, as well as of the academic staff. The functions and structure of the quality control system as well as the order of student opinion survey and the way of disclosure of its results are regulated in the regulations for the activities of the higher school".

In the normative framework of NAOA, it is also said that "the question of the quality of training is the subject of a special text (ordinance, part of an ordinance or other official a document mandatory for higher education institutions) in which the elements of quality are specified, as well as the structures for its maintenance and control".

In Art. 30 of the Law on Higher Education, art. 30 par. 1 item 15 the adoption of such a system is ordered to the Academic Council, which approves a System for evaluation and maintenance of the quality of the training and the academic staff in accordance with Art. 6, para. 4. There is a similar text in the Regulations on the structure and operation of the European polytechnic university, the Academic Council "adopts the Assessment System and maintaining the quality of the training of the academic staff and carries out control over its implementation and improvement."

The European Polytechnic University has as its highest value the quality in all its dimensions. That is why the System, the subject of this normative act, is essential its management component.



## **1. PURPOSE OF THE ASSESSMENT AND MAINTENANCE SYSTEM THE QUALITY**

Art. 1. (1) The system is designed to control, maintain and improve quality of studies at the European Polytechnic University (hereinafter "the University").

(2) Quality here means a multidimensional set of properties and characteristics of the object (training program, study discipline, teacher) that they give it ability to satisfy contingent or assumed changing requirements to him.

(3) The system is a means of internal university accreditation of the Programs for training and for internal audit of individual assessment sites.

(4) Quality can also be measured quantitatively depending on the influencing factors on an introduced measurement scale.

## **2. OBJECTIVE OF THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT AND MAINTENANCE SYSTEM**

Art. 2 (1) The purpose of SOPKO is for the University to achieve and control the quality of training corresponding to European traditions and standards combined with American pragmatism.

(2) The objective is specified for each object of assessment in the Program and Departments advice by defining requirements for it

## **3. APPROACHES TO ACHIEVING THE GOALS OF THE SYSTEM**

Art. 3 (1) The following apply to quality control, improvement and maintenance approaches:

1. Definition of requirements for the educational object and its rules work, control of their implementation and comparison of the obtained results with the defined ones requirements; the quality is as better as the difference between the requirements and expected, on the one hand, and the results obtained from the educational object, on the other, is smaller and the faster it is overcome.
2. Objectification of the quality assessment by means of multifactor quantitative methods for its assessment; determining adequate sources of information and assessment indicators and modeling of the aggregated quality assessment through multicriteria models.
3. Motivation of participants in the educational process to achieve high quality through:
  - a. publicity of the evaluations of the achieved quality;
  - b. inverse relationship between the assessed quality and the reward for the one who has it accomplished (teacher, supervisor, student).

This feedback will make the System itself work efficiently and effectively self-cultivation.

(2) The structure of this normative act follows the logic of the mentioned approaches.

#### **4. FUNCTIONS OF THE EVALUATION SYSTEM AND MAINTENANCE OF THE QUALITY**

Art. 4 The functions of the Quality Assessment and Maintenance System are:

1. Research and appropriate use of foreign and national experience of the quality of training.
2. Collection, verification and processing of the quality data training.
3. Development of criteria, indicators, sources of information, methods and models for quality assessment.
4. Conducting periodic internal reviews of the Training Programs.
5. Conducting periodic internal reviews of academic disciplines.
6. Evaluating teachers and proposing remuneration accordingly the quality they have achieved.
7. Validation of the ratings given by the System and realization of the consequences of them.
8. Publication of review results and dissemination of good practice at the university.
9. Self-discipline of the academic and management staff at the University.

#### **5. DEFINING TRAINING PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS**

Art. 5 (1) University quality requirements addressed to the object of evaluation, are contained in the Regulations for the structure and operation of the European Polytechnic University and in the normative documents arising from it, as well as in this one Regulations.

(2) The study documentation for each Study Program consists of:

1. qualification characteristic;
2. Curriculum;
3. characteristics of the disciplines studied.

Art. 6 (1) The qualification characteristics of the Training Program contain the required knowledge, skills and professional competences within the scope of the Program and compliance with:

1. trends for the development of the specialty in the medium and long term;
2. the mission and values of the University.

(2) The qualification characteristic is structured in the following sequence:

1. educational goals of the specialty;
2. knowledge and skills necessary for successful professional activity;
3. general theoretical preparation;
4. special training;
5. optional training
6. professional competences;
7. general skills;
8. special skills;

9. areas of professional realization of the graduate of the specialty.

(3) The quality of the qualification characteristic is determined by the degree of its compliance with the University's mission.

Art. 7 (1) The curriculum of the Training Program contains the markers of its curriculum content and consists of compulsory, elective and optional subjects, internships, practices and the form of completion of studies - thesis / state exam, situated in the space of knowledge and in time for their study so as to follow methodologically sound sequence with horizontal and vertical harmonization.

(2) The curriculum must create conditions for achieving the goals and ensure the preparation and competences of the students, which are contained in the qualification characteristic as

1. meets the state requirements for the relevant educational degree;
2. takes into account the successful implementation of the graduating students in professional practice;
3. is aimed at realizing the mission of the University in the relevant specialty.

(4) The timetable for each discipline and element of the curriculum shall be indicated in the curriculum process, form of control and credit points according to the Accumulation System and transfer of credits (Art. 81 - Art. 91 of the Regulations on the structure and operation of the University).

(5) Curricula follow a common format at the University and are approved at both the language – English and Bulgarian.

Art.8 (1) The initiator of a new study program can be a department/department of the university, the president, the academic leadership, governmental, scientific or economic organization, business enterprise or branch organization. The initiator makes a task with the name of the Program, in which the main component is its qualification characteristic.

(2) The study documentation of the Program is developed by an Expert Working Group, appointed by the Rector. In addition to full-time professors of the University, the working group includes include scientists from abroad, business representatives and employers in the specialty.

(3) Based on the qualification characteristics, the working group develops a project for a curriculum and submits it to the Commission on Academic Work of the Academic Council. After discussion in the Commission, the project is adjusted by the working group in accordance with the made notes.

(4) With a joint report of the head of the working group and the chairman of The Commission of the Academic Council on the educational process projects for the qualification description and curriculum are submitted to the Academic Council. The council decides on approval or return of the draft for refinement.

(5) With the acceptance of the study documentation in the Academic Council, it is also confirmed a permanent Program Council of the Study Program, at the base of which may stands the working group on the project.

(6) When the Training Program is from a professional direction, in which the university does not have accreditation, the Academic Council decides on the opening of procedure under Art. 81 (1) 5, b of the Higher Education Institution for the evaluation of a project for the opening of a professional direction.

Art. 9. To prepare the qualification characteristics and the curriculum required:

1. To study the educational documentation of leading higher schools in Europe and the USA with analogous to the Mission and Values Study Program at the University.
2. To conduct studies on:
  - a. The sought-after knowledge and applicable skills in the specialty in the medium term The European Union and the USA, as well as the countries from which the University trains students in this Program.
  - b. The requirements of assessment and accrediting agencies and certification organizations in Europe and America.
3. In accordance with Art. 71 par. 5 of the Regulations of the University Program Council aligns the study plans and preparation under the Training Program with that of the foreign partner university so that substantive problems are not created for the transition of students from the University for one semester abroad.
4. Based on the studies in the curriculum, the knowledge, skills, the values and attitudes to be acquired by the students of the Study Programme, such as the mission and values of the University are taken into account and the "Basic Parameters of the curricula for the majors at the European Polytechnic University", adopted in the Academic Council.

Art. 10 (1) The program board defines the study content of each discipline in type of short summaries - tasks on the basis of which tenders are announced and/or solicited teachers under Art. 15 (3) of the Act on the Development of the Academic Staff, including from the partner university.

(2) After the recruitment of full-time teachers under Art. 43 and 44 of the Rules of The University, the Program Board assigns the designated holder the development of description of the discipline according to the summary according to para. 1 and discusses the presented by him project. The program board can reject the project, make notes for corrections or yes accept it.

(3) After its acceptance, the project is presented to the Committee on the educational work of the Academic Council. With a joint report, the head of the Program Board and the chairman to the Commission submit for approval the characteristics of the rector's discipline, after which it becomes the academic standard of the discipline.



Art. 11 (1) Quantitative and normative requirements for the academic composition of the training program is contained in Art. 17 para. 2, item 2, of the Higher Education Institution, according to which the teachers of a basic employment contract must lead not less than half of the auditorium and the practical classes, and the qualified persons in it read no less than 70 percent of the lecture courses. Up to 30 percent of lecture courses can also be assigned to non-habilitated teachers with an educational and scientific degree "doctor".

(3) The requirements for the quality of the academic staff under the Training Program are contained in the Regulations for the organization and operation of the University (art. 45 - art. 48) and the regulations on the terms and conditions for occupying academic positions and development of the academic staff at the University.

(4) The requirements for the material and information base for each discipline are contained in her academic standard (point 4 and point 8).

(5) The requirements for conducting the study process according to the approved study plan documentation are placed in the Regulations for the organization of the educational process and its quality is judged by the conformity with its actual course and the results obtained.

Art. 12 (1) All managers, teachers, employees and students in European polytechnic university are obliged to comply with the requirements specified in the previous ones members.

(2) In order to maintain continuous compliance with established requirements the study documentation and the study process are continuously monitored and controlled.

Art. 13 (1) The head of the department is obliged to:

1. To respond in a timely manner to all signals about academic problems disciplines submitted by students, academic staff or employers;
2. At least once a year, according to a previously established schedule, to hold conversations with holders of the study disciplines, to listen to their self-assessments about the training in the discipline and shares with them the opinions and impressions received;
3. At least once a year, he reports to the Faculty Council on assessments and general impressions from the reported signals, the conversations held with the holders of the disciplines and offers solutions for improvement. Records are kept of assessments and observations.

(2) To report the educational activity in the disciplines for which each department is responsible semester The departmental council holds a meeting with an analysis of the performance of the course documentation and the conduct of the educational process.

Art. 14 (1) At least once a year, the head of the Program Council conducts general interview with the professors and heads of departments involved in the Program. Based on their

reports, the Program Board makes decisions on improving the educational process and the study documentation of the Training Program.

(2) At the meeting of the Program Council according to the previous paragraph, the deputy was present. the rector on the learning process and a representative of the "Technology of Education" office.

(3) The head of the Program Council holds periodic meetings with the students and with employers to raise quality issues and respond promptly to all current distress signals.

(4) The academic work committee of the Academic Council discusses the reports of the heads of all Program Councils and submits summary information to the Academic council, on the basis of which the Annual Report of the University is drawn up with decisions on quality improvement.

Art. 15 (1) Changes to the study plans may be initiated by the Program Councils, the departments/departments, the president and/or the rector. The change may be required by:

1. The development of sciences, technologies and professional practice in the specialty, requiring flexible responses of the University in the education and preparation of students;
2. New requirements of organizations and institutions outside the University (European union, MOMN, international and class organizations, etc.).
3. The need to harmonize curricula with partner universities, in which part of the students' training at the University takes place;
4. Contracts for joint study programs with other universities;
5. Weaknesses of the learning content identified by analyzes and discussions in the management governing bodies.
6. Dissatisfaction of students, ascertained by surveys and others sources.

(2) When the changes in the curriculum are more profound, it should be discussed as well also change the qualification characteristic so that it is continuously maintained the correspondence between them.

(3) Changes in the qualification characteristics and the study plan are submitted with a report to the head of the Program Council and the chairman of the academic work committee and so on approved by the Academic Council.

Art. 16. (1) The requirements for the Training Programs given in the preceding texts, are specified by the Program Councils according to the specifics of the programs and are reported The evaluation indicators given in Appendix 1.

Art. 17. (1) When in the decisions of the Accreditation Agency for program accreditation of professional direction or specialty in regulated professions contain critical remarks and recommendations, the University takes action to remove the weaknesses and reacts in accordance with the recommendations.



(2) The head of the Program Board, in agreement with those affected by the notes and the recommendations leaders, teachers and students, study the problems and in a month deadline, they make a proposal for a reaction and for solving the problems.

(3) Proposals, programs and discussions are conducted at the relevant levels protocol records.

## **6. DEFINING COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

Art. 18 (1) The academic discipline is presented through its characteristics in compliance with the requirements of Art. 45, para. 2. item 2 of the Regulations on the device and action of the University.

(2) The established academic standards for the relevant disciplines are the framework in which the teacher exercises his right to freedom of teaching.

(3) The educational content of the discipline is in constant accordance with the latest and university knowledge of the discipline.

(4) In the evaluation, the learning content is measured against similar courses in the leading ones higher schools in Europe and the USA with similar mission and values to the University, as well as the needs of the professional practice for which the students of the University are preparing.

(5) In the design and implementation of the educational discipline in the educational process follows to take into account that the following points of view are also controlled and evaluated:

1. the compliance of the curriculum with the educational qualification degree, to which it refers;
2. the proportionality of the individual topics and their compliance with the requirements for relevance and satisfaction of the student and the employer;
3. consistency with other disciplines of the Training Program in terms of concepts, knowledge, symbols and designations;
4. the type of classes on the relevant topics (lectures, exercises, course projects and assignments, reports and essays, etc.) and their adequacy with needs and character of knowledge and skills.

Art. 19. (1) The requirements for each of the study disciplines are set in Academic academic discipline standard.

(2) The requirements for the academic disciplines are specified by the Program Councils of based on the Evaluation Indicators given in Appendix 2.

(3) At the first lecture on the discipline, the incumbent announces and introduces the

students to the characteristics of the discipline, with the requirements for the students, their level preliminary preparation, the test method and make sure that they have understood it.

## **7. DEFINING THE REQUIREMENTS TO THE SCHOOL HOLDER DISCIPLINE AND TO THE ASSISTANT**

Art. 20 (1) The requirements for the holders of the study disciplines are set in The regulations for the structure and operation of the University (art. 45 paragraph 2).

(2) Each teacher, holder of a discipline at the University:

1. Harmonizes the educational content and methods of teaching and testing of the students with a foreign academic partner approved by the University in general or disciplines close to both parties, in which both are designated as starters;
2. Develops in a team with the assistants and the academic partner the characteristic of his discipline according to an academic standard (Art. 93 para. 3);
3. Knows modern university learning technologies and knows how to teach them;
4. Uses interactive forms of learning and methods that activate students and include them as equal participants in the learning process;
5. Participates in the design and construction (when necessary) of training and/or research laboratory in accordance with the curriculum and looks after its current condition, maintenance and operation;
6. Presents in electronic form his lectures, teaching and testing tests and others study materials;
7. Accepts to be recorded on video and provide students selected from it keynote lectures and discussions with students;
8. At the latest after three consecutive readings of a discipline from the bachelor's course issues textbook by complying with the Regulations for planning and issuing educational literature and electronic teaching aids.

Art. 21 (1) Each holder of an academic discipline continuously makes amendments to the learning content in accordance with:

1. the latest advances in science and methodology in the subject of the course which currently changing;
2. the received opinions of students and employers from surveys, discussions and others forums;
3. own scientific results and enriched professional views and competencies.

(2) The holder is obliged to present the study discipline for review in the faculty council when:

1. The changes affect more than 15% of the approved schedule characteristic or significant changes have occurred to the discipline's resources (provided new equipment or other material base and/or software for scientific research and the learning process);
2. Changes are required in the way students are taught and/or assessed.

(3) When there are more than 25% changes in the established academic standard or

motivated request of the head of the Program Board, the study discipline is submitted for approval by the Program Board.

(4) Protocol records are kept for the changes to the study documentation, according to which judge the regularity and legality of the procedure.

Art. 22 (1) The requirements for holders and assistants are specified in the Departments advice based on Art. 45 of the Regulations for the structure and activities of the University and the evaluation indicators given in Appendix 3.

(2) The departments/departments adopt an individual plan for each teacher's work, which is reported at the end of each semester.

## **8. CRITERIA AND INDICATORS FOR ASSESSMENT OF ACHIEVEMENT QUALITY**

Art. 23. The quality control toolkit consists of the following elements:

1. Evaluation criteria. They are signs (reporting points, control points for evaluation), on the basis of which an assessment of the quality of the individual components is made the educational process. The global quality assessment of an object takes into account all points from the criterion space, but with different significance.
2. Indicators (indicators) for quality - clarifying information "windows" to each of the criteria. They can take into account the specifics of the object of assessment, but in their totality must determine the content and scope of the relevant criterion.
3. Sources of quality information that may have different awareness, independence, competence and reliability, which are therefore weighted differently.
4. Quality assessment mechanisms that define the relationships assessed - evaluators, the methods of obtaining the evaluations and the periodicity of evaluation.
5. Validation of quality assessments after which they become usable and publication.

Art. 25 (1) The severity of the evaluation criteria is measured by the maximum number of points, which can be given when evaluating each of them.

(2) The criteria for evaluating the quality of the Training Program and the minimum and the maximum number of points on them are:

Criteria	Min.	Max.
1. Degree of compliance of study documentation with university documentation requirements	8	11

(3) The criteria for evaluating a course and the minimum and maximum number of points on them are:

--	--	--

(5) The criteria for evaluating a teacher-holder of a discipline and the minimum and maximum number of points for them are:


Art. 26 (1) The sum of the maximum number of points for a given assessment object is 100.

(2) The total (aggregated) score obtained is valid if each criterion has been obtained at least the minimum number of points.

## **9. INDICATORS FOR EVALUATING THE QUALITY ACHIEVED**

Art. 27 (1) Each indicator, depending on its significance for the assessment, has a maximum number of points awarded.

(2) The indicators for the evaluation criteria of a Training Program are given in Appendix #1.

(3) The indicators for the evaluation criteria of a study discipline are given in Appendix #2.

(4) The indicators for the evaluation criteria of a tenured teacher are given in Appendix #3.

(5) Program councils can specify and specify the indicators accordingly with the specifics of the object of evaluation by coordinating them with the Commission on the educational process of AC.

## **10. QUALITY ASSESSMENT DATA AND THEIR SOURCES**

Art. 28 (1) The pursuit of objectification of the evaluations presupposes the search for ones ones adequate quantitative data on the indicators of the evaluated quality.

(2) When numerical information is not available or cannot be obtained, verbal information is used information that the evaluation team converts into an evaluation number less than or equal to the maximum score for the relevant indicator.

(3) By sources, the data can be generated by:

1. i1 - Self-assessment of the object of assessment:
  - a. Program Council - for the Training Program;



- b. Teaching team - for the discipline;
  - c. The teacher - when he is the subject of assessment.
2. i2 - Student survey results:
- a. Students of the study program in various courses, incl. Graduates.
  - b. Students in the discipline;
  - c. Students taught by the teacher.
3. i3 - Evaluations of the head of the Program Board when it relates to discipline and teacher, resp. of the Commission on the educational process - when it refers to the Program for training.
4. i4 - Results of surveys with employers and former students.
5. i5 - Results of surveys with faculty (colleagues), when applicable discipline or faculty in which they are knowledgeable and have information.
6. i6 - Opinion of the head of the department, when it concerns a discipline or teacher from the department.
7. i7 - Data from the University administration.

(4) To the sources under para. 3 others may be added at the Commission's discretion for assessment under Art. 25.

## **1. ASSESSMENTS - ASSESSORS AND PERIODICITY OF THE ASSESSMENTS**

Art. 25 (1) The basic principle of the assessment is the independence of the assessor from assessments. In internal evaluation (internal audit), solutions are sought for evaluators without conflict of interest.

(2) Programs are evaluated by a Commission chaired by Deputy. the rector for accreditation, head of the Program Board of another program and representative of the "Technology of Education".

(3) Academic disciplines are evaluated by a Commission chaired by the head of Program council of the program whose curriculum includes the discipline, habilitation a teacher from a related discipline and a representative of the "Technology of Education" office.

(4) Teachers are evaluated by a Commission chaired by the head of the Program, under which the teacher gives lectures, a habilitated person from a department related to the department of the evaluated teacher, and a representative of the "Teaching Technology" office.

(5) For the review of the disciplines, the evaluation of the teachers and the programs

the rector issues an order in which he determines the evaluation teams, guided by art. 25.

Art. 26 (1) Programs are evaluated twice in one cycle between consecutive programs accreditations; the second time - in the year before the upcoming accreditation.

(2) Academic disciplines are evaluated according to a schedule approved by the Academic Council, but not less often than once every three years.

(3) Teachers are evaluated annually. Their evaluations are taken into account during the attestation according to Higher Education Institutions and when determining their remuneration according to the Ordinance on the Formation of the salary of the academic staff.

## **2. INFORMATION SOURCES AND ASSESSMENT MECHANISMS**

Art. 27. (1) The sources of information on the quality of the assessed objects i1, i2, i3, i4, i5, i6, i7 have different awareness, independence and competence and therefore different weight (significance) in the evaluation. Tables with sample values of coefficients of significance by metrics are given in respective appendices.

(2) Specifying the importance of sources i1, i2, i3, i4, i5, i6, i7 is the right of:

1. The department councils - for evaluation of the teacher;
2. Program advice - for evaluation of study disciplines;
3. The Commission of the Academic Council.- for evaluation of Study Programs;

(3) The tables with specified importance of information sources i1, i2, i3, i4, i5, i6, i7, if they agree with the Academic Process Committee of the AC and are signed by the rector.

Art. 28. (1) The self-assessment of the assessment object is carried out according to the criteria tables with the indicators (Appendices 1, 2 and 3), as the object of evaluation presents not only its own claims, but also the evidence supporting their self-assessments.

(2) For a study discipline, the self-assessment is presented by the team that conducts classes.

(3) For a Training Program, the self-assessment is prepared by a composition determined by the head of the program, and is accepted by the Program Council.

Art. 29. (1) Surveys of students are carried out according to evaluation indicators of:

1. training programs;
2. academic disciplines;
3. teachers.

(2) The forms for interviewing and communicating with students and extracting information are:



1. Ongoing polls that the teacher conducts on issues of his choice to get audience feedback and find out how his lectures are perceived. Surveys can be electronic (on the university network) and on a conventional medium.
2. Evaluation surveys, the results of which are used in the evaluations according to this one system.
3. Meetings of the heads of departments and of Study Programs with the students on issues of the educational process, which are discussed and their evaluations on the indicators for assessment.
4. Opinions of the Student Council, presented in the governing bodies or in writing if necessary.

Art. 30 (1) Evaluation surveys are anonymous, conventional, and are conducted according to a pre-made questionnaire that is provided to each student.

(2) The questions in all surveys follow the accepted evaluation indicators (Appendices 1, 2, and 3) for the relevant object, but may also contain other, topical issues. The essential thing is from them to be able to form evaluations according to the indicators.

1. Questions are posed as positive statements directly related to the indicators for evaluating the relevant object. Students mark the answer they chose to each statement "agree" "rather yes" "as much agree as no", "rather no", "disagree" by also answering the question of what part of the lectures the student attended.
2. The organization of the study discipline review survey is as follows:
  - a. Under the supervision of Deputy the rector of the educational process office "Technology of Education" prepares the questionnaires (questionnaire cards) for student groups on majors by using a template and filling in the name of the discipline.
  - b. A committee consisting of two - a member of the student council and an office worker "Technology of Education", distributes questionnaires to students trained in this discipline in the current semester.
  - c. Filled in by the students, the questionnaires are collected by the committee. They sign protocol in which it is reported how many students are subject to survey, how many the questionnaires were collected and the date they were collected.
  - d. Two different surveys are done – before and after the exam session with different content, in the second of which dominate questions in the examination session and student assessment.
  - e. Questionnaire cards are systematized and stored in the office "Technology of the training" and are provided against the signature of the head of the department and the head of the Training Program in whose curriculum the examinee is discipline.
  - f. Deputy gets acquainted with the results of the polls. the rector of the academic process, the chancellor and the president.
  - g. Assessments from surveys are used as one of the sources under Art. 27.

(3) The Student Council can be used as a source of information on some of the grades provided for students.

(4) In the "Technology of Education" office, the results of the surveys are averaged according to vindicators taking into account the higher significance of the answers of students with more regularity attendance at lectures. On the mechanism of averaging and its reduction in scores of ten ball scale vice. the rector of the academic process issues instructions.

Art. 31 (1) The evaluation of teachers is carried out with a survey corresponding to the status of the teacher (tenured or assistant). The survey includes relevant indicators and can be conducted in parallel with the study subjects survey. The order of the previous art. 30.

(2) About the mechanism of averaging, which takes into account the teacher's evaluations as holder or participant in various disciplines, and its reduction in grades on a ten-point scale deputy the rector of the academic process issues instructions.

(3) An assessment is formed for each teacher once a year, at the beginning of the academic year.

Art. 32. The evaluation of Study Programs by the students is carried out in the order of the preceding articles, but the surveys contain other questions related to indicators of evaluation of Programs.

Art. 33. (1) The opinions of the Head of the Program Council and the Head of the Department, as well as surveys with the teachers who have competence are presented in tables, similar to the self-assessments they complete.

(2) Surveys with employers and former students are prepared with appropriately selected issues arising from the evaluation criteria and indicators and their weighting. They are being prepared in the "Technology of Education" office under the supervision of the deputy. the rector of the educational process.

(3) The data providing the administration as the source shall be extracted from the documents in the University archive. (example list of documents - in Appendix 7). The details are specified by the rector's order for the relevant audit.

Art. 34 (1) The numerical evaluation of each criteria is obtained in the following way:

1. Each of the sources of information  $i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_6, i_7$ , give their ratings for each indicator by filling in a pre-prepared table, taking into account the maximum number of points awarded to the indicator under Annexes 1, 2 or 3.
2. Estimates received from sources  $i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_6, i_7$ , in the form of numbers, smaller or equal to the maximum number of points for the indicator, are multiplied by the coefficient of awareness the source has of the given metric. This is how its reduced form is obtained in the assessment. Since the sum of the awareness coefficients is equal to one, the sum of reduced scores models the aggregated quality score for a given metric.



3. Aggregate grade is a number less than or equal to the maximum number of points the indicator. The sum of the aggregated evaluations of the indicators for a given criterion form points scored - a number less than or equal to the maximum number of points for the criterion.
4. The sum of the scored points for all criteria forms the final grade for the quality of the given object in this assessment.

(2) The commissions under Art. 25 give the final grades based on the numerical results obtained from all sources involved and their weight.

(3) To carry out the calculations according to the previous texts the office of the "Technology of Education" has appropriate software.

### **13. PROCEDURES FOR VALIDATION OF QUALITY ASSESSMENTS AND CORRECTIVE EFFECTS ON ITS IMPROVEMENT**

Art. 35 (1) The results of the review (evaluations) are valid if they were carried out according to procedures corresponding to the object of evaluation under the following paragraphs.

(2) For Training Programs the procedure is:

1. The head of the Program submits a self-evaluation report compiled according to the criteria and the indicators from Appendix 1, which is discussed in the Academic Council.
2. The Academic Council analyzes the weaknesses and makes decisions about governing impacts and adjustments by approving (or rejecting) the assessment.
3. The implementation of the decisions and the impacts are assigned to the relevant units, to which are addressed, means and deadlines for control are determined.
4. Information on the results of the examination is published on the internal website of the university.

(3) For academic disciplines, the procedure is:

1. The subject holder submits a self-assessment report based on the criteria and the indicators (Appendix No. 2), which is considered at the Faculty Council of the department, in charge of discipline.
2. The accepted self-evaluation is reported to the Program Board of the program, in whose study plan is the relevant discipline.
3. The program board approves (or rejects) the evaluation by analyzing the weaknesses and makes decisions about management impacts and correctives.
4. The implementation of decisions and impacts is assigned to the relevant units, to which are addressed, and means and deadlines for control are determined.

(4) For teachers:

1. The teacher presents his self-evaluation according to the criteria and indicators Appendix No. 3.
2. The self-evaluation is reviewed by the Department Council of the department where the teacher works, and assessments and remedial actions are suggested.



3. Assessments and corrective actions are reported to the Academic Committee academic staff development council.
4. The Committee of the Academic Council makes decisions on governing impacts and corrections by confirming (or rejecting) the assessment.
5. The evaluation according to a ten-point system is reported to the rector and the president and affects the teacher's salary for the next period.
6. The teachers have given their consent under Art. 45 par. 3 of the University regulations their assessment to be public. The extent of publicity is determined at the discretion of the academic leadership.

#### **14. ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF DISTANCE LEARNING**

Art. 34. In connection with the evaluation and maintenance of the quality of the remote control training, the European Polytechnic University (EPU) undertakes to provide high-quality materials, resources and services for DOs commensurate and compatible with the educational services it offers through other means. To achieve this, the University is committed to providing:

- a continuous and thorough process of verification, monitoring and support of the offered educational services, which aims to ensure high quality and standards of education in general and distance education in particular.
- clear mechanisms for promoting and disseminating good practices of the use of educational institutions to increase the quality of education;
- organization of seminars, round tables, conferences, etc. for familiarizing the academic community, as well as for national and international presentation of the achievements and good practices of EPU in the field of research and the Distance Learning application.

**Monitoring, evaluation, maintenance and improvement of quality of the Distance Form of Education (DFE) is part of the university's quality management system (SOPKO), incl. the general provisions regulated in it, emphasis placed, informational and methodological provision.**

Art. 35 (1) The admission of students and doctoral students to the DFE takes place within the framework of the approved number of the order of art. 9., para. 3., item 6. of ZVO. Admission to the DFE is carried out according to state requirements for student admission.

(2) Vocational education is equal to the regular form of education in terms of the content of the curriculum plan, required number of credits for the relevant specialty, diploma for completed OCS and professional qualification.

(3) The organization and conduct of the DFE are regulated in the rules of the EPU.

(4) The activity on the planning, organization and conduct of the DFE is carried out through a special service unit of EPU for distance education was established. CSO implements the technological and technical provision of training.

(5) Educational and methodological provision in the DFE is carried out by the main unit, conducting the relevant training.

## **15. PROMOTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF QUALITY**

Art. 36 (1) Incentives have a moral and material expression.

(2) For teachers, the incentives are contained in:

1. Adjustment of the salary for the next period according to the Formation Ordinance of the teachers' salary in accordance with the assessment received for the quality.
2. Initiating a procedure for advancement in an academic position;
3. Additional one-time financial incentive;
4. Publication of the best teachers on the University website;
5. Publishing the rating of all teachers during the evaluation period;
6. Other bonuses as decided by the AC.

(3) For managers, they are contained in:

1. Influence of the result of the evaluation of the Training Program on the remuneration of the head and deputy. the head of the Program;
2. Influence of the result of teacher evaluations on the remuneration of the deputy head the head of the department from which the teachers are.
3. Other bonuses as decided by the AC.

The system for evaluating and maintaining the quality of education was adopted at a meeting of the Academic Council of the European Polytechnic University on December 22, 2011 and updated on 27.12.2021