

**Resolution No. 1/2011  
of the Polish Accreditation Committee  
of 10 November 2011  
on the Statutes of the Polish Accreditation Committee**

§ 1

On the basis of Article 53 (1) of the Act of 27 July 2005, the Law on Higher Education (Journal of Law No. 164, item 1365, as amended by subsequent legislation), the Polish Accreditation Committee hereby adopts its Statutes which form an annex to this Resolution.

§ 2

The Resolution shall come into force on the date of its adoption.

PRESIDENT  
OF THE POLISH ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE

Marek Rocki

STATUTES  
OF  
THE POLISH ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE

adopted on 10 November 2011

§ 1.

1. The Polish Accreditation Committee, hereafter referred to as 'the Committee', is an institution established on the basis of the Act of 27 July 2005, the Law on Higher Education (Journal of Law No. 164, item 1365, as amended by subsequent legislation), hereafter referred to as 'the Act', and acting independently for enhancing the quality of higher education.
2. The activities of the Committee shall cover public and non-public higher education institutions which are subject to the provisions of the Act.
3. The Committee shall cooperate with national and international institutions and organisations active in the field of higher education, and in particular with those which are concerned with quality assessment of education or accreditation.
4. The activities of the Committee shall be subject to external review at least every five years and in accordance with operational arrangements for accreditation agencies working within the European Higher Education Area.

§ 2.

1. The term of office of the Committee shall be four years and shall begin on 1 January.
2. The President of the Committee and its Secretary shall be appointed and dismissed by the minister responsible for higher education, hereafter referred to as 'the Minister'.
3. Members of the Committee shall be appointed by the Minister, except for the President of the Students' Parliament of the Republic of Poland who shall be a member of the Committee by virtue of law.
4. A member of the Committee may be dismissed by the Minister at the request of the Presidium of the Committee.
5. The first plenary session of the Committee in a new term of office shall be convened by the Minister.

§ 3.

The Committee shall include sections, hereafter referred to as 'the Sections', working within academic areas which cover the following domains of science and fine arts:

- 1) Humanities and Theology,
- 2) Economics,
- 3) Social Sciences and Law,

- 4) Mathematics, Physical and Chemical Sciences,
- 5) Biological, Earth, Agricultural, Forestry and Veterinary Sciences,
- 6) Engineering and Technology,
- 7) Medical, Pharmaceutical, Health and Physical Culture Sciences,
- 8) Film, Music, Visual Art and Theatre Sciences.

#### § 4.

1. The Committee shall present to the Minister opinions and motions concerning in particular:
  - 1) programme evaluation, including the evaluation of initial teacher training programmes;
  - 2) institutional evaluation, including the quality evaluation of third-cycle programmes and non-degree postgraduate programmes;
  - 3) the compliance with the requirements for the provision of programmes as laid down in the legislation;
  - 4) the re-granting of suspended authorisations to provide programmes in specific fields of study and at specific levels of study;
  - 5) the establishment of higher education institutions;
  - 6) the granting of authorisations to organisational units of higher education institutions to provide programmes in specific fields of study and at specific levels of study where the field of study concerned covers an academic area and domains of science or fine arts which do not correspond to authorisations to confer post-doctoral degrees (*doktor habilitowany*) held by a given unit;
  - 7) the establishment of a higher education institution or a branch campus in the territory of the Republic of Poland by a foreign higher education institution.
2. Evaluations referred to in section 1, subsections (1) and (2) shall be conducted by the Committee in the following cases:
  - 1) where a given field of study and organisational unit of a higher education institution has been selected for evaluation by the Presidium of the Committee;
  - 2) at the request of the Minister;
  - 3) at the request of the higher education institution concerned.
3. The Committee may request clarification and information from higher education institutions concerning matters within its remit, undertake site visits to higher education institutions and process personal data of academic staff and students in institutions under evaluation in so far as it is necessary to perform the tasks referred to in section 1.
4. At the request of a unit applying for authorisations to confer doctoral (*doktor*) and/or postdoctoral degrees (*doktor habilitowany*), the Committee shall give its opinion on the quality of education provided by the unit concerned.
5. The Committee shall give its opinion on draft legislation concerning higher education and science received from the competent ministers.
6. In performing their duties, members of the Committee and its experts shall be guided by the principles of diligence, impartiality and transparency, and shall give their opinions and assessments in accordance with the evaluation criteria adopted by the Committee which are laid down in the annex to the Statutes.

#### § 5.

1. The Committee shall work at plenary sessions and through its bodies.
2. At plenary sessions, the Committee shall, in particular:
  - 1) adopt and amend its Statutes;
  - 2) adopt its mission statement, strategy and quality policy;
  - 3) adopt and amend its Code of Ethics;
  - 4) appoint the Section for Ethics;
  - 5) elect its Vice-Presidents;
  - 6) undertake a summary review of its performance;
  - 7) take its position on matters presented by the Minister.
3. The bodies of the Committee shall be:
  - 1) the President,
  - 2) the Secretary,
  - 3) the Presidium.

#### § 6.

1. The Code of Ethics shall lay down the principles of ethical conduct for members and experts of the Committee and specify the extent of liability for violating them.
2. Committee members and experts shall be accountable for violating the standards of conduct laid down in the Code of Ethics to the Section for Ethics.
3. The Section for Ethics, composed of five members, shall be appointed from among Committee members at the first plenary session of the Committee in a given term of office.
4. Detailed organisational and operational arrangements for the Section for Ethics shall be laid down in the rules of procedure adopted by the Section.

#### § 7.

1. The President shall manage the work of the Committee and represent it in external relations.
2. The President shall take decisions concerning the activities of the Committee which are not reserved for its other bodies or the Chairs of the Sections.
3. In particular, the President shall:
  - 1) convene, subject to § 2, section 5, and chair plenary sessions of the Committee;
  - 2) convene and chair meetings of the Presidium;
  - 3) sign resolutions of the Committee and its Presidium and contracts or agreements concluded with institutions and organisations referred to in § 1, section 3;
  - 4) establish criteria and procedures for the appointment of experts who are not members of the Committee, and draw up and update a list of such experts;
  - 5) appoint the Sections and specify the fields of study falling within their remit, while taking into consideration the academic areas from which they stem;
  - 6) confirm the expiry of the mandate of a Committee member for reasons referred to in Article 46b, section 1 of the Act;

- 7) exclude a Committee member or expert for reasons referred to in Article 48a, section 6 of the Act;
- 8) lay down the rules for proceedings in matters falling within the remit of the Committee;
- 9) lays down the procedure for electronic voting, taking into consideration the need to maintain the accountability for, and confidentiality of, voting, i.e. to ensure positive identification of the individuals taking part in voting and prevent unauthorised access to information;
- 10) supervise the internal quality assurance system, including the appointment of a representative for the quality management system;
- 11) appoint working groups;
- 12) determine the levels of fees for opinions and evaluations.

#### § 8.

1. The President may establish a Consultative Council, hereafter referred to as 'the Council', which shall perform opinion-giving and advisory functions for the Committee.
2. The Council may be composed of former Presidents of the Committee, representatives of the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland, the Conference of Rectors of Non-University Higher Education Institutions in Poland and employers' organisations, and representatives and experts of international accreditation agencies who have extensive knowledge and experience in quality evaluation of education and in the management of higher education institutions.
4. Detailed organisational and operational arrangements for the Council shall be laid down in the rules of procedure adopted by the Council.

#### § 9.

1. The Secretary shall ensure efficient functioning of the Committee and the performance of its tasks.
2. In particular, the Secretary shall:
  - 1) organise current activities of the Committee and sign related documents;
  - 2) resolve disputes between the Sections related to their remit;
  - 3) appoint evaluation panels;
  - 4) appoint experts delivering opinions on individual matters.

#### § 10.

1. The Presidium shall be composed of:
  - 1) the President,
  - 2) the Secretary,
  - 3) the Chairs of the Sections,
  - 4) the President of the Students' Parliament of the Republic of Poland,
  - 5) two representatives of employers' organisations, elected from among themselves by members of the Committee delegated by employers' organisations.
2. The powers of the Presidium shall include in particular:
  - 1) adopting resolutions on matters referred to in § 4, sections 1, 2 and 4;
  - 2) identifying fields of study and higher education institutions or their organisational units to be subject to evaluation in a given academic year;

- 3) adopting guidelines for self-evaluation reports and templates for such reports;
- 4) adopting rules for conducting site visits and templates for site visit reports;
- 5) submitting a motion to the Minister to dismiss a member of the Committee.

3. In adopting resolutions referred to in § 4, sections 1 and 2, the Presidium shall be guided by reports submitted by the individual Sections.

#### § 11.

1. At the request of the President, the Committee shall elect no more than two Vice-Presidents.
2. The powers of Vice-Presidents shall include:
  - 1) participating in the work of the Presidium;
  - 2) planning activities to implement the strategy of the Committee;
  - 3) analysing the activities of the Committee, and preparing on a regular basis a self-evaluation report necessary for an external review of the Committee referred to in § 1, section 4;
  - 4) organising cooperation with national organisations and institutions, in particular those which are concerned with quality evaluation or accreditation;
  - 5) cooperating with foreign institutions and international organisations which are concerned with quality evaluation of education or accreditation;
  - 6) preparing documents and papers related to the implementation of arrangements established as part of cooperation referred to in subsections 4 and 5;
  - 7) presenting achievements of the Committee abroad;
  - 8) developing Committee members' awareness of arrangements in the area of accreditation and quality evaluation of education adopted in other countries.
3. The precise remit of the Vice-Presidents shall be defined by the President of the Committee.
4. The President of the Committee may authorise the Vice-President or the Secretary to act on his or her behalf in specific matters.

#### § 12.

1. The Chairs of the Sections shall be elected by their members from among themselves. The Chairs of the Sections shall organise the work of the Sections and ensure that their tasks are performed in a proper and timely manner. The Chairs of the Sections shall convene and chair meetings of the Sections.
2. At the request of the Chair of the Section approved by the President of the Committee, the Section may elect a Vice-Chair from among its members.
3. In justified cases, the Chair of the Section where no Vice-Chair has been elected may authorise a member of the Section to act on his or her behalf in specific matters.
4. A Committee member may only be a member of one Section.
5. The provisions of sections 1 to 3 shall apply accordingly to working groups referred to in § 7, subsection 11.

#### § 13.

1. The Sections shall prepare reports containing opinions, evaluations and draft resolutions, together with their justifications, on matters referred to in § 4, sections 1, 2 and 4.

2. Where an institutional evaluation is conducted in a basic organisational unit of a higher education institution which provides programmes in the fields of study falling within the remit of different Sections, a report and draft resolution shall be prepared by the Section represented by the chair of the evaluation panel. Members of the other Sections involved in the evaluation shall attend, with voting rights, meetings of the Section preparing a report and a draft resolution.
3. In order to deal with other matters which fall within the remit of more than one Section, the President of the Committee or its Secretary shall appoint the coordinating Section and give consent for members of the other Sections concerned to attend a meeting of this Section with voting rights.
4. The President of the Committee, its Vice-President or Secretary may attend meetings of the Sections with voting rights.
5. The President of the Committee and the Chairs of the Sections may also invite experts who are not included in the list of the Committee's experts to attend meetings in an advisory capacity.

#### § 14.

1. Subject to § 27, resolutions at plenary sessions and resolutions of the Presidium on matters referred to in § 4, sections 1, 2 and 4 shall be adopted in an open ballot by a simple majority of votes, with at least half of the membership of the Committee or the Presidium, respectively, present.
2. Resolutions of the Presidium on personal matters shall be adopted in a secret ballot by an absolute majority of votes, with at least three-fourths of the membership of the Presidium present.
3. Voting may be conducted electronically in particularly justified cases. Electronic voting shall be conducted in accordance with a procedure laid down by the President of the Committee.
4. The provisions of sections 1 to 3 shall apply accordingly to voting conducted within the Sections.
5. The Vice-Presidents of the Committee, the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the Sections, and members and the Chair of the Section for Ethics shall be elected in a secret ballot by a simple majority of votes, with at least half of the membership of the Committee or the Section, respectively, present. The provisions of section 3 shall apply accordingly.

#### § 15.

1. Administrative and financial services for the Committee, its bodies and Sections, the Section for Ethics and working groups shall be provided by the Bureau of the Polish Accreditation Committee, hereafter referred to as 'the Bureau'. The Bureau shall be supervised by the President of the Committee.
2. The precise remit of the Bureau and its organisational structure shall be specified in its organisational regulations provided by the President of the Committee after consultation with the Presidium.
3. The Director of the Bureau shall be appointed and dismissed by the President of the Committee.

#### § 16.

1. In performing the tasks referred to in § 4, section 1, the Committee shall use, and in performing the tasks specified in § 4, section 4, the Committee may use opinions given by its members and experts referred to in section 2 below.

2. The following persons may be experts:
  - 1) an academic teacher who has recognised achievements in a given domain of science or fine arts, considerable teaching experience and experience in accreditation or quality evaluation of education;
  - 2) a person who has in-depth knowledge of the legal and organisational framework for the operation of higher education institutions;
  - 3) a student proposed by the competent body of the Students' Parliament of the Republic of Poland;
  - 4) a doctoral student proposed by the competent body of the National Representation of Doctoral Students;
  - 5) a person proposed by a representative employers' organisation within the meaning of the Act of 6 July 2001 on the Tripartite Commission for Social and Economic Issues and Regional Commissions for Social Dialogue (Journal of Law No. 100, item 1080, as amended by subsequent legislation);
  - 6) an international quality assurance expert.
3. Upon their consent, members of the Committee in its previous terms of office shall be included in the list of its experts.
4. Experts referred to in section 2, subsections 1 to 5 are required to be familiar with the operational arrangements of the Committee and apply its evaluation procedures and criteria.
5. Members and experts of the Committee shall receive a fee for written opinions and evaluations.

#### § 17.

1. Subject to section 2 below, in matters referred to in § 4, section 1, subsections 3 to 7, the relevant Section shall prepare opinions and draft resolutions based on application documents and reviews.
2. Acting on their own initiative or at the request of the Chair of the Section, the President of the Committee or its Secretary may decide that a site visit should be undertaken, determining its scope and procedure.
3. Reviews referred to in section 1 shall be prepared by members of the Section or experts appointed by the Secretary in consultation with the Chair of the Section. The Chair of the Section shall propose candidates for reviewers to the Secretary within two weeks of the date of the receipt of an application by the Committee.
4. A review or a report on a site visit referred to in section 2 above shall be prepared not later than within three weeks of the date of the receipt of an application or the end date of a site visit.
5. Where a review has not been prepared by the deadline set or a review has been prepared by an expert rather than a Committee member, a given case is presented at the next meeting of the Section concerned by its Chair or a member appointed by the Chair, with a so-called internal review prepared prior to the meeting.
6. Opinions and resolutions referred to in section 1 above shall be prepared by the Section concerned not later than within four weeks of the date of the receipt of a review or a report on a site visit referred to in section 2 above.
7. Matters referred to in section 1 above shall be considered by the Presidium not later than within four weeks of the date on which the Section concerned prepared an opinion and a draft resolution.

8. Resolutions of the Presidium shall be forwarded to the Minister and the higher education institutions or applicants concerned not later than within two weeks of the date of their adoption. In the case of higher education institutions supervised by ministers other than the minister responsible for higher education, a resolution shall also be forwarded to the competent minister.

9. The Secretary may extend the time limits referred to in sections 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 in particularly justified cases.

#### § 18.

1. Quality ratings in evaluations referred to in § 4, section 1, subsections 1 and 2, except for evaluations referred to in Article 11a, sections 2 and 3, and Article 49, section 4 of the Act, shall be given following an evaluation process.

2. The evaluation process shall comprise:

- 1) a self-evaluation report prepared by the higher education institution concerned;
- 2) a site visit undertaken in accordance with the rules laid down by the Presidium;
- 3) a report prepared by an evaluation panel in accordance with a template adopted by the Presidium;
- 4) the forwarding of the evaluation panel's report to the higher education institution under evaluation;
- 5) feedback on the evaluation panel's report provided by the higher education institution under evaluation;
- 6) a proposed quality rating together with its justification prepared by the Section concerned;
- 7) a resolution on a programme or institutional evaluation adopted by the Presidium.

3. Higher education institutions shall prepare their self-evaluation reports in accordance with a template and guidelines adopted by the Presidium.

4. Higher education institutions shall provide their self-evaluation reports to the Committee within six weeks of the date of the receipt of evaluation notice. In particularly justified cases, the Secretary may extend the deadline for the submission of the self-evaluation report only once and by no more than five weeks.

5. A site visit should be conducted not later than within eight weeks of the date of the receipt of the self-evaluation report. In particularly justified cases, the Secretary may extend the time limit for conducting a site visit.

6. The failure of a higher education institution to provide its self-evaluation report or feedback on the report from an evaluation panel shall not prevent further action within the evaluation process.

7. The Director of the Committee's Bureau shall notify the higher education institution concerned of the date of a site visit and shall provide an outline agenda for the visit to the institution not later than two weeks before the starting date of the visit.

#### § 19.

1. The evaluation process referred to in § 18, section 1 shall be conducted by an evaluation panel composed of Committee members and experts.

2. The chair of an evaluation panel shall be a member of the Committee or, in particularly justified cases, an expert referred to in § 16, section 3.

3. An evaluation panel, composed of two to five members in the case of programme evaluation and three to eight members in the case of institutional evaluation, shall be appointed by the Secretary in consultation with the Chair of the Section concerned. The Secretary may increase the number of evaluation panel members in particularly justified cases.

§ 20.

1. Following the analysis of a self-evaluation report and a site visit, an evaluation panel shall prepare a report within a period of six weeks. The report shall contain:

- 1) in the case of a programme evaluation: a quality assessment of education provided as part of a given programme, taking into consideration learning outcomes and the compliance with the requirements for the provision of a given programme which have impact on its quality, as laid down in the regulations issued on the basis of Article 9, section 3, subsections 1 to 4, and Articles 9b and 9c of the Act;
- 2) in the case of an institutional evaluation:
  - a) an assessment of the activities of the basic organisational unit of the higher education institution concerned, and
  - b) a quality assessment of education provided as part of third-cycle programmes and non-degree postgraduate programmes, where such programmes are offered.

2. A report of an evaluation panel referred to in section 1 above shall be sent to the higher education institution concerned which may provide its feedback on the report within three weeks of the date of its receipt.

3. The chair of an evaluation panel shall present, at a meeting of the Section concerned, assessments referred to in section 1 which are given in the report and the feedback received from the higher education institution concerned.

4. Minutes of the Section's meeting and a draft resolution on the quality rating given as a result of an evaluation referred to in § 18, section 1, together with its justification, shall be presented at a meeting of the Presidium by the Chair of the Section concerned or, in particularly justified cases, by a person appointed by the Chair not later than within six weeks of the date of the receipt of the feedback from the higher education institution concerned.

5. The provisions of § 17, sections 7 and 8 shall apply accordingly.

§ 21.

1. A resolution of the Presidium on matters referred to in § 18, section 1 shall include a quality rating, awarded in accordance with the scale established in Article 49, section 6 of the Act, and its justification.

2. A resolution may also include recommendations.

3. The President of the Committee shall put proposed quality ratings to the vote, starting with an outstanding rating.

4. Re-evaluation is conducted:

- 1) after 8 years in the case of a outstanding rating awarded previously,
- 2) after 6 years in the case of a positive rating awarded previously,

unless there are reasons to conduct it at an earlier date.

§ 22.

1. Where a conditional rating is awarded, a resolution of the Presidium shall identify shortcomings to be eliminated and set the deadline for a follow-up evaluation.
2. Where a follow-up evaluation is conducted, the President of the Committee or its Secretary may decide that another site visit should be undertaken, determining its scope and procedure. The provisions of § 20, sections 4 and 5, and § 21 shall apply accordingly.
3. Where evaluations referred to in Article 11a, sections 2 and 3, and Article 49, section 4 of the Act are conducted, a decision of the President of the Committee or its Secretary to undertake a site visit shall determine its scope and procedure. The provisions of § 20, sections 4 and 5, and § 21 shall apply accordingly.

§ 23.

1. A party which is dissatisfied with a resolution adopted by the Presidium on matters referred to in § 4, section 1 may submit a request for reconsideration of the matter within 30 days of the date of the delivery of the resolution.
2. The request referred to in section 1 shall be considered by the Section concerned and the Presidium at a joint meeting not later than within two months of the date of the receipt of the request.
3. The request shall be presented at a meeting of the Presidium by the Chair of the Section concerned or a person appointed by the Chair.

§ 24.

1. Resolutions adopted after the completion of an evaluation process, together with their justification, shall be published on the website of the Committee and in the Public Information Bulletin.
2. The Committee may also publish reports of evaluation panels on its website.

§ 25.

1. Minutes shall be taken of Committee and Presidium meetings, and reports shall be drawn up on Section meetings.
2. Minutes and reports shall include at least the reference titles of matters under consideration, the names of speakers, an opinion or a quality rating put to the vote and voting results.
3. Minutes and reports signed by the President of the Committee or the Chair of the Section, together with attendance lists, resolutions adopted, documentation concerning opinion-giving processes in matters referred to in § 4, section 1, subsections 4 to 7, and documentation concerning evaluation processes shall be archived in accordance with separate legislation.

§ 26.

Fees for members of the Committee and experts referred to in § 16 and costs of site visits referred to in § 17, section 2, § 18, section 2, subsection 2, and § 22, sections 2 and 3, shall be covered by funds allocated for the activities of the Committee in section 803, Higher Education, of the State budget.

§ 27.

The Statutes of the Committee shall be adopted at a plenary session of the Committee by a simple majority of votes, with at least half of its membership present, at the request of the President or at least 30 members of the Committee.

§ 28.

The provisions of § 18, section 5 of the Statutes referred to in § 29 shall remain in force until 31 December 2011.

§ 29.

The Statutes adopted by Resolution no. 1/2005 of the State Accreditation Committee of 13 October 2005 is hereby repealed.

§ 30.

The Statutes shall come into force on the date of its adoption, except for § 3 which shall come into force on 1 January 2012.

## PART I

### Criteria for Programme Evaluation

- 1. The unit has formulated a concept for the development of the programme under evaluation.**
  - 1) The concept of education refers to the mission statement of the higher education institution and corresponds to the aims set in the strategy of the unit.
  - 2) Internal and external stakeholders are involved in the process of defining the concept of education for the programme concerned, including its profile/orientation, aims, outcomes and development prospects.
  
- 2. The unit has developed and applies a coherent description of stated educational aims and expected learning outcomes for the programme under evaluation and a system for verifying their achievement.**
  - 1) Expected learning outcomes, which refer to a given study programme, its level/cycle and profile/orientation, are in conformity with the requirements of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and the concept for the development of the programme in the field of study concerned. Expected learning outcomes for practically-oriented programmes take into consideration expectations of the labour market or requirements of professional organisations, enabling students to acquire qualifications necessary to practise a given profession. Expected learning outcomes for general academically-oriented programmes take into consideration the requirements defined for a given academic area from which the field of study concerned stems. The description of learning outcomes is published.
  - 2) Learning outcomes for a given programme are easily understandable and assessable.
  - 3) The unit applies a transparent system for the assessment of learning outcomes which makes it possible to verify stated aims and to assess the achievement of learning outcomes at each stage of education. This system is accessible to all.
  - 4) The unit tracks its graduates' careers on the labour market and makes use of findings to enhance the quality of the teaching/learning process.
  
- 3. The study programme enables the achievement of expected learning outcomes.**
  - 1) The study programme implemented by the unit enables students to achieve each of the stated educational aims of the programme and expected learning outcomes and the expected structure of the graduate's qualifications.
  - 2) Expected learning outcomes, programme contents, types of classes, and teaching and learning methods used make up a coherent whole.
  
- 4. The number and quality of staff guarantees the achievement of educational aims set for the study programme.**
  - 1) The number of research and teaching staff and the structure of their qualifications enable the achievement of the stated educational aims of the programme concerned and the expected outcomes of its implementation.

- 2) Research achievements and teaching skills of staff, in particular staff members counted towards the minimum staff resources, are adequate for the programme implemented and expected learning outcomes. Where programmes are practically oriented, the teaching process involves teachers with practical experience related to a given field of study.
- 3) The unit pursues a staff policy encouraging skills enhancement and provides conditions for staff to develop their research and teaching competence and career through, among other things, exchanges with higher education institutions and research institutions within the country and abroad.

**5. The unit provides adequate teaching/learning and research facilities ensuring the achievement of expected learning outcomes and enabling the conduct of scientific research.**

The higher education institution provides facilities which are necessary to achieve the final learning outcomes defined for the programme under evaluation, and which take into consideration the needs of disabled people.

**6. The unit conducts scientific research within the academic area(s) to which the field of study of the programme under evaluation is assigned.**

Results of scientific research conducted are used in the teaching/learning process. Where a general academically-oriented programme is offered, the unit enables students to participate in scientific research and acquire knowledge and skills which are useful in research work.

**7. The higher education institution provides students with adequate support in the learning process.**

- 1) Student admission rules and procedures are transparent, take into consideration the principle of equal opportunities and ensure proper selection of applicants for the programme concerned.
- 2) The system for assessing student achievements is oriented towards the learning process, includes standard requirements, and ensures the transparency and objectivity in marking.
- 3) The structure and organisation of the programme under evaluation is conducive to in-country and international mobility of students.
- 4) The system for research, learning and financial support is conducive to the academic, social and professional development of students and to the effective achievement of expected learning outcomes.

**8. The unit develops an internal quality assurance system geared towards achieving high education quality culture within the programme under evaluation**

- 1) The unit has developed a transparent structure for the management of the programme under evaluation and undertakes a comprehensive evaluation of learning outcomes on a regular basis. Results of such evaluations provide a basis for a review and revision of the study programme and methods for its implementation, geared towards enhancing the quality of the final outcomes of the programme concerned.
- 2) The process of assuring quality and developing a quality culture involves staff, students, graduates and other external stakeholders.

## PART II

### Criteria for Institutional Evaluation

#### 1. The unit has a development strategy in place.

- 1) The strategy for the development of the unit is convergent with the mission statement and strategy of the higher education institution and takes into consideration the policy for assuring high quality of education.
- 2) The unit has developed a concept of education covering first-cycle, second-cycle, third-cycle (doctoral) and non-degree postgraduate programmes, hereafter referred to as 'programmes', which is consistent with its strategic aims and objectives.
- 3) The unit defines its role and position on the education market while taking into consideration the importance of the quality of education.
- 4) Internal and external stakeholders are involved in the process of determining the range and contents of programmes and courses offered and building a high education quality culture.

#### 2. The unit applies an effective internal quality assurance system.

- 1) The structure for decision-making in quality management is transparent and ensures the involvement of staff, students, doctoral students, learners following non-degree postgraduate programmes and external stakeholders in important decisions concerning the quality of education.
- 2) Internal quality assurance procedures are comprehensive, prevent pathologies and ensure that the unit may verify and assess the effectiveness of all factors which have impact on the quality of education. In particular, the internal procedures in place enable the unit to:
  - a) assess the extent to which the learning outcomes defined for the programmes provided by the unit have been achieved;
  - b) ensure the involvement of employers and other representatives of the labour market in defining and assessing learning outcomes;
  - c) track graduates' careers in order to assess training outcomes on the labour market;
  - d) monitor and review study programmes on a periodic basis;
  - e) evaluate the rules for the assessment of students, doctoral students and learners following non-degree postgraduate programmes, and verify the outcomes of their training;
  - f) assess the quality of staff involved in, and supporting, the teaching process, including the appraisal by students, doctoral students and learners following non-degree postgraduate programmes, and the staff policy pursued by the unit;
  - g) assess the research quality of the unit;
  - h) assess material resources, including teaching/learning and research facilities as well as resources available to support students;
  - i) operate an information system, covering arrangements for the collection, analysis and use of relevant information in quality assurance;
  - j) ensure public access to up-to-date and objective information about study programmes, expected learning outcomes, and organisational and procedural arrangements for following programmes.

- 3) The unit evaluates the effectiveness of its internal quality assurance system on a regular basis and uses results of such evaluations to improve its quality assurance policy and build a quality culture.
- 3. The unit uses a coherent description of educational aims and learning outcomes for doctoral (third-cycle) and non-degree postgraduate programmes offered, and applies an efficient and credible system to verify and confirm the achievement of the aims and outcomes.**
    - 1) The unit ensures that the doctoral programmes offered lead to the achievement of learning outcomes relevant to the research area concerned and enables students to obtain a doctoral degree.
    - 2) The unit ensures that the non-degree postgraduate programmes offered lead to the achievement of learning outcomes which comply with the requirements of professional organisations and employers and enable the acquisition of qualifications to practise a profession or new skills necessary on the labour market.
    - 3) Internal and external stakeholders are involved in the process of defining learning outcomes.
    - 4) The unit applies ECTS where the number of credits corresponds to the workload of the doctoral student or the learner following a non-degree postgraduate programme, with the workload being proportionate to the learning outcomes achieved.
    - 5) The unit has put in place a credible and transparent system accessible to all, in particular students, doctoral students and learners following non-degree postgraduate programmes, which makes it possible to assess the extent to which the stated educational aims and expected learning outcomes have been achieved.
  - 4. The unit has sufficient staff, material and financial resources to achieve the stated strategic aims and objectives and expected learning outcomes.**
    - 1) The unit provides staff resources adequate to the needs resulting from research, teaching and organisational activities undertaken and pursues a staff policy which enables its staff to develop their research and teaching competence.
    - 2) The unit has adequate teaching and learning facilities which are adjusted to the specificity of the programmes offered and which ensure the achievement of expected learning outcomes.
    - 3) The financial policy of the unit ensures its sustainable development.
  - 5. The unit conducts scientific research.**

The unit conducts scientific research in the areas, domains and disciplines of science related to the programmes offered, and it uses findings from its research and the latest scientific achievements in a given area in the teaching process. The unit provides conditions for doctoral students to conduct independent scientific research and enables them to participate in the research conducted.
  - 6. The unit participates in in-country and international exchange of students, doctoral students, research and teaching staff and cooperates with national and international academic institutions, other institutions and enterprises.**
    - 1) Students, doctoral students and staff of the unit participate in international programmes.
    - 2) The unit undertakes activities aimed at the internationalisation of the teaching/learning process, covering, among other things, the definition of learning outcomes and the delivery of programmes.

- 3) The unit cooperates with national and international academic institutions.
  - 4) The unit cooperates with its social and economic environment with a view to achieving relevant learning outcomes.
- 7. The unit provides adequate research, learning and financial support for students and doctoral students in the process of attaining learning outcomes.**
- 1) The unit has put in place a system for research, learning and financial support which also takes into consideration the needs of disabled people.
  - 2) The unit has put in place an effective system for considering complaints and conflict resolution.
  - 3) The unit supports the activities of, and cooperates with, student and doctoral student self-government bodies and organisations. The governing bodies of the unit undertake activities on their own initiative in order to ensure wide participation of students, doctoral students and their representatives in the work carried out by the governing bodies and statutory and ad-hoc committees, in particular those whose activities are centred around the teaching/learning process and matters concerning students and doctoral students.
- 8. The unit has in place a coherent system of internal regulations underpinning the quality assurance process which is in conformity with the national legislation.**

### **PART III**

#### **Criteria and Conditions for Awarding Quality Ratings**

1. The provisions of Parts I and II shall apply accordingly to evaluations and opinions referred to in Article 49, section 1, subsections 1, 3 and 4 of the Act of 27 July 2005, the Law on Higher Education (Journal of Law No. 164, item 1365, as amended by subsequent legislation).

2. Conducting evaluations referred to in Article 49, section 1, subsection 2, and section 4 of the Act and § 21 of the Statutes, in accordance with the criteria set out in Parts I and II, the Committee shall use the scale of quality ratings established in Article 49, section 6 of the Act, taking into consideration the following conditions for awarding individual ratings:

1) in the case of programme evaluation:

- a) an outstanding rating may be given where the criteria defined in Part I, sections 2, 3, 4 and 8 are fulfilled at an outstanding level, and the other criteria concerning the quality of a given programme are at least fully met;
- b) a positive rating may be given where the criteria defined in Part I, sections 2, 3, 4 and 8 are at least fully met and the other criteria concerning the quality of a given programme are largely or partially met; however, no more than 25% of the total number of the criteria can be only partially met;
- c) a conditional rating may be given where the criteria defined in Part I, sections 2, 3, 4 and 8 are at least largely met, and the other criteria concerning the quality of a given programme are at least partially met;
- d) a negative rating may be given where the criteria defined for a conditional rating are not met.

2) in the case of institutional evaluation:

- a) an outstanding rating may be given where the criteria defined in Part II, sections 1 and 2 are fulfilled at an outstanding level, and the other criteria concerning the types of programmes provided by the unit are at least fully met;
- b) a positive rating may be given where the criteria defined in Part II, sections 1 and 2 are at least fully met, and the other criteria concerning the types of programmes provided by the unit are at least largely or partially met; however, no more than 25% of the total number of the criteria can be only partially met;
- c) a conditional rating may be given where the criteria defined in Part II, sections 1 and 2 are at least largely met, and the other criteria concerning the types of programmes provided by the unit are at least partially met;
- d) a negative rating may be given where the criteria defined for a conditional rating are not met.