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# Information about the visit and its course

## 1.1. Composition of the Polish Accreditation Committee’s evaluation panel

Chair: , PKA member;

Members:

1.

2.

3.

4.

## 1.2. Information about the evaluation process

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

(You should indicate if it is the first or a subsequent visit, mention the grounds of the site visit; PKA’s initiative, request of the minister responsible for higher education, HEI’s request, and briefly present the evaluation procedure, major actions taken by the members of the evaluation panel during the site visit and meetings held with internal and external stakeholders. If the evaluation is a subsequent programme evaluation, you should provide information on the results of the last programme evaluation).

Legal basis of the evaluation is mentioned in Annex no. 1, and a detailed schedule of the site visit, including the division of tasks between individual members of the evaluation panel, is mentioned in Annex no. 2.

# Basic information about the study programme in the field of study under evaluation

(if the field of study is offered at different levels of study, information should be provided for each level of study)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of the field of study** |  |
| **Level of study**(First-cycle, second-cycle, long-cycle programme) |  |
| **Degree profile** | Practical |
| **Mode of study** (full-time/part-time) |  |
| **Name of the area of education, to which the field of study has been assigned**(if the field of study has been assigned to more than one area of education, you should quote the percentage share of the number of ECTS credits for each area in the number of ECTS credits required in the programme of study for being awarded a qualification corresponding to the level of education) |  |
| **Fields of science/arts and scientific/artistic disciplines, to which learning outcomes of the field of study under evaluation relate** (in accordance with the regulation of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of 8 August 2011 on the areas of knowledge, fields of science and arts and scientific and artistic disciplines, OJ 2011, No. 179, item 1065) |  |
| **Number of semesters and the number of ECTS credits required in the programme of study for being awarded qualifications corresponding to the level of study** |  |
| **Number of hours of student placements** |  |
| **Specialisation tracks offered as part of the field of study** |  |
| **Degree awarded to graduates** |  |
| **Number of academic teachers forming the minimum staff resources**  |  |
|  | **Full-time programmes** | **Part-time programmes** |
| **Number of students of the field of study** |  |  |
| **Number of hours of full-time programme classes, for which personal participation of academic teachers and students is required** |  |  |

# Assessment of the degree of satisfying the programme evaluation criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Ratings describing the degree of satisfying the criterion[[1]](#footnote-1)****Outstanding/ Fully-compliant/ Satisfactory, Partial/ Negative** |
| **Criterion 1. Concept of education and its conformity with HEI’s mission and strategy** |  |
| **Criterion 2. Study programme and possibility for achieving intended learning outcomes** |  |
| **Criterion 3. Effectiveness of internal education quality assurance system** |  |
| **Criterion 4. Staff providing the education process** |  |
| **Criterion 5. Cooperation with representatives of social and economic stakeholders in the education process** |  |
| **Criterion 6. Internationalisation of the education process** |  |
| **Criterion 7. Infrastructure used in the education process** |  |
| **Criterion 8. Care and support provided to students in the process of learning and attaining learning outcomes** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **If arguments presented in response to the site visit report or in the request for re-investigating the case justify the modification of the evaluation, the report should be amended. With reference to each criterion, in the scope of which the evaluation has been amended, you should identify documents, present brief explanation and provide additional arguments and information on the reasons that have affected the evaluation, and provide the final evaluation in Table no. 1.** |

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

**Table no. 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Rating describing the degree of satisfying the criterion**1**Outstanding/ Fully-compliant/ Satisfactory, Partial**  |
| **Note:** You should only mention the criteria, in relation to which the evaluation has changed. |  |

# Detailed description of the degree of satisfying the programme evaluation criteria

## Criterion 1. Concept of education and its conformity with HEI’s mission and strategy

* 1. Concept of education
	2. Development work in the areas of professional/economic activity typical for the field of study
	3. Learning outcomes

### Analysis of actual facts and the assessment of the degree of satisfying Criterion 1.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Justification, taking into account the strengths and weaknesses

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Good practices

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Recommendations

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

## Criterion 2. Study programme and possibility for achieving intended learning outcomes

* 1. Study programme and programme of study - selection of course contents and teaching methods
	2. Effectiveness of achieving intended learning outcomes
	3. Student admission, completion of a given stage of a study programme, awarding diplomas, recognition and attestation of learning outcomes.

### Analysis of actual facts and the assessment of the degree of satisfying Criterion 2.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Justification, taking into account the strengths and weaknesses

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Good practices

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Recommendations

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

## Criterion 3. Effectiveness of internal education quality assurance system

* 1. Design, approval, monitoring and periodic reviews of study programme
	2. Public access to information

### Analysis of actual facts and the assessment of the degree of satisfying Criterion 3.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Justification, taking into account the strengths and weaknesses

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Good practices

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Recommendations

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

## Criterion 4. Staff providing the education process

* 1. The number, scientific/artistic achievements, professional experience gained outside the HEI and teaching competences of staff
	2. Staffing of classes
	3. Professional development and in-service training of staff

### Analysis of actual facts and the assessment of the degree of satisfying Criterion 4.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Justification, taking into account the strengths and weaknesses

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Good practices

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Recommendations

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

## Criterion 5. Cooperation with representatives of social and economic stakeholders in the education process

### Analysis of actual facts and the assessment of the degree of satisfying Criterion 5.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Justification, taking into account the strengths and weaknesses

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Good practices

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Recommendations

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

## Criterion 6. Internationalisation of the education process

### Analysis of actual facts and the assessment of the degree of satisfying Criterion 6.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Justification, taking into account the strengths and weaknesses

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Good practices

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Recommendations

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

## Criterion 7. Infrastructure used in the education process

* 1. Teaching infrastructure and this used for practical training
	2. Library, IT and education resources
	3. Development and improvement of infrastructure

### Analysis of actual facts and the assessment of the degree of satisfying Criterion 7.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Justification, taking into account the strengths and weaknesses

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Good practices

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Recommendations

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

## Criterion 8. Care and support provided to students in the process of learning and attaining learning outcomes

* 1. Effectiveness of care and support system and of motivating students to achieve learning outcomes
	2. Development and improvement of the system to support and motivate students

### Analysis of actual facts and the assessment of the degree of satisfying Criterion 8.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Justification, taking into account the strengths and weaknesses

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Good practices

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

### Recommendations

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

# Assessment of the unit’s acting on the recommendations presented in the last PKA’s evaluation with reference to the results of the current evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation** | **Description of improvement measures and assessment of their effectiveness** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Annexes:

## Annex No. 1. Legal basis of the evaluation of education quality

## Annex No. 2. Detailed schedule of the site visit and the division of tasks between individual members of the evaluation panel

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

## Annex No. 3. Evaluation of selected mid-term papers and of final theses

**Part 1. Evaluation of randomly selected mid-term papers**

(divided into the following categories: mid-term papers written during first-cycle full-time programmes, mid-term papers written during first-cycle part-time programmes, mid-term papers written during second-cycle full-time programmes, mid-term papers written during second-cycle part-time programmes. Mid-term papers written during long-cycle full-time programmes, mid-term papers written during long-cycle part-time programmes - if applicable)

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

**Part 2. Evaluation of randomly selected final theses**

(divided into the following categories: Theses written at the end of first-cycle full-time programmes, theses written at the end of first-cycle part-time programmes, theses written at the end of second-cycle full-time programmes, theses written at the end of second-cycle part-time programmes. Theses written at the end of long-cycle full-time programmes, theses written at the end of long-cycle part-time programmes - if applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Graduate’s full name** |  |
| **Student’s book number** |  |
| **Level of study (first-cycle/second-cycle/ long-cycle programme)****Mode of study****(full-time/part-time)** |  |
| **Field of study / specialisation track** |  |
| **Thesis title** |  |
| **Full name, degree/title of thesis supervisor and thesis grade awarded by the supervisor** |  |
| **Full name, degree/title of thesis reviewer and thesis grade awarded by the reviewer** |  |
| **Overall grade** |  |
| **Grade awarded for the final examination** |  |
| **Grade at the diploma** |  |
| **Questions asked during the final examination** |  |
| **Type (nature of the work) and a brief description of the contents** |  |
| **Assessment of the degree, to which the thesis meets the requirements relevant for the field of study under evaluation, level of study and general academic profile, including:** |  |
| **a. conformity of the topic of the thesis with learning outcomes for the field of study under evaluation and its scope**  | **YES/NO[[2]](#footnote-2)** |
|  **b. conformity of the contents and structure of the thesis with its topic**  | **YES/NO1** |
| **c. correctness of applied methods, terminology, grammar and style** | **YES/NO1** |
| **d. selection of literature used in the thesis** | **YES/NO1** |
| **Does the thesis satisfy the criteria typical for master or bachelor of science degree theses if the programme leads to the award of an inżynier or magister inżynier degree (bachelor of science or master of science)** | **YES/NO/NOT APPLICABLE** |
| **Legitimacy of grades for final theses awarded by supervisors and reviewers**  |  |

## Annex No. 4. List of academic teachers who can be included in the minimum staff resources for the field of study (from among academic teachers who gave their consent for being included in the minimum staff resources)

(separate lists must be drawn for each level of study under evaluation)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item no.** | **Full name, degree/title of the academic teacher** | **Area of knowledge/arts, field of science/arts and scientific/artistic discipline, in which the output of the academic teacher is comprised and professional experience acquired outside of the higher education institution related to skills specified in the statement of expected learning outcomes**(in accordance with the regulation of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of 8 August 2011 on the areas of knowledge, fields of science and arts and scientific and artistic disciplines, OJ 2011, No. 179, item 1065) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Annex No. 5. List of academic teachers who cannot be included in the minimum staff resources for the field of study (from among academic teachers who gave their consent for being included in the minimum staff resources)

(separate lists must be drawn for each level of study under evaluation)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item no.** | **Full name, degree/title of the academic teacher** | **Justification with quoting the reasons why a teacher cannot be included in the minimum staff resources** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Annex No. 6. List of modules, for which staffing of classes is improper

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of the module / level of study / year of study** | **Full name, degree/title of the academic teacher** | **Justification**  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Annex No. 7. Information on inspected classes and their evaluation

(divided into the following categories: classes as part of first-cycle full-time programmes, classes as part of first-cycle part-time programmes, classes as part of second-cycle full-time programmes, classes as part of second-cycle part-time programmes. classes as part of long-cycle full-time programmes, classes as part of long-cycle part-time programmes - if applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course name / module, mode of class (lecture, tutorial, seminar, laboratory, language course, etc.)** |  |
| **Full name, degree/title of the academic teacher teaching the class** |  |
| **Specialisation track/mode (full-time/part-time) year/semester/group** |  |
| **Date, time, room in which the classes are held** |  |
| **Field of study / specialisation track** |  |
| **The number of students enrolled for the class/present in class** |  |
| **Topic of the class under inspection**  |  |
| **Rating:** |
| **a. form of activity in the class and the academic teacher’s contact with the group** |  |
| **b. conformity of the class topic with course/module syllabus** |  |
| **c. preparedness of the academic teacher for the class** |  |
| **d. correctness of the selection of teaching methods** |  |
| **e. correctness of the selection of teaching materials** |  |
| **f. use of teaching infrastructure, information technology, access to apparatus, etc.** |  |

1. If the ratings for individual levels of study vary, you should quote the rating for each individual level. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Delete as appropriate. If you selected answer NO, justify briefly [↑](#footnote-ref-2)