



UNIVERSITY  
OF ŽILINA

## **FULL TEXT OF DIRECTIVE No. 210**

elaborated on 18 December 2023

### **Statute of the Accreditation Board of the University of Žilina**

## **PART 1: STATUS OF THE ACCREDITATION BOARD**

### **Article 1 General Provisions**

1. This Statute is issued as an internal regulation of the University of Žilina in accordance with the provisions of Section 15, paragraph 1, point b), of Act No. 131/2002 Coll. on Higher Education Institutions and Amendments to Certain Acts, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Higher Education Act").
2. The Statute of the Accreditation Board of the University of Žilina is an internal regulation of the University of Žilina (hereinafter referred to as "UNIZA" or "the University"), which is a part of the internal quality assurance system of education at UNIZA (hereinafter referred to as the "IQAS UNIZA").
3. This Statute regulates the status, scope, composition, responsibilities and authorities, accomplished activities, method of deliberation and decision-making of the Accreditation Board of the University of Žilina (hereinafter referred to as the "Accreditation Board") and its working groups (review panels) within the framework of the IQAS UNIZA.

### **Article 2 Status of the Accreditation Board**

1. The Accreditation Board is the highest decision-making body within the framework of quality assurance of higher education, accreditation of study programmes, habilitation proceedings and proceedings for the appointment of a professor (hereinafter referred to as the "inauguration proceedings") at UNIZA within the meaning of the Act No. 269/2018 Coll. on Quality Assurance of Higher Education and Amendment to the Act No. 343/2015 Coll. on Public Procurement and Amendments to Certain Acts, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education").
2. The decisions of the Accreditation Board are binding for all Faculties and other workplaces of UNIZA, where study programmes, habilitation proceedings and inauguration proceedings, scientific, research, development, artistic and other creative activities are delivered.

## **PART 2: THE ACTIVITY, COMPOSITION AND SCOPE OF THE ACCREDITATION BOARD**

### **Article 3 Activity of the Accreditation Board**

1. The activities of the Accreditation Board shall be governed by this Statute, which also includes the establishment of rules for the manner and conduct of the meetings (deliberations) of the Accreditation Board and its working groups.
2. In the framework of its activities, the Accreditation Board:
  - a) is responsible for the internal evaluation of the quality of education, scientific research activities, habilitation proceedings and inauguration proceedings at UNIZA,
  - b) regularly evaluates the compliance of the IQAS UNIZA with the Standards of the Slovak Accreditation Agency for Higher Education (hereinafter

- referred to as the "SAAHE") for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education and its implementation,
- c) on an irregular basis, based on suggestions from the internal and external environments, reviews the compliance of the IQAS UNIZA with the SAAHE Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education and its implementation,
  - d) discusses and approves reports on periodic and non-periodic reviews of the IQAS UNIZA,
  - e) proposes measures for improvement and initiates amendments to the IQAS UNIZA and submits them to the rector,
  - f) discusses and decides on the approval of proposals for new study programmes, proposals for modification of study programmes, proposals for cancellation of study programmes,
  - g) determines corrective measures resulting from the evaluation of the proposals referred to in point f),
  - h) approves requests for evaluation of the compliance of an existing study programme with the SAAHE Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education and the SAAHE Standards for Study Programmes,
  - i) evaluates and approves the application for accreditation of a study programme in the field of study and the level of study in which UNIZA applies for the SAAHE accreditation before sending it to the SAAHE,
  - j) performs regular ongoing supervision over the implementation of study programmes, performs periodic review and approval of study programmes, evaluates the compliance of study programmes with the SAAHE Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education and the SAAHE Standards for Study Programmes,
  - k) discusses and evaluates the fulfilment of the corrective measures set by the Accreditation Board,
  - l) decides on the suspension of the implementation of a study programme,
  - m) evaluates and approves applications for accreditation in the fields of habilitation proceedings and inauguration proceedings in which UNIZA is authorized to deliver study programmes and in new fields of the habilitation and inauguration proceedings before sending them to the SAAHE,
  - n) decides on the acquisition of the right to the habilitation proceedings and inauguration proceedings (hereinafter referred to as the "HPaIP"), on the withdrawal/cancellation of the right to the HPaIP, on the harmonization and the proposal for the acquisition of the right to the HPaIP, on the proposal for the modification of the right to the HPaIP,
  - o) regularly evaluates the level of quality of research, development, artistic and other creative activities at UNIZA,
  - p) approves corrective measures resulting from corrective measurements imposed by the SAAHE,
  - q) regularly monitors and supervises the fulfilment of the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings (Proceedings for the Appointment of Professors) at individual Faculties and institutes of UNIZA,
  - r) approves nominations of persons to the list of candidates for members of the working groups of the Accreditation Board,

- s) approves, on the proposal of the chairperson of the Accreditation Board, the members of the working groups of the Accreditation Board,
- t) where a conflict of interest is identified, the Accreditation Board shall dismiss the members of the working groups concerned on the proposal of any member of the Accreditation Board,
- u) approves, on the proposal of the chairperson of the Accreditation Board, the composition of the group of persons responsible for the elaboration of the application for the evaluation of the compliance of the internal quality assurance system according to Section 24 of the Act No. 269/2018 Coll., and the related appendices to the application,
- v) approves the application for evaluation of the compliance of the internal quality assurance system according to Section 24 of Act No. 269/2018 Coll., and related appendices of the application before sending it to the SAAHE,
- w) implements other activities related to the maintenance and improvement of the internal quality assurance system at UNIZA following the SAAHE Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education and the Standards for Study Programmes.

#### **Article 4**

#### **Composition of the Accreditation Board**

1. The Accreditation Board consists of a chairperson, a first and second vice-chairperson and members of the Accreditation Board.
2. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board is the rector. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board manages the Accreditation Board and acts and represents the Accreditation Board externally.
3. The first vice-chairperson of the Accreditation Board is the vice-rector for education, who shall represent the chairperson of the Accreditation Board in full during his/her long-term sick leave lasting more than 14 calendar days or based on a written authorization by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board.
4. The second vice-chairperson is the vice-rector for science and research, who shall represent the chairperson of the Accreditation Board in full during the long-term sick leave of the chairperson and the first vice-chairperson during a sick leave lasting more than 14 calendar days or based on a written authorization by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board.
5. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall inform the members of the Accreditation Board about the representation of the chairperson.
6. A member of the Accreditation Board shall participate in the meetings of the Accreditation Board and in the meetings of the working groups of which he/she is a member.
7. The membership in the Accreditation Board shall be non-representative.
8. The Accreditation Board has 17 members.
9. The Accreditation Board is composed of:
  - a) the rector, the chairperson of the Accreditation Board,
  - b) the vice-rector for education, the first vice-chairperson of the Accreditation Board,
  - c) the vice-rector for science and research, the second vice-chairperson of the Accreditation Board,
  - d) 7 members based on faculty proposals, each member being from a different faculty,

- e) 1 member based on proposals from other University workplaces providing university-wide study programmes,
  - f) 2 members from academic staff outside UNIZA, of whom at least 1 is active at a foreign university,
  - g) 2 members from the external environment of UNIZA from employers, while these members are not involved in the educational process and scientific research activities at UNIZA,
  - h) 2 members from among the representatives of UNIZA students studying at two different Faculties or other workplaces of UNIZA, of whom
    - 1 is a student of the 2nd level of higher education,
    - 1 is a student of the 3rd level of higher education.
10. The rector appoints and dismisses the members of the Accreditation Board based on the approval of the UNIZA Scientific Board.
  11. The post of a member of the Accreditation Board is incompatible with the position of the vice-rector, except for the vice-rector for education and the vice-rector for science and research.
  12. The post of a member of the Accreditation Board is incompatible with the position of the dean of a UNIZA faculty, vice-dean of a UNIZA faculty, director of a UNIZA institute, chairperson of the UNIZA Academic Senate, chairperson of the Academic Senate of a UNIZA faculty.
  13. The post of a member of the UNIZA Accreditation Board is incompatible with the position of a person responsible for the implementation, development and quality assurance of a study programme (guarantor of a study programme) and a person responsible for habilitation proceedings and inauguration proceedings (HPaIP guarantor). An exception may be made only in the case of the chairperson, the first and second vice-chairpersons of the Accreditation Board, provided that these members are excluded from the activities referred to in Article 3 if they are involved in the matter under discussion.

## **Article 5**

### **Nomination as a Member of the Accreditation Board**

1. The members of the Accreditation Board according to Article 4, paragraph 9, except for points a) to c), shall be approved by the UNIZA Scientific Board on the proposal of the rector.
2. Nominations for members of the Accreditation Board must be justified by the nominator.
3. The selection of candidates for membership in the Accreditation Board shall be accomplished by the Rector's Advisory Board based on nominations within the meaning of Article 5, paragraph 4 while respecting the provisions of Article 4, paragraph 9.
4. The nomination of candidates for members of the Accreditation Board shall be submitted to the rector as follows:
  - a) according to Article 4, paragraph 9, point d), by the dean of the relevant faculty; the faculty shall nominate at least 2 candidates,
  - b) according to Article 4, paragraph 9, point e), the director of the relevant UNIZA workplace, where the university-wide study programme is provided, shall nominate at least 2 candidates,
  - c) according to Article 4, paragraph 9, point f), by the dean of the relevant faculty, the director of the Institute of High Mountain Biology (hereinafter referred to as

- "VÚVB") and the director of the Institute of Forensic Research and Education (hereinafter referred to as "ÚZVV"), who shall nominate at least one candidate,
- d) according to Article 4, paragraph 9, point g), the dean of the relevant faculty, the director of the VÚVB and the director of the ÚZVV shall nominate at least 1 candidate,
  - e) according to Article 4, paragraph 9, point h) by the chairperson of the UNIZA Academic Senate (hereinafter referred to as the "AS UNIZA"), based on the approval of the student part of the AS UNIZA, who shall nominate at least 1 candidate with emphasis on the nomination of a student of a university-wide study programme,
  - f) according to Article 4, paragraph 9, point h) by the chairperson of the faculty Academic Senate (hereinafter referred to as the "AS"), based on the approval of the student part of the faculty AS, who shall nominate at least 1 candidate.
5. The basic criteria for a candidate for nomination as a member of the Accreditation Board according to Article 4, paragraph 9, points d), e), f) are:
- a) the scientific-pedagogical degree/title of professor or associate professor, or the scientific degree of DrSc./D.Sc.,
  - b) the candidate is a recognised professional and moral authority.
6. The basic criteria for a candidate for nomination as a member of the Accreditation Board according to Article 4, paragraph 9, point g) are:
- a) the candidate must hold at the time of nomination a significant professional position in a sector related to the professional profile of UNIZA,
  - b) the candidate is a recognised professional and moral authority.
7. The basic criteria for a candidate for nomination of a UNIZA student as a member of the Accreditation Board according to Article 4, paragraph 9, point h) are:
- a) excellent study results of the student who, based on the value of his/her weighted study average, belongs to the first quartile of the best students of the faculty or institute in the case of university-wide study programmes, of the students of the respective level and form of study at the faculty/institute based on the value of the weighted study average. In the case of students in the 2nd and 3rd levels of studies, the values of the student's weighted academic averages for the previous level of higher education shall be used.
  - b) the student's study of the standard length of study, unless the student's extra length of study is due to the student's participation in academic mobility under an exchange programme, subject to the conditions of that exchange programme,
  - c) disciplinary action not taken during the student's undergraduate studies.
8. In addition to the requirement stated in paragraph 2 of this Article, the nomination of a candidate for a member of the Accreditation Board must include:
- a) a professional Curriculum Vitae,
  - b) consent with the nomination,
  - c) consent with the processing of personal data,
  - d) the candidate's assignment to a field of study from the system of fields of study.
9. In the case of nomination of a candidate from among the students of UNIZA for a member of the Accreditation Board according to Article 4, paragraph 9, point h), the nomination shall include, in addition to the requirements stated in paragraphs 2 and 8, the following:
- a) the name of the faculty or institute in the case of a university-wide study programme,
  - b) the name of the study programme in which the student is enrolled,

- c) the name of the field of study from the system of fields of study,
  - d) the level of higher education,
  - e) the form of study,
  - f) confirmation from the department for education/studies of a relevant workplace/department that the student is in the first quartile of the best students of the faculty, or institute in the case of university-wide study programmes, of the students of the respective level and form of study at the faculty/institute based on the value of the weighted study average of the student. In the case of students in the 2nd and 3rd levels of studies, the values of the student's weighted academic averages for the previous levels of higher education shall be used.
10. The membership in the Accreditation Board according to Article 4, paragraph 9, points a) to c) shall commence automatically upon appointment for the post (office).
  11. The term of office of a member of the Accreditation Board according to Article 4, paragraph 9, points a) to c) shall be identical to that of the rector and the vice-rector.
  12. The term of office of a member of the Accreditation Board according to Article 4, paragraph 9, points d) to h) shall commence on the date of appointment as a member of the Accreditation Board.
  13. The term of office of a member of the Accreditation Board according to Article 4, paragraph 9, points d) to g) shall be 6 years.
  14. The term of office of a member of the Accreditation Board according to Article 4, paragraph 9, point h) shall be 2 years.

## **Article 6**

### **Termination of the Membership in the Accreditation Board**

1. The membership in the Accreditation Board terminates:
  - a) on the day on which a member of the Accreditation Board ceases to meet any of the criteria referred to in Article 5, paragraphs 5 to 7 according to his/her classification as a member of the Accreditation Board,
  - b) on the day on which a UNIZA employee ceases to be an employee of the faculty or an organisational unit that nominated him/her as a member of the Accreditation Board,
  - c) on the day on which a student of UNIZA as a member of the Accreditation Board ceases to be a student of UNIZA,
  - d) on the day on which the term of office of a member of the Accreditation Board expires according to Article 5, paragraphs 13 and 14,
  - e) on the day on which the term of office of an academic official has expired,
  - f) on the day of resignation from the membership in the Accreditation Board by written notice of resignation to the chairperson of the Accreditation Board,
  - g) on the day on which a member of the Accreditation Board has been dismissed from the Accreditation Board by the UNIZA Scientific Board based on an initiative of a member of the Accreditation Board,
  - h) upon the death of a member of the Accreditation Board.
2. Lack of activity of a member of the Accreditation Board in fulfilling his/her duties in the Accreditation Board, repeated unexcused absence from the meetings of the Accreditation Board may lead to the termination of the membership according to paragraph 1, point g) of this Article.

3. The rector is obliged in the case of paragraph 1, points a) to h) of this Article to initiate the completion of the Accreditation Board following Article 5 of this Directive.

## **Article 7**

### **Responsibilities and Authorities of the Members of the Accreditation Board**

1. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board is responsible for:
  - a) the management of the Accreditation Board,
  - b) convening meetings of the Accreditation Board,
  - c) chairing the meetings of the Accreditation Board,
  - d) announcing the call for nominations of persons for the list of candidates for the members of the working groups of the UNIZA Accreditation Board, when the draft nominations are submitted to the Accreditation Board for approval,
  - e) submitting a proposal for the composition of the working groups to the Accreditation Board for approval,
  - f) submitting a draft schedule of the Accreditation Board's activities to the Accreditation Board for approval,
  - g) submitting the annual report on the activities of the Accreditation Board to the UNIZA Scientific Board for discussion, subject to its approval by the Accreditation Board.
2. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board has the authority to:
  - a) control the fulfilment of individual decisions and tasks assigned to the members of the Accreditation Board or the members of the working group,
  - b) submit an initiative for the dismissal of a member of the Accreditation Board to the UNIZA Scientific Board,
  - c) appoint members of working groups of the Accreditation Board,
  - d) approve the minutes of the meetings of the Accreditation Board,
  - e) propose the composition of the working groups of the Accreditation Board,
  - f) propose the invitation of experts and other guests to the meetings of the Accreditation Board,
  - g) establish a timetable for the submission of applications to the Accreditation Board,
  - h) delegate specific tasks related to the activities of the Accreditation Board to the vice-chairpersons and individual members of the Accreditation Board.
3. The vice-chairpersons of the Accreditation Board:
  - a) have the right to represent the chairperson of the Accreditation Board in full during his/her long-term sick leave within the meaning of paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 4 of this Directive and the responsibilities and authorities resulting from the delegation of representation,
  - b) have the responsibilities and authorities of the members of the Accreditation Board referred to in paragraphs 4 and 5 of this Article.
4. A member of the Accreditation Board is responsible for:
  - a) attending meetings of the Accreditation Board,
  - b) accomplishing tasks assigned by the Accreditation Board,
  - c) accomplishing the assignments imposed by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board,
  - d) participating as an observer in the meetings of the working groups of the Accreditation Board,



- e) performing his/her duties and tasks independently, honestly and responsibly to the best of his/her knowledge and conscience.
5. A member of the Accreditation Board has the authority to:
- a) comment on the materials discussed and proposed resolutions,
  - b) vote on the resolutions of the Accreditation Board,
  - c) make proposals to the agenda of the Accreditation Board,
  - d) request documents and information related to the applications under discussion from the submitters on the authority of the chairperson.
6. All members of the Accreditation Board have the right to vote. Each member has one valid vote.

### **Article 8**

#### **Secretary of the Accreditation Board**

1. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall not be a member of the Accreditation Board and shall participate in the meetings of the Accreditation Board without voting rights.
2. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall support the activities of the Accreditation Board and the working groups and provide organisational and administrative support for the preparation and conduct of the meetings of the Accreditation Board and the working groups.
3. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall ensure the elaboration of the minutes of the meeting of the Accreditation Board. For this purpose, the chairpersons of the working groups shall cooperate and provide the secretary with all necessary related documents.
4. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall:
  - a) be responsible for the overall running of the Accreditation Board in terms of organisational and administrative support,
  - b) elaborate documentation for the Accreditation Board,
  - c) based on the proposal of the chairperson of the Accreditation Board, elaborate a draft agenda of the Accreditation Board meeting, which together with the invitation is sent to the members of the Accreditation Board no later than 10 days before the date of the meeting of the Accreditation Board; shall make the materials for the meeting available through the UNIZA Information System for Accreditation, or in printed form,
  - d) receive applications from the submitters, accomplish the acknowledgement of receipt of the application from the submitter,
  - e) perform a formal check of the submitted applications,
  - f) ensure communication with the submitters of applications for accreditation of a study programme and the habilitation and inauguration proceedings,
  - g) make applications available to the members of the Accreditation Board and the members of the relevant working groups,
  - h) receive proposals from members of the Accreditation Board for the agenda,
  - i) arrange the technical and agenda arrangements for the Accreditation Board meetings,
  - j) inform the Accreditation Board on the implementation of the resolutions of the Accreditation Board,
  - k) record the proceedings in the form of minutes of the meetings of the Accreditation Board,

- l) be accountable for the fulfilment of duties to the chairperson of the Accreditation Board,
- m) perform further tasks as delegated by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board.

### **Article 9**

#### **Conflict of Interest of a Member of the Accreditation Board and its Resolution**

1. If there is a conflict of interest of a member of the Accreditation Board, he/she shall immediately inform of this fact:
  - a) the chairperson of the Accreditation Board, if it is a member of the Accreditation Board,
  - b) the Accreditation Board, through its secretary, if it is the chairperson of the Accreditation Board.
2. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board shall inform the Accreditation Board of this fact, which may subsequently decide to limit the scope of activities of the person in conflict of interest in deciding on the matter under discussion. A written record of this fact shall be elaborated.
3. If a member of the Accreditation Board is aware that there are facts in the evaluation process which may affect the objectivity of his/her judgement in the evaluation of a particular application submitted and does not immediately notify the chairperson of the Accreditation Board of these facts, he/she is committing a conflict of interest and should therefore be excluded from the process of the evaluation.
4. Failure to declare a conflict of interest may lead to the termination of the membership according to Article 6, paragraph 1, point g) of this Directive.

### **PART 3: DELIBERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE ACCREDITATION BOARD**

#### **Article 10**

##### **Method of Deliberation of the Accreditation Board**

1. The rector shall convene the inaugural meeting of the Accreditation Board no later than 30 days after the approval of the members of the Accreditation Board by the UNIZA Scientific Board.
2. The Accreditation Board shall approve the statements within its competence by resolution. The statement shall include its justification.
3. Meetings of the Accreditation Board shall be convened by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board as necessary, at least once in a calendar year.
4. The meeting of the Accreditation Board shall be chaired by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board or the vice-chairperson of the Accreditation Board (hereinafter referred to as the "chairperson"). The invitation to a meeting of the Accreditation Board, together with the draft agenda for the meeting of the Accreditation Board, shall be sent by the secretary to the members of the Accreditation Board and invited persons at least 7 calendar days before the beginning of the meeting of the Accreditation Board.
5. The agenda of the Accreditation Board meeting shall be elaborated and proposed by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board in cooperation with the secretary of the Accreditation Board.

6. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall make available to the members of the Accreditation Board the supporting documents for each item on the draft agenda no later than 7 calendar days before the beginning of the meeting of the Accreditation Board.
7. The documents for the individual items of the meeting shall include in particular:
  - a) the applicant's application on which the Accreditation Board is to take a decision and its appendices,
  - b) the evaluation report or the review of the working group of the Accreditation Board on the matter under discussion,
  - c) a draft resolution of the Accreditation Board,
  - d) other reviews submitted on the application,
  - e) a statement by the submitter.
8. The meeting of the Accreditation Board shall not be public. In addition to the members of the Accreditation Board and the secretary of the Accreditation Board, other invited experts, guests and students may attend the meeting based on a proposal by the chairperson and approval by the Accreditation Board.
9. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board may declare part or all of the meeting and debate to be restricted to the members of the Accreditation Board and the secretary of the Accreditation Board.
10. Decisions of the Accreditation Board shall be taken in closed session.
11. The Accreditation Board may invite the dean of the faculty, the director of the organisational unit providing the university-wide study programme, a study programme guarantor or an HPaIP guarantor to the meeting, depending on the matter under discussion.
12. If a person invited to the meeting entrusts another person to represent him/her at the Accreditation Board meeting, the Accreditation Board shall accept the participation of the entrusted representative if the secretary and the chairperson of the Accreditation Board are informed of this fact at least three working days before the beginning of the Accreditation Board meeting, otherwise only if the Accreditation Board decides on this by voting.
13. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board may also convene an extraordinary meeting of the Accreditation Board. The secretary shall inform the members of the Accreditation Board of the convening of an extraordinary meeting of the Accreditation Board at least 3 calendar days prior to the beginning of the meeting.

## **Article 11**

### **Course of Deliberation of the Accreditation Board**

1. At the beginning of the meeting of the Accreditation Board, the chairperson shall open the debate on the draft agenda of the meeting of the Accreditation Board. During the debate, members of the Accreditation Board may propose amendments to the draft agenda. At the end of the debate, the chairperson shall put to the vote the individual proposals for amendments to the proposed agenda and then the agenda as a whole.
2. The Accreditation Board shall be able to deliberate and adopt resolutions if a majority of all members is present.
3. If the Accreditation Board does not have a quorum at the beginning of the meeting, but is expected to do so during the scheduled duration of the meeting, the chairperson may decide to postpone the beginning of the meeting until the Accreditation Board has a

- quorum. Otherwise, in cooperation with the secretary of the Accreditation Board, he/she shall set an alternative date for the meeting of the Accreditation Board.
4. The Accreditation Board shall normally discuss the items of the meeting in the order in which they were approved in the agenda of the meeting.
  5. At the beginning of the discussion of an agenda item, the chairperson shall open a debate on the agenda item, which shall be chaired by the chairperson. The first speaker shall normally be the member of the Accreditation Board to whom the application has been referred for review, or the member of the Accreditation Board chairing the working group, who has reviewed the application, or another member of the Accreditation Board if he/she has been delegated to do so by the chairperson of the working group and shall inform the members of the Accreditation Board of the draft resolution.
  6. The draft resolution on the agenda item shall be elaborated by the member of the Accreditation Board to whom the application has been assigned for review or who chairs the working group for the review of the application. If the draft resolution is communicated to the members of the Accreditation Board by the chairperson, the draft resolution for the relevant agenda item shall be elaborated by the chairperson. The draft resolution shall be delivered to the secretary at least 7 working days before the meeting of the Accreditation Board and, in the case of an extraordinary meeting of the Accreditation Board, not later than 5 working days before the meeting of the Accreditation Board.
  7. If an evaluation report has been elaborated for an application and the appendix to the report contains a statement of disagreement with its contents, this fact shall be mentioned at the beginning of the debate on the item in question.
  8. The chairperson may adjourn the meeting if the debate on the item under discussion has been concluded.
  9. The members of the Accreditation Board and invited persons may speak in the debate.
  10. The members of the Accreditation Board may propose amendments to the draft resolution tabled in the debate.
  11. At the end of the debate, the chairperson shall put the proposed amendments to the vote, followed by a vote on the drafts for resolutions.
  12. The approval of a majority of all members is required for the adoption of a resolution of the Accreditation Board; in the event of a tie, the vote of the chairperson of the Accreditation Board shall prevail.
  13. The Accreditation Board shall act by public vote. The chairperson or a member of the Accreditation Board may, in justified cases, propose a secret ballot. If the chairperson so determines, only the members and the secretary of the Accreditation Board shall be present during the vote of the Accreditation Board. In deciding on matters of accreditation of study programmes and the HPaIP, the Accreditation Board shall act by secret ballot in closed session of the Accreditation Board.
  14. The results of the vote shall be communicated to the Accreditation Board by the chairperson.
  15. The Accreditation Board shall first vote on the amendments to the draft resolution submitted by the members of the Accreditation Board in the debate in the order in which they were submitted. The Accreditation Board shall then vote on the draft resolution as a whole.
  16. If the Accreditation Board does not adopt the resolution, the relevant item shall be re-discussed. At the beginning of the re-discussion of the item, the chairperson shall summarise the previous debate, and the results of the vote, propose a new text for the resolution and open the debate on the item. The Accreditation Board shall repeat the

procedure stipulated in this paragraph until it has adopted a resolution on the agenda item. The Accreditation Board shall adjourn until its next meeting if none of the proposed resolutions is adopted following paragraph 12 of this Article or if the Accreditation Board ceases to have a quorum.

17. If a member of the Accreditation Board is unable to attend a meeting, he/she shall immediately notify the secretary of the Accreditation Board.
18. The minutes of the meeting of the Accreditation Board shall be elaborated. The minutes shall be elaborated by the secretary of the Accreditation Board. The minutes shall include the attendance list, the agenda of the meeting, the resolutions adopted by the Accreditation Board and the appendices to these resolutions.
19. The secretary shall submit the draft minutes of the meeting to the members of the Accreditation Board within 7 calendar days of the end of the meeting. The members of the Accreditation Board may make comments on the draft minutes to the chairperson of the Accreditation Board within five working days from the date of sending the draft minutes. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall edit the draft minutes as instructed by the chairperson. The amended minutes shall be approved without delay by the signature of the chairperson of the Accreditation Board.
20. In particular, the appendix to the Resolution shall comprise:
  - a) a list of the members of the working group of the Accreditation Board, if a working group has been established by the resolution,
  - b) the approved statement of the working group on the application submitted and the matter under expert review, with reasons, the evaluation report, if it is part of the matter under expert review,
  - c) the opinion of the submitter on the matter being evaluated,
  - d) the approved statement of the Accreditation Board on the application submitted, with reasons for the submitted applications and the evaluation report on which the statement was based.
21. The secretary shall publish the minutes of the meeting in the UNIZA Information System for Accreditation within five working days of their approval.
22. The meeting of the Accreditation Board can be conducted:
  - a) face-to-face,
  - b) via videoconference or by other means of information and communication technology without the physical presence of the members of the Accreditation Board at the meeting, mainly due to an emergency or if the chairperson of the Accreditation Board so decides,
  - c) in combination according to points a) and b) of this paragraph of this Article.
23. In emergencies, if it is necessary for the Accreditation Board to decide without delay, the chairperson of the Accreditation Board may also use *per rollam* voting by electronic communication.
24. The members of the Accreditation Board, the secretary of the Accreditation Board and the members of the working groups shall be obliged to maintain confidentiality of the votes of the individual members of the Accreditation Board and members of the working groups.
25. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall, before making applications received by the Accreditation Board available to the members of the Accreditation Board and members of the working groups, ensure that they are instructed on the rules on the processing and protection of personal data that these applications may contain.

## **Article 12**

### **Process for Evaluation of Applications Submitted to the Accreditation Board**

1. The deliberations and the decision-making process of the Accreditation Board and its working groups shall be governed by the relevant provisions of this Statute of the Accreditation Board.
2. The Accreditation Board shall register all submitted applications concerning the accreditation of a new study programme, the modification of a study programme, the cancellation of restrictions on the accreditation of a study programme, the cancellation of a study programme, applications for the acquisition of the right to the HPaIP, the withdrawal/cancellation of the right to the HPaIP, the reconciliation and proposal for the acquisition of the right to the HPaIP, the proposal for the modification of the right to the HPaIP, etc., and shall inform the applicant in writing of the initiation of the procedure.
3. The decision-making process of the Accreditation Board on the proposals submitted according to paragraph 2 of this Article shall commence on the date of the submission of the application by the submitter in the UNIZA Information System for Accreditation.
4. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall register the receipt of the submitted application.
5. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall examine and check the formalities of the submitted application and its appendices.
6. If the submitted application or its appendices do not meet the required formal requirements, the secretary of the Accreditation Board shall invite the submitter to complete the documents within a time limit of 10 to 30 calendar days from the date of receipt of the request for completion of the documents by the submitter. A record of this fact shall be elaborated.
7. If the submitted application and its appendices comply with the required formal requirements, the secretary of the Accreditation Board shall make the application and its appendices available to the members of the Accreditation Board in electronic form.
8. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board shall propose a working group of at least 5 members according to the matter under expert review and respecting the rules stated in Article 27. Upon approval of the working group by the Accreditation Board, the chairperson of the Accreditation Board shall appoint the working group. The Accreditation Board shall assign the application to a working group for its evaluation.
9. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall make the application and its appendices available to the members of the working group in electronic form no later than five working days from the date of the appointment of the working group and the assignment of the application to the working group by the Accreditation Board.
10. When evaluating the submitted proposal, the working group of the Accreditation Board shall evaluate the compliance of the proposal with the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education, the SAAHE Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education, the SAAHE Standards for Study Programmes, the Standards for HPaIP and the internal regulations of UNIZA.
11. The working group will review the application and its appendices, and examine the self-assessment of the fulfilment of each standard and the references to the corresponding evidence in the application documents, in particular in the internal evaluation report. The evaluation by the working group shall also include a site visit evaluation depending on the matter under expert review.

12. The working group shall elaborate an evaluation report and a review of the matter under evaluation.
13. The working group shall vote on the final version of the evaluation report and review on the matter under discussion and adopt a resolution.
14. The chairperson of the working group shall submit the evaluation report and the review of the working group on the matter under discussion to the secretary of the Accreditation Board within the time limit set by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board via the UNIZA Information System for Accreditation.
15. If the submitted evaluation report or the review of the working group does not meet the required formal requirements, the secretary of the Accreditation Board shall invite the chairperson of the working group to eliminate the deficiencies within a time limit of 10 to 30 calendar days. A record of this fact shall be elaborated.
16. If the submitted evaluation report and the review of the working group comply with the required formalities, the secretary of the Accreditation Board shall make the evaluation report and the review of the working group available to the members of the Accreditation Board.
17. The Accreditation Board shall make a decision on the applicant's application based on its deliberations and based on the discussion of the evaluation report and the expert review of the working group.
18. The Accreditation Board shall issue a decision on the matter under discussion. The decision shall contain the mandatory parts of a statement, a statement of reasons and an instruction. The decision of the Accreditation Board shall also contain other elements depending on the nature of the matter under discussion. If the Accreditation Board needs further supporting documents on the matter under discussion in order to make a decision, the Accreditation Board shall adopt a statement setting a deadline for the completion of the supporting documents. The written statement of the Accreditation Board shall be delivered by the secretary of the Accreditation Board to the submitter.
19. The decision shall be sent to the applicant by the secretary of the Accreditation Board.
20. If the Accreditation Board has decided by resolution, the decision of the Accreditation Board shall be final.

### **Article 13**

#### **Decision-making on Granting Accreditation to a New Study Programme**

1. The Accreditation Board decides on the accreditation of a new study programme at UNIZA based on an application for the creation of a new study programme or an application for the granting of accreditation of a new study programme by the SAAHE. The application is submitted to the Accreditation Board by the dean of the faculty in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty or by the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme. In the case of a study programme provided at several Faculties, the application is submitted by the dean of the faculty which guarantees the study programme.
2. Upon receipt of an application for the creation of a new study programme or upon receipt of an application for the granting of accreditation of a new study programme by the SAAHE, the Accreditation Board shall establish a working group according to Article 27 in order to evaluate the submitted proposal. The composition of the working group shall respect the field of study and the level of study of the proposed study programme.

3. The working group shall elaborate a written statement (review) and an evaluation report on the submitted application by the deadline stated by the Accreditation Board.
4. The Accreditation Board shall decide on the application for the creation of a new study programme within 90 days of receipt of the application.
5. The Accreditation Board may discontinue the process of approving an application for the creation of a new study programme and return it to the dean or the rector for completion and the elimination of deficiencies. The Accreditation Board shall set a reasonable time limit for the completion of the application or the correction of deficiencies.
6. The Accreditation Board, after discussing the application for the creation of a new study programme or the application for the granting of accreditation of a new study programme in which UNIZA applies for accreditation by the SAAHE, and based on the discussion of the statement of the working group of the Accreditation Board, shall by its resolution:
  - a) decide on the approval of a new study programme which
    - I. can be created at UNIZA if the study programme belongs to the field of study and the level of study in which UNIZA is authorized to create, implement and modify study programmes,
    - II. UNIZA may submit to the SAAHE for accreditation according to Section 30 of Act No. 269/2018 Coll. if it is a field of study and a level of study in which UNIZA does not have the authorization to create, implement and modify the study programmes,
    - III. or according to Section 36, paragraph 2 of the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education,
  - b) identify deficiencies in the proposal for the creation of a new study programme and propose measures for their elimination, taking particular care to the harmonization of the study programme with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education,
  - c) decide not to approve the new study programme.
7. The decision of the Accreditation Board on the granting of accreditation of a study programme according to paragraph 6, point a) (I.) of this Article shall include:
  - a) the name of the faculty in the case of a study programme provided at a faculty, in the case of a study programme provided by several Faculties the name of the faculty guaranteeing the study programme, the name of the University in the case of a university-wide study programme,
  - b) the name of the study programme,
  - c) the form of study,
  - d) the standard length of study,
  - e) the level of higher education study,
  - f) the language or languages in which the study programme is to be delivered,
  - g) the name of the field of study from the system of fields of study,
  - h) the code of the level of education and the code of the field of education according to the International Standard Classification of Education,
  - i) the level of the national qualifications framework,
  - j) the academic degree awarded,
  - k) the period for which accreditation of the study programme is granted,
  - l) the date of approval of the accreditation of the study programme by the UNIZA Accreditation Board,
  - m) the date of validity and entry into force of the accreditation of the study programme.



8. If the application for the creation of a new study programme does not comply with the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education, with the Standards for Study Programmes, or with the internal regulations of UNIZA, including the Long-term Plan of UNIZA or the Long-term Plan of the faculty that submitted the proposal, or if the deficiencies identified by the Accreditation Board during the approval process have not been eliminated, the Accreditation Board shall not approve the proposal for a new study programme and shall issue a decision on this with justification.
9. Based on the decision on the approval of the new study programme by the Accreditation Board according to paragraph 6, point a) (I.) of this Article, the dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall ensure the creation of the new study programme and the entry of data on it in the register of study programmes.
10. Upon approval of the new study programme by the Accreditation Board according to paragraph 6, point a) (II.) of this Article, the rector shall apply for accreditation of the study programme to the SAAHE.
11. If the Accreditation Board has decided according to paragraph 6, point b) of this Article, i.e. has identified deficiencies in the proposal for the creation of a new study programme and has proposed measures for their elimination and the harmonization of the study programme with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education, it shall return the submitted proposal to the dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, or to the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme. The Accreditation Board shall set a time limit for the elimination of deficiencies, which shall be a maximum of 90 days. The Accreditation Board shall request the submitter to eliminate the deficiencies and to ensure that the proposal complies with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education. The dean of a faculty-guaranteed study programme, the Rector, in cooperation with the director of the institute in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall request the relevant Board of Study Programme to eliminate the deficiencies and ensure compliance with the Standards.
12. The submitter according to paragraph 11 of this Article, the dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, and the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall resubmit a revised application for the creation of a new study programme to the Accreditation Board according to paragraph 1 of this Article.
13. If the proposal for the creation of a new study programme does not comply with the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education, the Standards for Study Programmes or the internal regulations of UNIZA, or if the deficiencies identified by the Accreditation Board during the evaluation process have not been eliminated, the Accreditation Board shall not approve the proposal for a new study programme and shall issue a decision on this with justification.
14. If the Accreditation Board has decided on paragraph 6, point c) of this Article; it shall give reasons for its decision. The decision of the Accreditation Board shall be final.

#### **Article 14**

#### **Decision-making on the Evaluation of the Compliance of the Study Programme with the Standards**

1. The Accreditation Board decides on the evaluation of the compliance of a study programme with the SAAHE Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education and the Standards for Study Programmes at UNIZA based on a request from the dean of the faculty for a study programme provided by a faculty and a request from the rector for a university-wide study programme. In the case of a study programme provided at several faculties, the application shall be submitted by the dean of the faculty which guarantees the study programme.
2. The Accreditation Board, upon receipt of an application for the evaluation of the compliance of an existing study programme with the Standards, shall create a working group in accordance with Article 27 of this Directive in order to evaluate the submitted application. The composition of the working group must respect the field of study and the level of study (degree) of the harmonized study programme.
3. The working group shall elaborate a written statement (review) and an evaluation report on the submitted application for the evaluation of the compliance of the study programme with the Standards by the deadline stated by the Accreditation Board.
4. The Accreditation Board shall decide on the compliance of the study programme with the SAAHE Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education and the Standards for Study Programmes within 90 days of receipt of the application.
5. The Accreditation Board may discontinue the process of approving the compliance of the study programme with the Standards and return it to the dean or the rector for completion and the elimination of deficiencies. The Accreditation Board shall set a reasonable time limit for the completion of the application or the correction of deficiencies.
6. The Accreditation Board, after reviewing the application for the evaluation of the compliance of the study programme with the Standards and based on the review of the working group of the Accreditation Board, shall by its resolution:
  - a) decide on the approval of the compliance of the study programme with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education,
  - b) identify deficiencies in the proposal for the harmonization of the study programme with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education and propose measures in order to eliminate the deficiencies and bring the study programme into compliance with the Standards,
  - c) decide on the cancellation of the study programme.
7. The decision of the Accreditation Board on approval of the compliance of the study programme with the Standards according to paragraph 6, point a) of this Article shall also include approval of the continuation of the delivery of the existing study programme.
8. The decision of the Accreditation Board on the approval of the compliance of a study programme with the Standards according to paragraph 6, point a) of this Article shall include:
  - a) the name of the faculty in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, in the case of a study programme provided by several Faculties the name of the faculty guaranteeing the study programme, the name of the University in the case of a university-wide study programme,
  - b) the name of the study programme,
  - c) the form of study,
  - d) the standard length of study,

- e) the level of higher education study,
  - f) the language or languages in which the study programme is to be delivered,
  - g) the name of the field of study from the system of fields of study,
  - h) the code of the level of education and the code of the field of education according to the International Standard Classification of Education,
  - i) the level of the national qualifications framework,
  - j) the academic degree awarded,
  - k) the date of the approval of the compliance of the study programme with the Standards by the UNIZA Accreditation Board,
  - l) the date of validity and entry into force of the harmonized study programme.
9. If the Accreditation Board has decided according to paragraph 6, point b) of this Article, i.e. has identified deficiencies in the proposal for the harmonization of the study programme with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education, and proposes measures to eliminate the deficiencies and bring the study programme into compliance with the Standards, it shall return the submitted proposal to the dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, or to the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme. The Accreditation Board shall set a time limit for the elimination of the deficiencies, which shall be a maximum of 90 days. The Accreditation Board shall request the submitter to eliminate the deficiencies and to ensure that the proposal complies with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education. The dean for a faculty study programme or the rector in coordination with the director of the institute for a university-wide study programme shall request the relevant Board of Study Programme to eliminate the deficiencies and ensure compliance with the Standards.
  10. The submitter under paragraph 9, the dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, and the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall resubmit a modified application for the evaluation of the compliance of the study programme with the Standards to the Accreditation Board under paragraph 1 of this Article.
  11. The dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, or the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, based on the decision of the Accreditation Board according to paragraph 6, point c) of this Article, shall ensure the cancellation of the study programme in the register of study programmes.
  12. Based on the decision of the Accreditation Board according to paragraph 6, point c) of this Article, UNIZA shall ensure that the SAAHE is notified of the cancellation of the study programme without delay.
  13. If the Accreditation Board has decided according to paragraph 6, point c) of this Article, it shall give reasons for the decision to cancel the study programme. The decision of the Accreditation Board shall be final.

## **Article 15**

### **Decision-making on the Modification of a Study Programme**

1. The Accreditation Board decides on the modification of a study programme at UNIZA based on a request of the dean of the faculty in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty and a request of the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme. In the case of a study programme provided at several Faculties, the

- application is submitted by the dean of the faculty which guarantees the study programme.
2. Upon receipt of the application for modification of a study programme, the Accreditation Board shall create a working group in accordance with Article 27 of this Directive in order to evaluate the submitted proposal. The composition of the working group must respect the field of study and the level to which the study programme belongs.
  3. The working group shall elaborate a written statement (review) and an evaluation report on the submitted application by the deadline stated by the Accreditation Board.
  4. The Accreditation Board shall decide on the modification of the study programme within 60 days of receipt of the application.
  5. The Accreditation Board may discontinue the process of approving the application for modification of the study programme and return it to the dean or the rector for completion and the elimination of deficiencies. The Accreditation Board shall set a reasonable time limit for the completion of the application or the correction of deficiencies.
  6. The Accreditation Board, after discussing the application for the modification of the study programme and based on the discussion of the review of the working group of the Accreditation Board, shall, by its resolution:
    - a) decide on the approval of the modification of the study programme,
    - b) identify deficiencies in the proposal for modification of the study programme and propose measures for their elimination, taking particular care to harmonization of the study programme with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education,
    - c) decide not to approve the modification of the study programme.
  7. If the Accreditation Board decides to approve the modification of the study programme according to paragraph 6, point a) of this Article, the decision on the modification of the study programme shall be issued for the period until the end of the validity of the accreditation of the study programme.
  8. The decision of the Accreditation Board on the modification of the study programme according to paragraph 6, point a) of this Article shall include:
    - a) the name of the faculty in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, in the case of a study programme provided by several Faculties the name of the faculty guaranteeing the study programme, the name of the University in the case of a university-wide study programme,
    - b) the name of the study programme,
    - c) the form of study,
    - d) the standard length of study,
    - e) the level of higher education study,
    - f) the academic degree awarded,
    - g) the specification of the modifications of the study programme,
    - h) the period to which the modification of the study programme applies,
    - i) the date of the approval of the modification of the study programme by the UNIZA Accreditation Board,
    - j) the date of validity and entry into force of the modification of the study programme.
  9. The dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, and the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, based on the decision of the Accreditation Board according to paragraph 6, point a) of this Article, shall authorize the guarantor of the study programme who, in cooperation with the relevant Board of Study Programme, shall make modifications to the study programme and register the modifications in the

UNIZA Academic Information and Education System (hereinafter referred to as the "AIVS").

10. The dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, and the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall ensure that the data on the study programme modifications are entered into the register of study programmes.
11. If the Accreditation Board has decided according to paragraph 6, point b) of this Article, i.e. has identified deficiencies in the application for modification of the study programme and has proposed measures for their elimination and harmonization of the study programme with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education, it shall return the submitted proposal to the dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, or the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme. The Accreditation Board shall set a time limit for the elimination of deficiencies, which shall be a maximum of 60 days. The Accreditation Board shall request the submitter to eliminate the deficiencies and to ensure that the proposal complies with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education. The dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, the rector in cooperation with the director of the institute in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall request the relevant Board of Study Programme to eliminate the deficiencies and ensure compliance with the Standards.
12. The submitter according to paragraph 11 of this Article, the dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, and the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall resubmit a modified application for the modification of the study programme to the Accreditation Board according to paragraph 1 of this Article.
13. If the Accreditation Board has decided according to paragraph 6, point c) of this Article, it shall give reasons for the decision. The decision of the Accreditation Board shall be final.

## **Article 16**

### **Decision-making on the Suspension of a Study Programme**

1. The decision to suspend a study programme at UNIZA may be taken by:
  - a) the SAAHE based on the provisions of Section 27 of the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education,
  - b) the Accreditation Board.
2. If the Accreditation Board finds that the study programme does not meet the Standards for Study Programmes, it will decide on the suspension of the implementation of the study programme.
3. In the case of suspension of the implementation of the study programme, the Accreditation Board shall invite in writing the dean of the relevant faculty at which the suspended study programme was implemented, or the rector in the case of a suspension of a university-wide study programme, to submit a proposal for modification of the study programme within a specified time limit in accordance with the provisions of Section 27 of the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education. In the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, the Rector, in cooperation with the director of the institute in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall request the relevant Board of Study Programme to remedy the deficiencies and ensure compliance with the Standards.

4. Upon suspension of the implementation of the study programme, the dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall submit to the Accreditation Board:
  - a) a proposal for modification of the study programme which will create a prerequisite for meeting the Standards for Study Programmes, or
  - b) a proposal for the cancellation of a study programme.
5. If the proposer submits a proposal for modification of the study programme according to paragraph 4, point a) of this Article, the procedure under Article 15, paragraphs 1 to 5 of this Directive shall apply.
6. The Accreditation Board shall, after discussing the application for modification of the study programme and following the discussion of the review of the working group of the Accreditation Board, by its resolution:
  - a) decide on the approval of the modification of the study programme and the approval of the submitted proposal for the modification of the SAAHE study programme, if it concerns the suspension of the study programme by the SAAHE,
  - b) decide on the approval of the modification of the study programme and on the lifting of the suspension to implement the study programme after the implementation of the modification of the suspended study programme by the Accreditation Board,
  - c) identify deficiencies in the proposal for modification of the study programme and propose measures for their elimination, taking particular care to the harmonization of the study programme with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education,
  - d) decide not to approve the modification of the study programme.
7. If the Accreditation Board decides to approve the modification of the study programme and to agree with the submitted proposal for the modification of the SAAHE study programme according to paragraph 6, point a) of this Article, the rector is obliged to submit the proposal for the modification of the study programme to the SAAHE without delay.
8. If the Accreditation Board decides to approve the modification of the study programme according to paragraph 6, point b) of this Article, the decision on the modification of the study programme shall be issued for the period until the end of the validity of the accreditation of the study programme.
9. The decision of the Accreditation Board on the modification of the study programme according to paragraph 6, point b) of this Article shall include:
  - a) the name of the faculty in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, in the case of a study programme provided by several faculties the name of the faculty guaranteeing the study programme, the name of the University in the case of a university-wide study programme,
  - b) the name of the study programme,
  - c) the form of study,
  - d) the standard length of study,
  - e) the level of higher education study,
  - f) the academic degree awarded,
  - g) the specification of the modifications of the study programme,
  - h) the period to which the modification of the study programme applies,
  - i) the date of the approval of the modification of the study programme by the UNIZA Accreditation Board,
  - j) the date of validity and entry into force of the modification of the study programme.

10. The dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, and the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, based on the decision of the Accreditation Board according to paragraph 6, point b) of this Article, shall authorize the study programme guarantor who, in cooperation with the relevant Board of Study Programme, shall perform the modification of the study programme and register the modifications in the UNIZA AIVS.
11. The dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, and the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall ensure that the data on the study programme modifications are entered in the register of study programmes.
12. If the Accreditation Board has decided according to paragraph 6, point c) of this Article, i.e. has identified deficiencies in the application for modification of the study programme and has proposed measures for their elimination and for the harmonization of the study programme with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education, it shall return the submitted proposal to the dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, or to the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme. The Accreditation Board shall set a time limit for the elimination of deficiencies which shall be a maximum of 60 days. The Accreditation Board shall request the submitter to eliminate the deficiencies and to ensure that the proposal complies with the Standards for Study Programmes and the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education. The dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, or the rector in cooperation with the director of the institute in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall request the relevant Board of Study Programme to eliminate the deficiencies and to ensure compliance with the Standards.
13. The submitter according to paragraph 12 of this Article, the dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, and the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, shall repeatedly submit a modified application for modification of the study programme to the Accreditation Board according to paragraph 4 of this Article.
14. If the Accreditation Board has decided according to paragraph 6, point d) of this Article, it shall give reasons for the decision. The decision of the Accreditation Board shall be final.
15. If the proposer submits a proposal for the cancellation of the study programme according to paragraph 4, point b) of this Article or the Accreditation Board has decided according to paragraph 6, point d) of this Article, the procedure under Article 17 of this Directive shall be applied.

#### **Article 17**

##### **Decision on the Cancellation of a Study Programme**

1. The Accreditation Board shall decide on the cancellation of a study programme at UNIZA based on a request for the cancellation of a study programme.
2. The request with justification for the cancellation of a study programme shall be submitted to the Accreditation Board by the dean of the faculty in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty or by the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme. In the case of a study programme provided at several Faculties, the application for cancellation of the study programme shall be submitted by the dean of the faculty which guarantees the study programme.

3. The Accreditation Board shall decide on the discussion of the application for the cancellation of a study programme without reviewing the application by the working group of the Accreditation Board.
4. The Accreditation Board shall also examine compliance with the provisions of the Higher Education Act, including Section 51a, paragraph 2 of the Higher Education Act when reviewing the application for the cancellation of a study programme.
5. The Accreditation Board shall decide on the cancellation of the study programme within 60 days of receipt of the application for cancellation of the study programme.
6. The Accreditation Board may discontinue the process of reviewing an application for the cancellation of the study programme and return the application to the dean or the rector for completion. The Accreditation Board shall set a reasonable time limit for the completion of the application.
7. The Accreditation Board, after reviewing the application for the cancellation of a study programme, shall by resolution:
  - a) approve the cancellation of the study programme,
  - b) not approve the cancellation of the study programme.
8. The decision of the Accreditation Board on the cancellation of the study programme according to paragraph 7, point a) of this Article shall include:
  - a) the name of the faculty in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, the name of the guaranteeing faculty in the case of a study programme provided by several faculties, the name of the University in the case of a university-wide study programme,
  - b) the name of the study programme,
  - c) the form of study,
  - d) the standard length of study,
  - e) the level of higher education study,
  - f) the language or languages in which the study programme was delivered,
  - g) the name of the field of study from the system of fields of study to which the study programme has been assigned,
  - h) the academic degree awarded,
  - i) the date on which the study programme was cancelled by the Accreditation Board,
  - j) the validity and effective date of the cancellation of the study programme.
9. The submitter, the dean in the case of a study programme provided by a faculty, the rector in the case of a university-wide study programme, upon the decision of the Accreditation Board according to paragraph 7, point a) of this Article, shall ensure the cancellation of the study programme in the register of study programmes.
10. Based on the decision of the Accreditation Board according to paragraph 7, point a) of this Article, UNIZA shall ensure that the SAAHE is notified of the cancellation of the study programme without delay.
11. If the Accreditation Board has decided according to paragraph 7, point b) of this Article, it shall give reasons for its decision. The decision of the Accreditation Board shall be final.

**Article 18**  
**Continuous Monitoring, Periodic Review and Periodic Approval**  
**of Study Programmes at UNIZA**



1. The Accreditation Board shall perform continuous monitoring of the implementation of the study programmes and periodically review (evaluate) and periodically approve the study programmes at UNIZA in order to ensure that the study programmes comply with the Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education and the Standards for Study Programmes and that the learning objectives and learning outcomes achieved are in line with the needs of students, employers and other stakeholders, that they correspond to current knowledge and the state-of-the-art of their applications, current technological possibilities, and that the level of graduates, in particular through the achieved learning outcomes, is in line with the required level of the qualification framework.
2. The study programmes provided at UNIZA are continuously monitored by the Faculties and institutes, regularly evaluated, modified and then regularly submitted to the Accreditation Board for approval by the dean of the faculty in the case of study programmes provided by the faculty, by the rector in the case of university-wide study programmes, in the period corresponding to the standard length of study of the particular study programme.
3. The dean of the faculty in the case of study programmes provided by the faculty, and the rector in the case of university-wide study programmes, are obliged to submit the documents for the approval of the study programme within the periodic approval to the Accreditation Board via the UNIZA Information System for Accreditation no later than 180 calendar days before the expiry of the standard length of study of the particular study programme.
4. The Accreditation Board shall systematically analyse the level of quality assurance of higher education and perform its periodic evaluation with emphasis on the level of quality of the study programmes at UNIZA.
5. During the periodic review of the study programmes, the Accreditation Board checks and makes sure that the study programmes are delivered in accordance with the SAAHE Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education, the Standards for Study Programmes and the rules and regulations of the IQAS UNIZA. The periodic review of the study programmes is performed on an annual basis. The basis for the periodic review of the study programmes is in particular:
  - a) reports on the evaluation of the study programmes elaborated by the respective Board of Study Programme, elaborated on an annual basis,
  - b) reports on the evaluation of the educational activities at the UNIZA Faculties and institutes, elaborated on an annual basis by the UNIZA Faculties and institutes.
6. During the process of the periodic review of the study programmes the Accreditation Board shall follow a special internal regulation.
7. The Accreditation Board shall periodically approve the study programmes at UNIZA within a period corresponding to the standard length of study of the particular study programme.
8. During the process of the periodic approval of the study programmes, the Accreditation Board shall evaluate the compliance of the study programmes with the SAAHE Standards for the Internal Quality Assurance System of Higher Education and the Standards for Study Programmes according to Article 14 of this Directive.

**Article 19**  
**Decision-Making on the Acquisition of the Right to the Habilitation**  
**and Inauguration Proceedings**

1. The dean of the faculty shall submit to the chairperson of the Accreditation Board a draft application for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in a given field of the habilitation proceedings and inauguration proceedings (hereinafter referred to as the "HPaIP"), elaborated under the provisions of the Directive No. 208 Rules for the Acquisition of Rights, Harmonization of Rights, Regulation and Cancellation of Rights to Habilitation and Inauguration Proceedings at the University of Žilina – rules and procedures in the conditions of the University of Žilina. In the case of acquisition of the right to the habilitation proceedings and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the application shall be submitted by the Rector.
2. The application for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in a given HPaIP field will be thoroughly reviewed following the procedure for this type of application, and the Accreditation Board will thoroughly evaluate in particular the fulfilment of the individual SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings (Proceedings for the Appointment of Professors).
3. The Accreditation Board, having performed all the prescribed actions, shall:
  - a) approve the application for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field, which UNIZA shall submit for accreditation to the SAAHE in accordance with Section 31 of the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education,
  - b) identify deficiencies and propose measures for their elimination, taking particular care to the harmonization of the proposed HPaIP field with the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings,
  - c) not approve the application for the harmonization and the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field, while the decision of the Accreditation Board shall be final.
4. If the application does not comply with the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education, the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings or the internal regulations of UNIZA and the Accreditation Board has identified deficiencies in the application, it shall propose measures to eliminate the deficiencies that are inconsistent with the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings.
5. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board shall return the application for the acquisition of the HPaIP right to the dean, and in the case of an application for the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, to the Rector, who shall ensure that the identified problems and deficiencies are rectified. The Accreditation Board shall set a time limit for the elimination of the deficiencies, which shall be a maximum of 90 days. The Accreditation Board shall request the submitter to remedy the deficiencies and to ensure that the proposal complies with the Standards for Habilitation Proceeding and Inauguration Proceedings and with the Standards for the internal quality assurance system of education. The dean, or in the case of an application for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the Rector, will ask the guarantors of the HPaIP field to eliminate the deficiencies and ensure compliance with the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings.
6. The submitter, the dean, in the case of an application for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the

Rector, as the case may be, shall resubmit a revised application in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article.

7. If, subsequently, the application for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field does not comply with the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education, the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings or the internal regulations of UNIZA, or if the deficiencies identified by the Accreditation Board during the approval process have not been eliminated, the Accreditation Board shall not approve the application for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given field of HPaIP and shall issue a decision with the reasons therefor, which shall be final.

## **Article 20**

### **Decision-Making on Harmonization and Proposal for the Acquisition of the Right to the Habilitation and Inauguration Proceedings**

1. The dean of the faculty shall submit to the chairperson of the Accreditation Board a draft application for the harmonization and the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given field of HPaIP, elaborated under the provisions of Directive No. 208 Rules for the Acquisition of Rights, Harmonization of Rights, Regulation and Cancellation of Rights to Habilitation and Inauguration Proceedings at the University of Žilina – rules and procedures in the conditions of the University of Žilina. In the case of harmonization of the right to habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the rector shall submit the application.
2. The application for the harmonization and the proposal for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field will be reviewed in detail following the procedure for this type of application.
3. The Accreditation Board, having performed all the prescribed actions, shall:
  - a) approve the application for the harmonization and the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field, which UNIZA shall submit for accreditation to the SAAHE in accordance with Section 31 of the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education,
  - b) identify deficiencies in the harmonization and the proposal for the acquisition of the right and propose measures for their elimination, taking particular care to the harmonization of the proposed HPaIP field with the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings; or
  - c) not approve the application for the harmonization and the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field, while the decision of the Accreditation Board shall be final.
4. If the application does not comply with the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education, the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings or the internal regulations of UNIZA and the Accreditation Board has identified deficiencies in the application, it shall propose measures to eliminate the deficiencies that are inconsistent with the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings of the SAAHE.
5. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board shall return the application for the acquisition of the HPaIP right to the dean, and in the case of an application for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field,

to the Rector, who shall ensure that the identified problems and deficiencies are rectified. The Accreditation Board shall set a time limit for the elimination of the deficiencies, which shall be a maximum of 90 days. The Accreditation Board shall request the submitter to remedy the deficiencies and to ensure that the proposal complies with the Standards for Habilitation Proceeding and Inauguration Proceedings and with the Standards for the internal quality assurance system of education. The dean, or in the case of an application for the harmonization and the proposal for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the Rector, will ask the guarantors of the HPaIP field to eliminate the deficiencies and ensure compliance with the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings.

6. The submitter, the dean, in the case of an application for the harmonization and the proposal for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the Rector, as the case may be, shall resubmit a revised application in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article.
7. If, subsequently, the application for the harmonization and the proposal for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field does not comply with the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education, the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings or the internal regulations of UNIZA, or if the deficiencies identified by the Accreditation Board during the approval process have not been eliminated, the Accreditation Board shall not approve the application for the harmonization and the proposal for the acquisition of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given field of HPaIP and shall issue a decision with the reasons therefor, which shall be final.

## **Article 21**

### **Decision-Making on a Proposal to Modify the Right to the Habilitation and Inauguration Proceedings**

1. The dean of the faculty shall submit to the chairperson of the Accreditation Board a draft application for the modification of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field, elaborated under the provisions of the Directive No. 208 Rules for the Acquisition of Rights, Harmonization of Rights, Regulation and Cancellation of Rights to Habilitation and Inauguration Proceedings at the University of Žilina – rules and procedures in the conditions of the University of Žilina. In the case of modification of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the rector shall submit the application.
2. The application for modification of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in a given HPaIP field will be reviewed in detail in accordance with the procedure for this type of application.
3. The Accreditation Board, having performed all the prescribed actions, shall:
  - a) approve the draft application for the modification of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field,
  - b) identify deficiencies in the proposal for the modification of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings and propose measures for their elimination, taking particular care to the harmonization of the HPaIP field in question with the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings; or

- c) not approve the application for the modification of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the HPaIP field in question, while the decision of the Accreditation Board shall be final.
4. If the application does not comply with the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education, the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings or the internal regulations of UNIZA and the Accreditation Board has identified deficiencies in the application, it shall propose measures to eliminate the deficiencies that are inconsistent with the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings.
5. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board shall return the application for the modification of the HPaIP right to the dean, and in the case of an application for the modification of the HPaIP right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field to the Rector, who shall ensure that the identified problems and deficiencies are rectified. The Accreditation Board shall set a time limit for the elimination of the deficiencies, which shall be a maximum of 90 days. The Accreditation Board shall request the submitter to remedy the deficiencies and to ensure that the proposal complies with the Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceeding and with the internal quality assurance system of education. The dean, or in the case of an application for the modifications of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the Rector, will ask the guarantors of the HPaIP field to eliminate the deficiencies and ensure compliance with the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings.
6. The submitter, the dean; in the case of an application for the modification of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the Rector, as the case may be, shall resubmit a revised application in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article.
7. If, subsequently, the application for the modification of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field does not comply with the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education, the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings or the internal regulations of UNIZA, or if the deficiencies identified by the Accreditation Board during the approval process have not been eliminated, the Accreditation Board shall not approve the application for the modification of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given field of HPaIP and shall issue a decision with the reasons therefor, which shall be final.

## **Article 22**

### **Decision-Making on the Withdrawal/Cancellation of the Right to the Habilitation and Inauguration Proceedings**

1. The dean of the faculty shall submit to the chairperson of the Accreditation Board a draft application for the withdrawal of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field, elaborated under the provisions of the Directive No. 208 Rules for the Acquisition of Rights, Harmonization of Rights, Regulation and Cancellation of Rights to Habilitation and Inauguration Proceedings at the University of Žilina – rules and procedures in the conditions of the University of Žilina. In the case of withdrawal/cancellation of the right to habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the rector shall submit the application.

2. The application for the withdrawal of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field will be reviewed in detail by the HPaIP guarantors.
3. The Accreditation Board, having performed all the prescribed actions, shall:
  - a) approve the draft application for the withdrawal of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field,
  - b) not approve the application for the withdrawal of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field, stating the reasons for this decision in the resolution.
4. If the application for the withdrawal/cancellation of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings does not comply with the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education, the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings or the internal regulations of UNIZA and the Accreditation Board has identified deficiencies in the application, it shall propose measures to eliminate the deficiencies that are inconsistent with the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings.
5. The chairperson of the Accreditation Board shall return the application for the withdrawal/cancellation of the HPaIP right to the dean, and in the case of an application for the withdrawal/cancellation of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field to the Rector, who shall ensure that the identified problems and deficiencies are rectified. The Accreditation Board shall set a time limit for the elimination of the deficiencies, which shall be a maximum of 90 days. The Accreditation Board shall request the submitter to remedy the deficiencies and to ensure that the proposal complies with the Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceeding and with the internal quality assurance system of education. The dean, or in the case of an application for the withdrawal/cancellation of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the Rector, will ask the guarantors of the HPaIP field to eliminate the deficiencies and ensure compliance with the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings.
6. The submitter, the dean; in the case of an application for the withdrawal/cancellation of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the university-wide HPaIP field, the Rector, as the case may be, shall resubmit a revised application in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article.
7. If, subsequently, the application for the withdrawal/cancellation of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given HPaIP field does not comply with the Act on Quality Assurance of Higher Education, the SAAHE Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings or the internal regulations of UNIZA, or if the deficiencies identified by the Accreditation Board during the approval process have not been eliminated, the Accreditation Board shall not approve the application for the withdrawal/cancellation of the right to the habilitation and inauguration proceedings in the given field of HPaIP and shall issue a decision with the reasons therefor, which shall be final.

### **Article 23**

#### **Regular Review of the Internal Quality Assurance System of UNIZA**

1. The Accreditation Board regularly evaluates the internal quality assurance system of UNIZA, evaluates the compliance of the IQAS UNIZA with the SAAHE Standards for the

- Internal System (internal quality assurance system of higher education) and its implementation.
2. The Accreditation Board regularly discusses and approves the report on the periodic evaluation of the IQAS UNIZA, the period of the evaluation of the internal quality assurance system is two years.
  3. Based on the regular periodic evaluation of the IQAS UNIZA, the Accreditation Board proposes measures for improvement and initiates amendments to the IQAS UNIZA and submits the proposals to the Rector.
  4. The Accreditation Board shall proceed according to a special internal regulation during the periodic evaluation of the IQAS UNIZA.

#### **Article 24**

#### **Periodic Evaluation of the Level of Quality of Research, Development, Artistic and other Creative Activities at UNIZA**

1. The Accreditation Board shall evaluate the level of quality of research, development, artistic and other creative activities at UNIZA at regular intervals to achieve international excellence in the study programmes provided at all levels of higher education and in the fields of the habilitation and inauguration proceedings. This level of activity is evaluated at UNIZA regularly every 2 years.
2. The Accreditation Board has access to all documents related to the periodic evaluation of creative activities at UNIZA.
3. The periodic evaluation of the level of quality of research, development, artistic and other creative activities at UNIZA is evaluated for the teaching and research staff of UNIZA. Emphasis is placed on the evaluation of persons occupying positions of associate professors and professors responsible for the quality and development of study programmes – guarantors, persons who provide study programmes and their supporting themes of the core knowledge of the field of study and guarantors with the academic title of professor and associate professor in the positions of professor and associate professor responsible for the habilitation and inauguration proceedings (HPaIP) in the HPaIP fields that UNIZA has the accreditations for.
4. The Accreditation Board shall proceed with the evaluation in accordance with the Methodology for the Evaluation of Standards issued by the SAAHE.

#### **PART 4: WORKING GROUPS OF THE ACCREDITATION BOARD**

#### **Article 25**

#### **Working Groups of the Accreditation Board**

1. The Accreditation Board may establish working groups (review panels) for the elaboration of expert reviews.
2. The reason for the establishment of the working groups is to elaborate expert reviews for the decision-making of the Accreditation Board.
3. The working groups shall elaborate expert reviews on applications and suggestions received by the Accreditation Board.
4. The working groups work as temporary groups, they are created to complete a specific task, which the Accreditation Board entrusts to the working group.

5. The members of the working group, except for the student members, must be eminent experts in the field of study or the HPaIP field being evaluated.
6. The guiding principles in the implementation of the activities of the working groups are professionalism, independence, objectivity and professional approach of the members to the issue under expert review.
7. The working group shall elaborate a review and an evaluation report on the application or on the initiative, which shall be the basis for the decision-making or statement of the Accreditation Board.
8. The working group shall base its evaluation report on an expert review of the documentation, information obtained by visiting the site concerned, available data and consultation with stakeholders.
9. In the evaluation report, the working group shall also indicate the facts which formed the basis for its conclusions, the procedure for the evaluation of these documents, an evaluation of the level of fulfilment of the individual standards, the deficiencies identified, recommendations to the party to the proceedings, a draft of the review, decision or statement of the Accreditation Board, and the names and surnames of the members of the working group.

#### **Article 26**

#### **Rules for the Establishment of the List of Candidates for Members of the Working Groups of the Accreditation Board**

1. The Accreditation Board, with the intention to establish working groups, shall create and maintain lists of candidates for members of the working groups. These lists shall include:
  - a) eminent experts from among the academic staff of UNIZA,
  - b) eminent experts from the academic environment from outside of UNIZA,
  - c) eminent academic experts from abroad,
  - d) eminent experts from employers from Slovakia as well as abroad,
  - e) UNIZA students of the 2nd and 3rd levels of higher education.
2. The list of candidates for members of the working groups shall include persons based on their approval by the Accreditation Board.
3. The post (function) of a candidate for a member of a working group of the Accreditation Board is incompatible with the position of the rector, vice-rector, dean of a faculty, vice-dean of a faculty, director of a university workplace/unit, chairperson of the Academic Senate of UNIZA, chairperson of the Academic Senate of a faculty of UNIZA.
4. Nominations of persons to the list of candidates for members of the working groups may be submitted to the Accreditation Board by:
  - a) according to paragraph 1, points a) to e), the academic staff of UNIZA through the dean of the faculty or the Rector,
  - b) according to paragraph 1, point e) of this Article, students of UNIZA through the dean of the faculty or the Rector,
  - c) according to paragraph 1, points a) to e) of this Article, the chairperson and the members of the Accreditation Board.
5. The proposed eminent experts under paragraph 1, points a) to c) of this Article must meet the highest pedagogical and scientific criteria. In the case of nominations under paragraph 1, points a) and c) of this Article, the nomination shall include a summary of pedagogical and research activities; for eminent experts from the academic environment in the Slovak Republic, their research/art/teacher profile of a person (hereinafter referred



- to as "RATP"; *in Slovak "VUPCH"*) shall be submitted according to the template and structure of the SAAHE.
6. The basic criteria for the nomination of a UNIZA student as a candidate for a member of the Accreditation Board working group under paragraph 1, point e) of this Article are:
    - a) excellent study results of the student who, based on the value of his/her weighted study average, belongs to the first quartile of the best students of the faculty or institute in the case of university-wide study programmes, of the students of the respective level and form of study at the faculty/institute based on the value of the weighted study average. In the case of students in the 2nd and 3rd levels of studies, the values of the student's weighted academic averages for the previous level of higher education shall be used.
    - b) the student's study of the standard length of study, unless the student's extra length of study is due to the student's participation in academic mobility under an exchange programme, subject to the conditions of that exchange programme,
    - c) disciplinary action not taken during the student's undergraduate studies.
  7. In the case of nomination of a UNIZA student according to paragraph 1, point e) of this Article, the nomination shall include:
    - a) the name of the faculty or institute in the case of a university-wide study programme,
    - b) the name of the study programme in which the student is enrolled,
    - c) the name of the field of study from the system of fields of study,
    - d) the level of higher education,
    - e) the form of study,
    - f) confirmation from the department for education/studies of a relevant workplace/department that the student is in the first quartile of the best students of the faculty, or institute in the case of university-wide study programmes, of the students of the respective level and form of study at the faculty/institute based on the value of the weighted study average of the student. In the case of students in the 2nd and 3rd levels of studies, the values of the student's weighted academic averages for the previous levels of higher education shall be used.
  8. The nomination of a person into the list of candidates for membership in the working groups referred to in paragraph 1, points a) to e) of this Article must also include:
    - a) a professional Curriculum Vitae,
    - b) consent with the nomination,
    - c) consent with the processing of personal data,
    - d) the candidate's assignment to a field of study from the system of fields of study.
  9. The Accreditation Board shall regularly update the lists of candidates for members of the working groups.
  10. Persons who:
    - a) no longer fulfil the prerequisites based on which they were approved as candidates for members of the working groups of the Accreditation Board,
    - b) have ceased to be students of UNIZA and are on the list of candidates for members of the working groups as students of UNIZA,
    - c) have requested to be removed from the list of candidates for the working group members based on a written request delivered to the chairperson of the Accreditation Board,
    - d) have diedshall be removed from the list of candidates for membership in the working groups.

11. Removal of a person from the list of candidates for the members of the working groups shall be approved by the Accreditation Board based on a proposal of the chairperson of the Accreditation Board.

## **Article 27**

### **Rules for the Establishment of Working Groups of the Accreditation Board**

1. A working group of the Accreditation Board shall have at least 5 members, including its chairperson, and the number of members of the working group shall be odd.
2. The chairperson of the working group and the members of the working group shall be proposed by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board.
3. Only a member of the Accreditation Board from among the academic staff may be the chairperson of the working group.
4. A member of a working group may be a member of the Accreditation Board or a person from the list of candidates for the members of the working groups approved by the Accreditation Board.
5. The chairperson of the working group shall be nominated by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board from among the members of the Accreditation Board.
6. The members of the working group shall be proposed by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board from the members of the Accreditation Board and the list of the members of the working groups.
7. The composition of the working group shall be approved by the Accreditation Board on the proposal of the chairperson of the Accreditation Board.
8. The members of the working group shall be appointed by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board upon their approval by the Board.
9. The membership of the Accreditation Board working group shall be non-representative.
10. The composition of the working group shall correspond to the focus of the matter under expert review according to the area of evaluation, respecting the field of study or the HPaIP field to which the matter under expert review belongs. The composition of the working group shall be balanced concerning the representation of the members as defined in paragraph 11.
11. The working group of the Accreditation Board shall be constituted to include:
  - a) at least one member of the Accreditation Board,
  - b) at least one member from the academic community of UNIZA who is an eminent expert in his/her field,
  - c) at least one external member from other domestic and foreign universities, professional institutions and scientific institutions who is an expert in the given or related field of study, or the relevant or related field of the habilitation and inauguration proceedings,
  - d) at least one external member who is an eminent expert of a relevant professional organisation (chamber, union, association, etc.) or from the industry, commerce, or social practice; applicable if the evaluation of the study programmes is conducted,
  - e) one student of UNIZA of the 2nd or 3rd cycle of higher education in the given or related field of study; applicable if the evaluation of the study programmes is conducted,
12. In the case of the evaluation of a study programme belonging to a field of study, the content of which is related to the preparation of professionals for the performance of one of the regulated professions, a member of the working group must be an external

member from outside UNIZA in order to ensure the evaluation of compliance with the European Directives for education in the regulated profession.

13. In the case of the evaluation of the study programme of the 3rd degree of higher education and the case of the evaluation of the habilitation and inauguration proceedings, at least one expert from abroad must be a member of the working group.

#### **Article 28**

#### **Method of Evaluation and Procedure Framework of the Working Group of the Accreditation Board**

1. The members of the working group shall evaluate the implementation of the standards and corrective measures by expert review, in particular, based on:
  - a) the application's supporting documentation (application and its appendices),
  - b) information obtained by visiting the evaluated workplace (site visit evaluation of the higher education institution),
  - c) available data,
  - d) consultations with stakeholders.
2. The working group shall start its work by examining the application and the application documentation, reviewing the self-assessment of the fulfilment of each standard and the references to the corresponding evidence in the application documentation, in particular in the internal evaluation report.
3. In the course of its work, the working group may request additional information, documents or evidence from the submitter. It may ask to see the documentation, to have access to written parts of the verification of the learning outcomes, to students' final theses, to request a meeting with the stakeholders, etc.

#### **Article 29**

#### **Site Visit Evaluation by the Working Group of the Accreditation Board**

1. The site visit evaluation at the workplaces delivering study programmes shall be performed by the working group, in particular during the implementation of the educational activities.
2. The evaluated workplace/unit shall assist the working group during the site visit evaluation.
3. The site visit evaluation shall normally consist of:
  - a) an opening meeting with representatives of the evaluated workplace, including representatives of its management,
  - b) the collection of information and evidence,
  - c) a summary of the findings,
  - d) a closing meeting with representatives of the evaluated workplace, including representatives of its management.
4. During the site visit evaluation, the evaluated workplace shall assist the members of the working group, in particular by:
  - a) the presence of representatives of the management of the workplace, persons responsible for the quality of study programmes, habilitation and inauguration proceedings, university teachers, students, administrative and support staff, representatives of external stakeholders from the ranks of employers, partners from the (business) practice as well as the graduates,

- b) the availability of representatives of external stakeholders from employers, partners from practice and graduates at least by videoconference or other means of information and communication technologies without their physical presence,
  - c) access of members of the working group to the workplace premises,
  - d) access to records, including student, staff, university teacher and training records,
  - e) access to information systems and databases in use,
  - f) possible participation of members of the working group in ongoing educational/training activities,
  - g) access to the written parts of the verification of students' knowledge from examinations, assignments, final theses, etc.,
  - h) suitable facilities for the activities of the working group during the site visit evaluation,
  - i) where appropriate, an accompanying person for the working group.
5. The members of the working group shall verify information and evidence, in particular:
    - a) by examining the files, records and information of the evaluated workplace,
    - b) by examining assignments of the term papers, year projects and final student theses,
    - c) by examining term papers, year projects and final theses produced by students,
    - d) by examining the written parts of examinations to verify students' knowledge,
    - e) by visiting the premises and facilities to verify the spatial, material, technical, instrumental and information equipment of the workplace,
    - f) by observation of the activities and processes of the workplace,
    - g) via interviews, depending on the type of procedure.
  6. The members of the working group shall verify the facts declared by the workplace being evaluated by conducting independent interviews, depending on the type of procedure.
  7. The members of the working group shall keep a running record of their findings.

### **Article 30**

#### **Deliberation of the Working Group of the Accreditation Board**

1. The deliberation (meeting) of the working group of the Accreditation Board shall be convened and chaired by the chairperson of the working group.
2. The chairperson of the working group shall inform the chairperson and the secretary of the Accreditation Board of the convening of the meeting of the working group.
3. The meeting of the working group shall not be public. A member of the Accreditation Board who is not a member of the working group shall have the right to attend the meeting of the working group, in such case he/she shall attend the meeting as an observer.
4. The deliberations of the working group shall be governed by the agenda of the meeting.
5. The agenda shall be elaborated by the chairperson of the working group in cooperation with the members of the working group. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall send an invitation to the meeting of the working group at least 10 calendar days before the meeting starts.
6. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall provide for the organisation of the meeting of the working group.
7. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall make the application and its appendices available to the members of the working group in electronic form no later than five

working days from the date of appointment of the working group and the assignment of the application to the working group by the Accreditation Board.

8. The meetings of the working group shall be chaired by its chairperson.
9. The members of the working group shall be obliged to participate in the meetings.
10. If a member of the working group is unable to attend a meeting for serious reasons, he/she shall be obliged to justify his/her absence from the meeting and to provide the chairperson of the working group with a written opinion on the individual items on the agenda.
11. In order for the working group to vote, there shall be a quorum of a majority of its members present at the meeting.
12. The adoption of a resolution of the working group shall require the approval of an absolute majority of the votes of all members; in the event of an equality of votes, the vote of the chairperson of the working group shall prevail.
13. The chairperson and the members of the working group shall elaborate a draft evaluation report or expert review of the application which has been assigned to the working group for review by the Accreditation Board.
14. If an application submitted to the working group for review does not contain all the required documents, including appendices, the working group may request the submitter, through the secretary of the Accreditation Board, to complete the documents within a time limit of 10 to 30 calendar days from the receipt of the request for completion of the documents sent to the submitter. A record shall be made of this fact, which shall become part of the expert review of the working group.
15. The evaluation report shall include the level of fulfilment of the individual criteria of the SAAHE Standards, i.e. the evaluation of the compliance with the SAAHE Standards for the Internal System (internal quality assurance system of higher education), Standards for Study Programmes, Standards for HPaIP according to the focus of the evaluation. If any of the evaluated criteria is not fulfilled, the reasons for such evaluation of the criterion shall be given.
16. In its evaluation report, the working group mainly states:
  - a) the facts on which the conclusions of the report are based,
  - b) the process of evaluation of the documentation,
  - c) an evaluation of the level of fulfilment of each standard,
  - d) the shortcomings identified,
  - e) recommendations for the party to the proceedings,
  - f) a draft decision or statement for the Accreditation Board,
  - g) the names and surnames of the members of the working group.
17. The working group shall vote on the final text of the evaluation report and the expert review on the matter under discussion and adopt a resolution.
18. Minutes shall be taken of the meeting of the working group. The minutes shall be elaborated by the chairperson of the working group or a member of the working group designated by him/her. The attendance list of the members present at the meeting and, in the case of an online meeting, the list of participants, shall create an appendix to the minutes. The minutes shall be approved by the chairperson of the working group who shall deliver the minutes to the secretary of the Accreditation Board. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall make the minutes available to the members of the Accreditation Board and to the members of the working group.
19. The evaluation report and the expert review of the working group on the matter under discussion shall be submitted by the chairperson of the working group to the secretary

- of the Accreditation Board within the deadline set by the chairperson of the Accreditation Board via the UNIZA Information System for Accreditation.
20. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall check the formal correctness of the submitted evaluation report and the expert review of the working group.
  21. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall provide the evaluation report or the expert review of the working group to the submitter of the application for comments no later than within 7 calendar days of its receipt by the chairperson of the working group of the Accreditation Board.
  22. The submitter of the application shall have the right to comment on the evaluation report or the expert review and his/her opinion shall be delivered to the secretary of the Accreditation Board within 14 calendar days of the receipt of the evaluation report or the expert review.
  23. The meeting of the working group of the Accreditation Board can be implemented:
    - a) in-person/face-to-face,
    - b) by videoconference or by other means of information and communication technology without the physical presence of the members of the working group at the meeting, mainly due to an emergency or based on a decision of the chairperson of the Accreditation Board,
    - c) in combination according to points a) and b) of this paragraph.
  24. If the working group must decide without delay, the chairperson of the working group may also make use of *per rollam* voting utilising electronic communication form.

### **Article 31**

#### **Conflicts of Interest of a Member of the Working Group and its Resolution**

1. Each member of a working group of the Accreditation Board shall declare by affidavit that he/she has no conflict of interest in the matter assigned to the working group for discussion and its expert review. The affidavit must be submitted in writing before the working group begins to evaluate the application submitted for expert review.
2. A member of the working group of the Accreditation Board shall notify the chairperson of the working group and the secretary of the Accreditation Board that he/she has a conflict of interest. The secretary of the Accreditation Board shall immediately inform the chairperson of the Accreditation Board of this fact.
3. If a member of the working group knows that there are facts in the review process for which he/she should be excluded from the review process and does not immediately notify the chairperson of the working group and the secretary of the Accreditation Board of these facts, he/she shall be guilty of a conflict of interest.
4. If a conflict of interest is identified, the Accreditation Board shall dismiss and exclude the member of the working group from the review process. A written record of this shall be made.
5. If a conflict of interest of a member of the working group has been identified, the chairperson of the Accreditation Board shall propose and the Accreditation Board shall approve a new member of the working group from the list of candidates for members of the working groups for the evaluated application in place of the member who has a conflict of interest. Such a change in the composition of the working group shall involve a review of the part of the procedure in question and the procedures accomplished by the removed member of the working group if the conflict has been

identified during the course of the evaluation and not before the procedure has been initiated.

## **PART 5: COMMON AND FINAL PROVISIONS**

### **Article 32**

#### **Documentation of the Accreditation Board, of the Working Groups and its Publication**

1. The documentation of the Accreditation Board and its working groups shall be elaborated in electronic form.
2. The documentation in electronic form shall be made available to the members of the Accreditation Board and the relevant working group in the UNIZA Information System for Accreditation.
3. Electronic means of communication may be used for the transmission of documents and mutual communication between the members of the Accreditation Board and the members of the working groups.
4. With the intention of information and transparency the Accreditation Board publishes relevant documents informing on the activities of the Accreditation Board, the working groups related to the quality assurance of educational, research, development, artistic and other creative activities at UNIZA on the UNIZA website.

### **Article 33**

#### **Seat of the Accreditation Board**

1. The Accreditation Board of the University of Žilina has its seat in the premises of the Rector's Office of the University of Žilina at Univerzitná Street No. 8215/1, Zip-code 010 26 Žilina.

### **Article 34**

#### **Final Provisions**

1. The Accreditation Board and the working groups of the Accreditation Board shall be governed by this Statute.
2. All Faculties and other workplaces of UNIZA are obliged to assist the Accreditation Board and its working groups. Based on the requests of the Accreditation Board and its working groups, the Faculties and workplaces of UNIZA are obliged to provide information and the documentation necessary for the implementation of activities according to this Statute and other internal regulations of UNIZA within the stipulated deadlines.
3. The Accreditation Board shall elaborate an annual report on its activities. After the approval of the Accreditation Board Activity Report by the Accreditation Board, the chairperson of the Accreditation Board shall submit the report to the UNIZA Scientific Board for discussion. After the discussion in the UNIZA Scientific Board, the report shall be published on the UNIZA Intranet.
4. Amendments to this Statute must be discussed in the Accreditation Board and approved by the Accreditation Board and subsequently submitted to the UNIZA Academic Senate for discussion before being submitted to the UNIZA Scientific Board for approval.

5. Appendix No. 3 of the Statute of the Board of Quality of the University of Žilina of the Directive No. 113 Internal Quality Assurance System of Education is repealed.
6. This Directive was discussed by the UNIZA Academic Senate on 21 June 2021.
7. This Directive was approved by the UNIZA Scientific Board on 1 July 2021.
8. This Directive shall enter into force and effect on the date of its approval.
9. Amendment No. 1 to the Directive No. 210 was discussed by the UNIZA Academic Senate on 25 April 2022 and was approved by the UNIZA Scientific Board on 5 May 2022.
10. The amendment enters into force and effect on the date of its approval by the UNIZA Scientific Board, i.e. on 5 May 2022.
11. Amendment No. 2 was discussed by the UNIZA Scientific Board on 14 December 2023 and approved by the UNIZA Accreditation Board on 18 December 2023.
12. Amendment No. 2 enters into force and effect on the day of its approval by the UNIZA Accreditation Board.

Prof. Ing. Ján Čelko, CSc.  
Rector