

S t a t u t e
**of the National Accreditation Bureau
for Higher Education**

**approved by the resolution of the Government
of the Czech Republic**

no. 923 of 17 October 2016

**amended by the resolution of the Government
of the Czech Republic**

no. 568 of 4 September 2018

S t a t u t e

of the National Accreditation Bureau for Higher Education

PART ONE

CONSTITUTIVE PROVISIONS

Article 1

Introductory Provisions

1. The National Accreditation Bureau for Higher Education (hereinafter “Accreditation Bureau”) is an independent body established by the Act No. 111/1998 Coll. (amended and consolidated) on Higher Education Institutions and on Amendments and Supplements to Some Other Acts (Higher Education Act), as resulting from later amendments,¹ with the authority to mainly:
 - a) decide on accreditation of degree programmes², institutional accreditation³ and accreditation of the habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment of professors⁴,
 - b) perform audit of compliance with legal regulations in carrying out accredited activities⁵ and
 - c) carry out external evaluation of educational, scientific, research, development, innovation, artistic and other related activities (hereinafter “creative activities”) of higher education institutions⁶.
2. The Accreditation Bureau is located in Prague.
3. The Accreditation Bureau performs its activities in compliance with the Higher Education Act, Code of Administrative Procedures⁷, other legal norms⁸ and this Statute of the National Accreditation Bureau for Higher Education (hereinafter “Statute”).
4. The Accreditation Bureau applies the Standards for Accreditation⁹, on which its activities are based along with administrative consideration, with attention to relevant principles of standards for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area¹⁰.

¹ Section 83 and further of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll. on higher education institutions and on amendments and supplements of some other acts (Higher Education Act), as resulting from later amendments.

² Section 79 through 81 of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from later amendments.

³ Section 81a through 81d of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

⁴ Section 82 of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from later amendments.

⁵ Section 84 (1) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from later amendments.

⁶ Section 84 (2) and (3) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

⁷ Act No. 500/2004 Coll., code of administrative procedures, as resulting from later amendments.

⁸ For example Act No. 101/2000 Coll., on protection of personal data and on amendments of some other acts, as resulting from later amendments.

⁹ Government Regulation No. 274/2016 Coll., on standards for accreditation in higher education.

¹⁰ Mainly the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area.

5. The Accreditation Bureau provides methodical support related to issues of a quality assurance system for educational, creative and other related activities of higher education institutions and internal quality evaluation.
6. In the interest of good public service, the Accreditation Bureau cooperates with the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (hereinafter “Ministry”) and possibly other relevant central bodies of public administration and bodies of representation of higher education institutions on issues within its competence that are key for the higher education system in the Czech Republic. The Accreditation Bureau cooperates, in the interest of good public service, also with other bodies of public administration, bodies of regional administration, professional chambers, employer associations and other social dialogue partners on issues related to graduates’ employability.
7. In the interest of good public service, the Accreditation Bureau cooperates with the Ministry, the Council for Research, Development and Innovation, bodies of representation of higher education institutions and possibly other relevant bodies of administration, institutions and organizations on issues within its competence that are key to the carrying out and evaluation of creative activities at higher education institutions.

Article 2

Bodies of the Accreditation Bureau

1. The executive body of the Accreditation Bureau is the Board of the Accreditation Bureau (hereinafter “Board”) ¹¹.
2. The chairperson of the Accreditation Bureau is the Chair of the Board ¹¹.
3. Two vice-chairpersons of the Accreditation Bureau are the Vice-Chairs of the Board ¹¹.
4. The operating body of the Accreditation Bureau is the Presidium of the Accreditation Bureau (hereinafter “Presidium”).
5. The body that makes decisions on appeals against decisions of the Board in the first instance is the Appeals Committee of the Accreditation Bureau (hereinafter “Appeals Committee”) ¹².
6. The advisory bodies of the Board are Evaluation Committees ¹³.
7. The advisory bodies of the Accreditation Bureau are also committees established by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau or by the Board; these committees may be permanent or established to solve particular matters.

Article 3

The Board and Members of the Board

1. Apart from the competences stipulated by the Higher Education Act ¹⁴, in matters that belong to the field of activity of the Accreditation Bureau and in matters of the Accreditation Bureau the Board also

¹¹ Section 83a of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act No. 137/2016 Coll.

¹² Section 83d of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act No. 137/2016 Coll.

¹³ Section 83e of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act No. 137/2016 Coll.

- a) approves the appointment of the members of the Board as rapporteurs for particular areas of activity; rapporteurs are always appointed for individual fields of study¹⁵, for institutional accreditation, for professionally oriented degree programmes¹⁶ and for representation of students in Evaluation Committees¹⁷,
- b) approves the Rules of Procedure for Evaluation Committees (Article 23),
- c) makes decisions on removal of an Evaluation Committee member in cases under Article 29 par. 12,
- d) approves the rules for remuneration of the members of committees established under Article 2 par. 7,
- e) resolves that the Accreditation Bureau instigates administrative proceedings towards a corrective measure under Section 83c (2) b) pt. 2 of the Higher Education Act (Article 13 par. 4),
- f) resolves that the Accreditation Bureau instigates administrative proceedings towards abolition of a corrective measure under Section 83c (2) b) pt. 3 of the Higher Education Act (Article 13 par. 5),
- g) approves the conducting of an exceptional external evaluation of educational, creative and related activities of a higher education institution¹⁸ (hereinafter “exceptional external evaluation of a higher education institution”) under Article 15 par. 1,
- h) approves principles of conduct of audit of compliance with legal regulations in carrying out accredited activities by higher education institutions (hereinafter “audit of higher education institutions”)¹⁹ under Article 17,
- i) approves other recommended procedures and methods (Article 20),
- j) approves standpoints on matters submitted by the Minister of Education, Youth and Sports (hereinafter “Minister”) that relate to higher education²⁰,
- k) approves suggestions of the Accreditation Bureau to amend legal regulations (Article 22 par. 6),
- l) assigns the Presidium with the task to draft a new Statute (Article 12 par. 1),
- m) approves the yearly report of the Accreditation Bureau (Article 24)²¹,
- n) charges members of the Board to manage internal evaluation of the activities of the Accreditation Bureau and approves the report on internal evaluation of the activities of the Accreditation Bureau including its updates (Article 25),
- o) resolves that the Accreditation Bureau shall undergo external evaluation (Article 26),
- p) approves the Code of Ethics of the Accreditation Bureau.

¹⁴ Section 83c (2), Section 83e (4) sentence 2 and Section 83e (5) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act No. 137/2016 Coll.

¹⁵ Section 44a of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act No. 137/2016 Coll.

¹⁶ Section 44 (5) a) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act No. 137/2016 Coll.

¹⁷ Section 83e (2) a) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

¹⁸ Section 84 (2) b) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

¹⁹ Section 84 (1) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from later amendments.

²⁰ Section 83 (2) g) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

²¹ Section 83 (2) h) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

2. A member of the Board methodically coordinates the activities of Evaluation Committees and possible other committees established under Article 2 par. 7 in the area of activity, in which he or she was appointed a rapporteur under provisions of par. 1 a).
3. A member of the Board or the Board may request supplementary documents to the matter in deliberation, typically through the Office of the Accreditation Bureau (hereinafter "Office")²².
4. The Board may request an expert statement through the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau.
5. A member of the Board is excluded from deliberation and decision-making on a matter under conditions stipulated by the Code of Administrative Procedures²³.
6. The operation of the Board as well as the procedure to exercise the competences of the Accreditation Bureau in certain matters is regulated in Part Two of the Statute.

Article 4

The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau

1. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau presides over activities of the Accreditation Bureau and represents it externally.
2. Apart from the competences stipulated by the Higher Education Act²⁴, in matters of organizing the activities of the Accreditation Bureau the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau mainly
 - a) after previous consultation in the Presidium issues provisions to ensure compliance of the activities of the Accreditation Bureau with legal regulations and the Statute, under which the bodies of the Accreditation Bureau, members of these bodies, evaluators enrolled in the Pool of Evaluators¹³ and employees of the Office act; these provisions are provided to the members of the Board and the Appeals Committee without delay,
 - b) submits items on the agenda of a Board meeting unless their submission is reserved for another member or members of the Board by the Statute,
 - c) coordinates the activities of the chairs of Evaluation Committees,
 - d) sets deadlines for the activities of Evaluation Committees (Article 31 par. 2),
 - e) gives consent to arrange an expert statement requested by an Evaluation Committee (Article 31 par. 5),
 - f) on the basis of information provided by higher education institutions or the Ministry²⁵ or information obtained through the activities of the Accreditation Bureau, initiates after previous consultation in the Presidium potential further steps to be taken by the Accreditation Bureau,

²² Section 83f of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

²³ Section 14 of the Act No. 500/2004 Coll., as resulting from the Act No. 250/2014 Coll.

²⁴ Section 83a (2) and (3) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

²⁵ Mainly Section 21 (1) c) and h), Section 42 (1) c), e) and j), Section 77b (3) c), Section 77c (5) a), Section 81b (2), Section 82 (8), Section 87 (1) t), Section 85 c) and d) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from later amendments.

- g) after previous consultation in the Presidium sets up a system of methodical trainings and other consultations for members of the bodies of the Accreditation Bureau and for evaluators enrolled in the Pool of Evaluators.
3. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau performs acts towards parties to the proceedings under Section 134 (1) sentence 2 of the Code of Administrative Procedures.
 4. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau approves work-related trips of the members of the Board²⁶ and members of the Appeals Committee²⁷, providing advances on travel expenses and their administrative processing. The rules for sending these persons on work-related trips and specification of covered travel expenses are determined by relevant internal regulations of the Ministry.

Article 5

The Vice-Chairs of the Accreditation Bureau

1. The Vice-Chairs of the Accreditation Bureau act as deputies for the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau in extent determined by the Chair.
2. The specification of competences of the Vice-Chairs of the Accreditation Bureau and information on the order in which they act as deputies for the Chair in full extent during his or her absence is made public.

Article 6

The Presidium

1. The Presidium is composed of the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau and the Vice-Chairs of the Accreditation Bureau.
2. Meetings of the Presidium take place as needed, usually twice a month but at the least once a month.
3. Meetings of the Presidium are convened by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau either on his or her own initiative, on request of a Vice-Chair of the Accreditation Bureau, a member of the Board, or on request of the director of the Office.
4. Meetings of the Presidium are attended without the right to vote by the director of the Office, and as a record-keeper an employee of the Office designated by the director after agreement with the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau. Meetings can be attended by other persons without the right to vote on invitation of the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau or the Presidium, as well as a member of the Board if the meeting is convened on his or her request.
5. The minutes from a meeting of the Presidium are approved by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau.
6. The minutes from a meeting of the Presidium are sent to the members of the Board.

²⁶ Section 83a (5) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

²⁷ Section 83d (2) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

PART TWO THE OPERATION OF THE BOARD

Article 7

Due and Nonscheduled Meetings of the Board

1. A schedule of due meetings of the Board is set by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau after previous consultation in the Presidium, typically for a period of one year; due meetings of the Board take place at least six times a year. The schedule is made public.
2. Due meetings of the Board are convened by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau according to the schedule.
3. Nonscheduled meetings of the Board are convened by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau after previous consultation in the Presidium, or on request of at least one third of all members of the Board, within 14 days unless the request sets a longer timeframe. The grounds of the request can be constituted only by urgent matters that cannot be postponed; the request must be accompanied by documentation.
4. The date and place of a due meeting is announced to the members of the Board and other persons expected to attend the meeting at least 14 days in advance; the date and place of a nonscheduled meeting is announced at least five days in advance.

Article 8

Meetings of the Board

1. A meeting of the Board is attended by members of the Board.
2. Unless the Code of Administrative Procedures stipulates otherwise²⁸, a meeting of the Board is attended without the right to vote by the director of the Office and as record-keepers employees of the Office designated by the director of the Office after agreement with the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau, and other persons invited by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau or the Board may attend as well.
3. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau typically invites representatives of the Ministry, bodies of representation of higher education institutions and social dialogue partners to attend those parts of the meeting of the Board that do not relate to administrative proceedings²⁹ conducted by the Accreditation Bureau or issues of state approval³⁰.
4. The agenda of a meeting of the Board is proposed by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau after previous consultation in the Presidium; the proposed agenda is announced in the manner stipulated in Article 7 par. 4. In urgent cases, the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau may subsequently change the proposal.
5. After a meeting has begun, the members of the Board may propose amendments or adjustments to the proposed agenda of the meeting. The Board resolves upon the proposed agenda of the meeting as well as any amendments or adjustments.

²⁸ Section 134 (1) sentence 4 of the Act No. 500/2004 Coll.

²⁹ Section 83 (2) a) through c) and e) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

³⁰ Section 39, 39a and 83 (2) f) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from later amendments.

6. Meetings of the Board are chaired by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau or a Vice-Chair of the Accreditation Bureau designated by the Chair.
7. The items on the agenda are typically deliberated on the basis of written documents. The documents are sent to the members of the Board at the latest seven days prior to a due meeting of the Board, or together with the announcement of the date and place of a nonscheduled meeting of the Board under Article 7 par. 4. The documents are sent electronically.
8. A discussion is held to each item on the agenda.
9. A vote is taken separately on each motion that has been made to the Board, unless the member of the Board that has made the motion withdraws the motion before the vote is taken. It is possible to vote jointly on motions that are related in their matter or on motions made to one item on the agenda.
10. A vote is taken in the order in which motions were made. If a motion has been made to withdraw an item from the agenda of the meeting, it is voted on first. A vote on proposed amendments and adjustments is taken prior to the vote on the original motion, in reverted order than the order in which they have been proposed. When a motion that includes alternatives is made, a vote is first taken on the individual alternatives and subsequently on the motion that resulted from that vote.
11. A vote is public unless stipulated differently by the Statute.
12. The vote pertaining to motions to remove a member of the Board under Article 27 par. 3 and 4 or a member of an Evaluation Committee under Article 29 par. 12 is always secret. In other cases pertaining to persons identified by name, the vote is secret if requested by at least three members of the Board. The votes casted in a secret vote are counted by a committee of three that can only be composed of the members of the Board.
13. After a vote has been taken or after the votes have been counted, the result is announced by stating the number of votes casted in favour of the proposal, against the proposal and the number of the members of the Board that abstained. If a member of the Board that was present did not participate in the vote, he or she is considered to have abstained.
14. Each member of the Board may raise an objection against the course of a vote immediately after that vote. The Board makes a decision on such objection without discussion. If the Board accepts the objection, the vote is repeated.

Article 9

Resolutions of the Board

1. The Board has a quorum if more than a half of all members of the Board are present. If, however, less than two thirds of all members of the Board are present, the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau may, in the interest of greater representativeness of the decision and with regard to the basic principles of operation of administrative bodies³¹, adjourn an item or items on the agenda to the next due meeting of the Board or to a

³¹ Part one, Chapter II of the Act No. 500/2004 Coll.

nonscheduled meeting of the Board; the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau may adjourn a given item on the agenda only once.

2. Unless the Higher Education Act³² or the Statute stipulate otherwise, a resolution of the Board is adopted if more than a half of the members present voted in favor of the resolution.
3. At least two thirds of all members of the Board must be in favour of a resolution to remove a member of the Board in order to adopt the resolution.
4. For the purpose of determining a quorum of the Board or counting the votes, it is always considered that the Board has the number of members stipulated by the Higher Education Act³³.

Article 10 **The Minutes**

1. The minutes from meetings of the Board are approved by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau.
2. The minutes from the meetings of the Board are sent to the members of the Board, the Ministry and the bodies of representation of higher education institutions and are made public.

Article 11 **Meeting and Vote Per Rollam**

1. A nonscheduled meeting of the Board will be held per rollam if the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau makes such a decision after previous consultation in the Presidium.
2. The documents and the motion, including substantiation, are distributed to the members of the Board for deliberation in a closed electronic conference. The resolution includes a deadline for deliberation and casting of the vote no shorter than three days from distribution.
3. A vote is public and to be casted through an electronic ballot.
4. It is not possible to vote per rollam on a proposal of the Statute, an amendment to the Statute or on resolutions in matters listed in Article 8 par. 12 sentence 1. It is also not possible to vote per rollam if at least one third of all members of the Board rejected a per rollam vote within the deadline for casting of the vote.
5. The results of the per rollam vote are announced to the members of the Board without delay; for purposes of counting votes in a per rollam vote it is considered that all members of the Board were present.

³² Section 83c (3) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

³³ Section 83b (1) sentence 1 of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

Article 12
The Approval Process of the Statute

1. A proposal of a new Statute is submitted to the Board by the Presidium either on its own initiative, or on the basis of the resolution of the Board.
2. A proposal for amendment of the Statute may be submitted by a member of the Board.
3. The proposal mentioned in par. 1 or 2 is submitted to the Office at least 21 days prior to a meeting of the Board and distributed to the members of the Board without delay.
4. Proposed adjustments to the proposal of a new Statute or to the proposal for an amendment of the Statute are submitted to the Office at least 14 days prior to the meeting of the Board. The submitter of the proposal may modify his or her proposal in reaction to the proposed adjustments; for the purposes of further deliberation the modification is considered a proposed adjustment.
5. A proposal of a new Statute or a proposal for amendment of the Statute along with submitted proposed adjustments will be deliberated by the Presidium. The proposal of a new Statute or an amendment of the Statute, the package of proposed adjustments and the standpoint of the Presidium constitute documents for the meeting of the Board.
6. The proposal of a new Statute or the proposal of amendments to the Statute approved by the Board as well as information on the approval process of this proposal by the Government is made public.

Article 13
Administrative Proceedings in the First Instance³⁴

1. The Office distributes the file to the chair and other members of the Evaluation Committee after its establishment according to Article 29 and to the relevant member or members of the Board (Article 29 par. 2).
2. On the basis of the standpoint of the Evaluation Committee (Article 31 par. 7) the relevant member or members of the Board produce a report within 14 days that includes also a proposal of a resolution of the Board as well as its substantiation; the report is submitted to the Office.
3. Documents for the meeting of the Board include mainly the standpoint of the Evaluation Committee and the report of the relevant member or members of the Board; this member or members of the Board are submitters of the given item on the agenda of a meeting of the Board.
4. The Board resolves upon instigation of administrative proceedings towards a corrective measure under Section 83c (2) b) pt. 2 of the Higher Education Act; the relevant item of the agenda including the substantiation may be proposed by a member of the Board. If it is a case under Section 81b (3) sentence 2 of the Higher Education Act, the act to instigate administrative proceedings must be performed without delay following the day as of which institutional accreditation for the relevant field or fields of education expired.

³⁴ Section 83c (2) b) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

5. The Board resolves upon instigation of administrative proceedings towards abolition of a corrective measure under Section 83c (2) b) pt. 3 of the Higher Education Act; the relevant item of the agenda including the substantiation may be proposed by a member of the Board. If a higher education institution applies for abolition of a corrective measure, the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau submits the given item to the agenda of a meeting of the Board.
6. If a new assessment of the matter by an Evaluation Committee is needed after a decision of the Board has been annulled or partially annulled and the matter has been returned by the Appeals Committee³⁵, the procedure under par. 1 through 3 applies, otherwise the matter will be submitted to the nearest meeting of the Board in compliance with the deadline under Article 7 par. 4. After a decision of the Board is annulled by court, it will be proceeded accordingly.

Article 14

The Standpoint to the Type of Higher Education Institution

1. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau establishes a committee under Article 2 par. 7 from the evaluators enrolled in the Pool of Evaluators to prepare a standpoint to an application of a higher education institution to the type of higher education institution³⁶.
2. The Office distributes the application of a higher education institution to the committee mentioned in par. 1 and to the Presidium.
3. Article 28 par. 2 and 3 apply to the activities of the committee accordingly and Article 31 applies proportionately.
4. On the basis of the standpoint of the committee, the Presidium produces a report within 14 days that includes also a proposal of a resolution of the Board as well as its substantiation; the report is submitted to the Office.
5. Documents for the meeting of the Board include mainly the standpoint of the committee and the report of the Presidium.
6. The standpoint to the type of a higher education institution will be issued by the Accreditation Bureau no later than 90 days from receipt of the application of the higher education institution.
7. The deadline for filing objections to the standpoint is 30 days from the receipt of the standpoint by the higher education institution.
8. Objections of the higher education institution filed within the deadline mentioned in par. 7 are distributed by the Office without delay to the Presidium and the committee if a new assessment of the matter by the committee is needed; the committee submits its standpoint to the objections of the higher education institution to the Office within 30 days. Documents for the meeting of the Board include mainly the objections of the higher education institution, a submission report of the Presidium and the standpoint of the committee if relevant. The matter shall be submitted to the nearest meeting of the

³⁵ Section 83c (4) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

³⁶ Section 2 (6) and Section 83c (2) e) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

Board in compliance with the deadline under Article 7 par. 4. If the Board finds the objections reasonable, its standpoint will be changed.

Article 15

The External Evaluation of a Higher Education Institution

1. The suggestion to conduct an exceptional external evaluation of a higher education institution¹⁸ may be made by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau after consultation in the Presidium, or the suggestion can be submitted to the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau by at least one third of all members of the Board; the suggestion must be substantiated. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau will request a standpoint of the concerned higher education institution to the reasons given for the suggestion; the deadline for submission of the standpoint is 15 days from the receipt of the request made by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau. Documents for the meeting of the Board include mainly the suggestion of the members of the Board and the standpoint of the higher education institution if applicable; the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau or the members of the Board mentioned in the first sentence are submitters of the given item to the agenda of a meeting of the Board.
2. The Office passes a suggestion of the Minister to conduct external evaluation of educational, creative and related activities of a higher education institution (hereinafter “requested external evaluation of a higher education institution”)³⁷ or a resolution of the Board to conduct an exceptional external evaluation of a higher education institution to the chair and other members of an Evaluation Committee following its establishment under Article 29 and to the relevant member or members of the Board (Article 29 par. 2) without delay.
3. On the basis of a draft of the report on requested external evaluation of a higher education institution or on exceptional external evaluation of a higher education institution (hereinafter “report on external evaluation of a higher education institution”) created by the Evaluation Committee, the relevant member or members of the Board produce a submission report within 14 days that includes also a proposal of a resolution of the Board; this report is submitted to the Office. The report on external evaluation of a higher education institution is also provided to the higher education institution for a statement; the deadline for submission of this statement is 15 days from the receipt of this report.
4. Documents for the meeting of the Board include mainly the draft of the report on external evaluation, the submission report of the relevant member or members of the Board and the statement of the higher education institution if applicable; this member or members of the Board are submitters of the given item to the agenda of the meeting of the Board.
5. The Accreditation Bureau will release the report on external evaluation of a higher education institution within 150 days from receipt of the suggestion of the Minister to conduct external evaluation of a higher education institution or from the day when the

³⁷ Section 84 (2) a) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

Board approved the resolution to conduct exceptional external evaluation of a higher education institution.

6. The deadline for filing objections to the report on external evaluation of a higher education institution is 30 days from the receipt of the report by the higher education institution.
7. Objections of the higher education institution filed within the deadline mentioned in par. 6 are distributed by the Office to the chair and other members of the Evaluation Committee and the relevant member or members of the Board without delay. The Evaluation Committee submits its standpoint to the objections, including possible proposed adjustments to the report on external evaluation of a higher education institution, to the Office within 30 days. Documents for the meeting of the Board include mainly the objections of the higher education institution, the standpoint of the Evaluation Committee and the submission report of the relevant member or members of the Board. The matter will be submitted to the nearest meeting of the Board in compliance with the deadline under Article 7 par. 4. If the Board finds the objections reasonable, the report on external evaluation of a higher education institution will be changed.
8. The report on external evaluation of a higher education institution is made public after expiration of the deadline mentioned in par. 6 on condition no objections have been filed or following the procedure under par. 7.

Article 16

The Standpoint to Granting State Approval

1. Article 13 par. 1 through 3 apply accordingly to the procedure of issuing a standpoint to granting state approval and to the procedure under Section 39a (2) sentences 2 and 3 of the Higher Education Act.
2. The Accreditation Bureau issues its standpoint to granting state approval within 90 days from the receipt of a request of the Ministry for the standpoint of the Accreditation Bureau to the application for granting state approval or within 60 days from the receipt of a request of the Ministry under Section 39a (2) sentences 2 and 3 of the Higher Education Act.

Article 17

The Audit of Higher Education Institutions

1. The procedure of audit of higher education institutions is compliant to the Code of Inspection³⁸ and the Principles of Conduct of Audit of Higher Education Institutions.
2. The Code of Inspection and the Principles of Conduct of Audit of Higher Education Institutions also apply in carrying out the competences of the Accreditation Bureau in

³⁸ Act No. 255/2012 Coll., on inspection (Code of Inspection).

audit of the activities of a European foreign higher education institution or a branch of a European foreign higher education institution in the territory of the Czech Republic³⁹.

3. The Presidium submits a proposal of the Principles of Conduct of Audit of Higher Education Institutions to the Board. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau first distributes a draft of the proposal to the members of the Board for their statement and consults the proposal with the bodies of representation of higher education institutions prior to submitting the proposal.
4. The proposal mentioned under par. 3 is submitted to the Office at least 21 days prior to the meeting of the Board and distributed to the members of the Board without delay.
5. Proposed adjustments to the proposal under par. 3 are submitted to the Office at least 14 days prior to the meeting of the Board. The Presidium will deliberate on the proposed adjustments and may modify their proposal in response to the proposed adjustments; for the purposes of further deliberation the modification is considered a proposed adjustment.
6. The proposal under par. 3, the package of proposed adjustments and a standpoint of the Presidium constitute the documents for the meeting of the Board.
7. The Principles of Conduct of Audit of Higher Education Institutions are made public.

Article 18

The Standpoint to Non-European Foreign Higher Education Institutions

1. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau establishes a committee under Article 2 par. 7 from evaluators enrolled in the Pool of Evaluators to prepare a standpoint to personnel, financial and material resources of a foreign higher education degree programme and to the fulfillment of conditions enabling due course of instruction and related creative activities by the applicant for a permit or authorization to provide foreign higher education in the territory of the Czech Republic, on request of the Ministry for cooperation of the Accreditation Bureau in assessment of compliance with requirements listed under Section 93f (5) a) or Section 93h (5) a) of the Higher Education Act⁴⁰.
2. The Office passes the request of the Ministry on to the committee and the Presidium.
3. Article 28 par. 2 and 3 apply to the activities of the committee accordingly and Article 31 applies proportionately.
4. The Presidium produces a report on the basis of the standpoint of the committee within 14 days including the proposal of a resolution of the Board as well as its substantiation; the report is submitted to the Office.
5. Documents for the meeting of the Board include mainly the standpoint of the committee and the report of the Presidium.
6. The Accreditation Bureau will release its standpoint with 90 days from the receipt of the request of the Ministry.

³⁹ Section 93k and related provisions of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

⁴⁰ Section 83c (2) h) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

Article 19

Recommended Procedures and Methods of Evaluation

1. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau establishes, after previous consultation in the Board, permanent committees under Article 2 par. 7 to draft recommended procedures and methods of evaluation in processes of accreditation of degree programmes, institutional accreditation and accreditation of the habilitation procedure and the procedure of appointment of professors⁴¹; these committees are established mainly from the members of the Board and evaluators enrolled in the Pool of Evaluators.
2. A part of the recommended procedures and methods of evaluation is also the recommended structure and format of an application for
 - a) accreditation of a degree programme, its expansion and extension,
 - b) institutional accreditation and its expansion,
 - c) accreditation of the habilitation procedure and the procedure of appointment of professors and
 - d) abolition of corrective measures.
3. The recommended procedures and methods of evaluation are made public.

Article 20

Other Recommended Procedures and Methods

1. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau establishes, after previous consultation in the Board, typically permanent committees under Article 2 par. 7 to draft recommended procedures and methods of carrying out the competences of the Accreditation Bureau not listed in Article 19; these committees are established mainly from the members of the Board and evaluators enrolled in the Pool of Evaluators.
2. A part of the recommended procedures and methods under par. 1 is typically also the recommended structure and format of
 - a) an application for a standpoint on the type of a higher education institution and
 - b) the part of an application for granting state approval that concerns proposals of degree programmes.
3. Other recommended procedures and methods are made public.

Article 21

The Pool of Evaluators

1. The Presidium prepares a proposal of requirements for enrollment in the Pool of Evaluators. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau provides a draft of the proposal prior to its approval in the Board⁴² to the members of the Board for their statement and consults the proposal with the bodies of representation of higher education institutions. The requirements for enrollment in the Pool of Evaluators are made public.

⁴¹ Section 83c (2) d) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

⁴² Section 83e (4) sentence 2 of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

2. In the Pool of Evaluators, the lowest possible proportion of persons in each field of study is⁴³
 - a) 50 % if persons engaged in higher education are concerned,
 - b) 20 % if persons engaged in the following spheres are concerned:
 - i. the sphere of other research institutions or
 - ii. state administration, regional or other public administration or
 - iii. the sphere of other employers of graduates of higher education institutions, in the corporate sphere that cooperates with higher education institutions or other professional experts
 - c) 5 % if students are concerned,where at least two persons from each of the spheres listed in par. b) pts. i) – iii) must be enrolled in the Pool of Experts. If the Pool of Experts is not composed in line with this requirement, the Accreditation Bureau will publish a call for additional enrollment in due time.
3. The Pool of Evaluators may contain a maximum of 100 persons in the fields of study Economics Disciplines, Philology and Pedagogy and a maximum of 80 persons in each other field of study⁴⁴.
4. An evaluator enrolled in the Pool of Evaluators is obliged to inform the Office without delay of any changes to his or her personal data kept for the purpose of the Pool of Evaluators⁴⁵.
5. A suggestion to exclude an evaluator from the Pool of Evaluators may be presented to the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau by a central body of administration listed in the Higher Education Act⁴⁶ or a member of the Board. The suggestion must be substantiated.
6. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau requests a statement from the concerned evaluator on the suggestion, unless it is the evaluator's own request; the deadline for this statement is 30 days.
7. Documents for the meeting of the Board include mainly the suggestion and the statement of the evaluator if applicable; if the suggestion has been made by a member of the Board, he or she is a submitter of this item to the agenda.
8. Grounds for excluding an evaluator from the Pool of Evaluators may be constituted mainly by repeated refusal to participate in a methodical training or to serve as member of an Evaluation Committee, by conduct giving rise to doubts regarding the independence or expertise of carrying out competences of the Accreditation Bureau or due conduct of these competences, by the fact that the evaluator ceased to be a student or ceased to be engaged in higher education or in a sphere mentioned in par. 2 b) or by inability to continue to be a member of an Evaluation Committee, unless it is the evaluator's own request.

⁴³ Section 83e (2) b) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

⁴⁴ Section 83e (3) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

⁴⁵ Section 83e (6) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

⁴⁶ Section 83e (5) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

Article 22

Suggestions to Amend Standards for Accreditation and to Amend Other Legal Regulations

1. A proposal of the Accreditation Bureau to make a suggestion to amend standards for accreditation⁴⁷ may be submitted by a member of the Board. The proposal includes a substantiation.
2. The proposal under par. 1 is submitted to the Office at least 21 days prior to the meeting of the Board and distributed to the members of the Board without delay.
3. Proposed adjustments to the proposal under par. 1 are submitted to the Office at least 14 days prior to the meeting of the Board. The submitter of the proposal may modify his or her proposal in reaction to the proposed adjustments; for the purposes of further deliberation the modification is considered a proposed adjustment.
4. The proposal along with submitted proposed adjustments is deliberated in the Presidium. The proposal under par. 1, the package of proposed adjustments and the standpoint of the Presidium constitute documents for the meeting of the Board.
5. Suggestions of the Accreditation Bureau to amend standards for accreditation are made public.
6. The provisions in previous paragraphs apply accordingly to the procedure for suggestions of the Accreditation Bureau to amend other legal regulations.

Article 23

Rules of Procedure for Evaluation Committees

1. A proposal of the Rules of Procedure for Evaluation Committees is submitted to the Board by the Presidium.
2. The proposal under par. 1 is submitted to the Office at least 21 days prior to the meeting of the Board and distributed to the members of the Board without delay.
3. Proposed adjustments to the proposal under par. 1 are submitted to the Office at least 14 days prior to the meeting of the Board. The Presidium deliberates the proposed adjustments and may modify the proposal in reaction to the proposed adjustments; for the purposes of further deliberation the modification is considered a proposed adjustment.
4. The proposal under par. 1, the package of proposed adjustments and the standpoint of the Presidium constitute documents for the meeting of the Board.
5. The Rules of Procedure for Evaluation Committees are made public.

Article 24

The Yearly Report of the Accreditation Bureau

⁴⁷ Section 83c (2) c) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

1. The Accreditation Bureau prepares a yearly report on its activities every year²¹.
2. The director of the Office prepares a draft of the yearly report of the Accreditation Bureau according to instructions from the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau.
3. The yearly report of the Accreditation Bureau is made public.

Article 25

The Internal Evaluation of the Activities of the Accreditation Bureau

1. The Accreditation Bureau prepares a report on internal evaluation of its activities once every three years. This report is updated every year.
2. Internal evaluation of the activities of the Accreditation Bureau and preparation of the report on internal evaluation and its updates is managed by the members of the Board charged by the Board to do so.
3. The report on internal evaluation of the Accreditation Bureau is made public.

Article 26

The External Evaluation of the Activities of the Accreditation Bureau

1. The Accreditation Bureau undergoes external evaluation of its activities as necessary.
2. The external evaluation of the activities of the Accreditation Bureau is conducted in compliance with relevant international standards¹⁰ and rules⁴⁸.
3. The report on external evaluation of the Accreditation Bureau is made public.

Article 27

The Proposal to Remove a Member of the Board

1. A suggestion to propose to remove a member of the Board⁴⁹ must be submitted in writing along with a substantiation; the grounds may be constituted only by circumstances related to the preconditions and requirements for exercise of the position of the Chair of the Board, Vice-Chair of the Board or a member of the Board stipulated by the Higher Education Act.
2. The suggestion must be signed by the members of the Board that make the suggestion, persons authorized to act on behalf of a body of representation of higher education institutions or the Minister. If the suggestion is made by a body of representation of higher education institutions, it must be accompanied by exact wording of the resolution.
3. The Board first assesses the admissibility of the suggestion. If a resolution on admissibility of the suggestion is not adopted, it is considered that the Board has rejected the suggestion; there is no further deliberation on a rejected suggestion.
4. If the suggestion is not rejected, the Board will deliberate it at its nearest meeting; the persons listed in par. 2 sentence 1 must be invited to this meeting and they or their

⁴⁸ Mainly rules set by the bodies of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA).

⁴⁹ Section 83c (2) j) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

authorized delegates may participate in this item of the agenda of the meeting. The member of the Board that is subject to the proposal of removal under vote will be granted at least 30 days to prepare for this meeting. In the course of discussion the member of the Board will make a statement on the grounds given for the proposal and has the right to pose questions related to these grounds to the persons that have made the suggestion.

PART THREE EVALUTION COMMITTEES

Article 28 Evaluation Committees

1. Evaluation Committees are advisory bodies of the Board for preparation of standpoints in individual administrative proceedings according to Section 83c (2) b) and g) of the Higher Education Act and for preparation of reports on external evaluation of higher education institutions.
2. Evaluation Committees proceed mainly from the Higher Education Act, the Code of Administrative Procedures, the Standards for Accreditation⁹, the Statute, recommended procedures and methods of evaluation, other recommended procedures and methods under Article 20 and provisions of the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau.
3. The director of the Office is responsible for making the documents listed in par. 2 as well as other relevant regulations⁸ available to members of Evaluation Committees.

Article 29 Establishment of Evaluation Committees

1. Evaluation Committees are established for individual administrative proceedings and for preparation of individual reports on external evaluation of higher education institutions; establishment of permanent Evaluation Committees is forbidden. The provisions in the first sentence do not rule out the possibility of repeated appointment of persons enrolled in the Pool of Evaluators to Evaluation Committees or the possibility of
 - a) establishment of one Evaluation Committee for preparation of standpoints in multiple administrative proceedings under Section 83c (2) b) of the Higher Education Act pertaining to the same degree programme or related degree programmes if the same higher education institution is concerned, or
 - b) establishment of one Evaluation Committee for preparation of standpoints in multiple administrative proceedings under Section 83c (2) b) of the Higher Education Act pertaining to related fields of the habilitation procedure or the procedure of appointment of professors if the same higher education institution is concerned,if the administrative proceedings under a) or under b) have not been merged into a joint proceeding according to Section 140 of the Code of Administrative Procedures.

2. A proposal of the composition of an Evaluation Committee is prepared under Article 30 by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau in cooperation with
 - a) the member of the Board that is a rapporteur for the concerned field of study⁵⁰, or in the case of a combined degree programme⁵⁰ with the members of the Board that are rapporteurs for the concerned fields of study, if administrative proceedings of accreditation of a degree programme are concerned,
 - b) the member of the Board that is a rapporteur for the field of study, in which the higher education institution intends to engage⁵¹, or, if the higher education institution intends to engage in multiple fields of study, with the members of the Board that are rapporteurs for these fields of study, and with the member of the Board that is a rapporteur for institutional accreditation, if administrative proceedings of institutional accreditation are concerned,
 - c) the member of the Board that is a rapporteur for the field of study which corresponds to the field of a habilitation procedure or appointment of professors, or, if this field corresponds to multiple fields of study, with the members of the Board that are rapporteurs for these fields of study, if administrative proceedings of accreditation of habilitation procedure or procedure of appointment of professors are concerned,
 - d) the members of the Board that are rapporteurs for the fields of study, to which the majority of degree programmes carried out by the higher education institution belongs, if external evaluation of a higher education institution is concerned,
 - e) the members of the Board that are rapporteurs for the fields of study, to which degree programmes listed in the application for granting state approval belong, if administrative proceedings of granting of state approval are concerned.

If the member of the Board under Article 3 par. 5 is excluded from deliberation of the given item, the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau designates another member of the Board with whom he or she then prepares the proposal of the composition of an Evaluation Committee; in such case this member of the Board performs other relevant tasks prescribed by the Statute.

3. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau continuously cooperates
 - a) with the member of the Board that is a rapporteur for professionally oriented degree programmes in the matters of inclusion of persons nominated to the Pool of Evaluators by professional associations or other legal entities listed in Section 77b (2) e) of the Higher Education Act or engaged in the sphere listed in Article 21 par. 2 par. b) pt. iii) in Evaluation Committees and
 - b) with the member of the Board that is a rapporteur for inclusion of students in Evaluation Committees in the matters of inclusion of students in Evaluation Committees.
4. An employee of a higher education institution or another legal entity with an employment or service contract or a student of a higher education institution may not

⁵⁰ Section 44 (8) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

⁵¹ Section 81a (2) b) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

be appointed a member of the Evaluation Committee if this higher education institution or this other legal entity is a party to the concerned administrative proceeding or if external evaluation of this higher education institution is concerned. Furthermore, a person that holds a remunerated position at the concerned higher education institution or another legal entity, is a remunerated member of its body or participates in business activities of the concerned higher education institution or another legal entity may not be appointed a member of the Evaluation Committee.

5. A precondition for appointment of a member of an Evaluation Committee is consent of the nominated person.
6. An Evaluation Committee, including its chair and vice-chair or vice-chairs where relevant, is established by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau after consultation in the Presidium no later than 30 days from
 - a) the receipt of an application of the concerned higher education institution by the Accreditation Bureau,
 - b) the instigation of administrative proceedings towards a corrective measure under Section 83c (2) b) pt. 2 of the Higher Education Act by the Accreditation Bureau,
 - c) the instigation of administrative proceedings towards abolition of a corrective measure under Section 83c (2) b) pt. 3 of the Higher Education Act by the Accreditation Bureau,
 - d) the receipt of a request from the Ministry for a standpoint of the Accreditation Bureau to an application for granting of state approval by the Accreditation Bureau,
 - e) the receipt of a suggestion of the Minister to conduct external evaluation of a higher education institution by the Accreditation Bureau, or
 - f) the approval of a resolution to conduct an exceptional external evaluation of a higher education institution by the Board.
7. The Office performs a check for formal errors and completeness of an application without delay. If grounds are found for discontinuation of the proceedings, the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau submits the matter to the Board and an Evaluation Committee will not be established.
8. A request for a standpoint to the composition of the Evaluation Committee is sent to the concerned higher education institution without delay following the establishment of the Evaluation Committee.
9. The deadline for submission of the standpoint by the higher education institution is seven days from the receipt of the request under par. 8.
10. If the standpoint of the higher education institution submitted within the deadline under par. 9 is disapproving, the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau establishes an Evaluation Committee with a changed composition; the provisions of par. 2 and 6 apply proportionately.
11. The Chair of the Accreditation Bureau removes a member of an Evaluation Committee mainly if the member of an Evaluation Committee ceased to comply with requirements for membership in an Evaluation Committee, ceased to be a student or has not participated in the activities of the Evaluation Committee or if his or her conduct rises doubts about the independence and expertise of carrying out competences of the Accreditation Bureau or due conduct of these competences.

12. If an objection of bias of a member of an Evaluation Committee is filed or if, following the establishment of an Evaluation Committee, a fact becomes known that constitutes grounds for removal of a member of the Evaluation Committee, the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau makes a decision regarding his or her removal from the Evaluation Committee; if the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau does not remove the member of the Evaluation Committee, he or she submits the matter to the Board.
13. If a member of an Evaluation Committee gives up the membership or if he or she is removed, the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau may appoint a new member in his or her stead.

Article 30

The Composition of Evaluation Committees

1. An Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings of accreditation of a degree programme is composed of a chair and four other members, on condition that
 - a) at least one member of the Evaluation Committee has been appointed professor or associate professor if a Bachelor's degree programme is concerned,
 - b) the chair of the Evaluation Committee and at least one other member of the Evaluation Committee have been appointed professor or associate professor if a Master's degree programme is concerned,
 - c) the chair of the Evaluation Committee and at least two other members of the Evaluation Committee have been appointed professor or associate professor if a Doctoral degree programme is concerned,
 - d) at least one member of the Evaluation Committee has been nominated for enrollment in the Pool of Evaluators by professional organizations or other legal entities listed in Section 77b (2) e) of the Higher Education Act or are engaged in a sphere listed in Article 21 par. 2 par. b) pt. iii) if a professionally oriented degree programme is concerned.

Members of the Evaluation Committee are appointed from the section of the Pool of Evaluators that corresponds to the field of study⁵², to which the concerned degree programme belongs, or to this field of study or a closely related field of study if a student is concerned; in the case of a combined degree programme, members of the Evaluation Committee are appointed from the sections of the Pool of Evaluators that correspond to the fields of study, to which the concerned degree programme belongs, or to these fields of study or a closely related field of study if a student is concerned.

2. An Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings of institutional accreditation is composed of
 - a) a chair, a vice-chair and three other members including a student, and in addition to that
 - b) a vice-chair and three other members for each field of study in which the higher education institution intends to engage.

⁵² Section 83e (3) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

The chair, vice-chair and three other members mentioned in par. a) will usually be appointed from the section or sections of the Pool of Evaluators that correspond to the field or fields of study in which the higher education institution intends to engage, and they form a subcommittee of the Evaluation Committee. The vice-chair and three members for the concerned field of study mentioned in par. b) will be appointed from the section of the Pool of Evaluators that corresponds to this field of study and they form another subcommittee or, if the higher education institution intends to engage in multiple fields of study, subcommittees of the Evaluation Committee; the conditions related to the type or types of degree programmes under par. 1 apply proportionately.

3. An Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings of accreditation of the habilitation procedure is composed of a chair and four other members on condition that the chair of the Evaluation Committee and at least two other members of the Evaluation Committee have been appointed professor or associate professor.
4. An Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings of accreditation of the procedure for appointment of professors is composed of a chair and four other members on condition that the chair of the Evaluation Committee and at least one other member of the Evaluation Committee have been appointed professor and at least one other member of the Evaluation Committee has been appointed professor or associate professor.
5. Members of an Evaluation Committee under par. 3 and 4 are appointed from the section of the Pool of Evaluators that corresponds to the field of study to which the concerned field of habilitation procedure or the field of procedure for appointment of professors correspond, or to this field of study or a closely related field of study if a student is concerned; if this field corresponds to multiple fields of study, members of the Evaluation Committee will be appointed from the sections of the Pool of Evaluators that correspond to these fields of study, or to these fields of study or a closely related field of study if a student is concerned.
6. If joint proceedings of an application for institutional accreditation and an application for accreditation of the habilitation procedure or the procedure for appointment of professors are conducted, the number of members of the Evaluation Committee stipulated in par. 2 b) increases by one member that has been appointed professor for each field of study to which the fields of the habilitation procedure or the procedure for appointment of professors applied for correspond; this member is appointed from the section of the Pool of Evaluators that corresponds to the concerned field of study and becomes a part of the subcommittee for the concerned field of study.
7. An Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings of state approval is composed of a chair and six other members; the conditions listed in par. 1 apply proportionately to the selection of these persons in relation to the degree programmes mentioned in the application for state approval.
8. An Evaluation Committee for preparation of a report on external evaluation of a higher education institution is composed of a chair, a vice-chair and five other members; the conditions listed in par. 1 apply proportionately to the selection of these persons in

relation to the degree programmes that constitute the majority of educational activities of the higher education institution.

9. If it is not possible to establish an Evaluation Committee from the Pool of Evaluators in the procedure under Article 29 in compliance with conditions listed in par. 1 through 8, these conditions will apply proportionately; in this case the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau shall consult a proposal of composition of the Evaluation Committee with all other members of the Board.
10. If suitable for preparation of a standpoint in the given matter or a report on external evaluation due to its extent, nature or complexity or if the subject of the Committee's activities is also assessment of general requirements of accreditation under Article 33, it is possible to increase the number of the Committee's members accordingly.

Article 31

The Activity of Evaluation Committees

1. Activities of an Evaluation Committee are directed by the chair of the Evaluation Committee.
2. The chair of the Evaluation Committee sets a schedule for the activities of the Evaluation Committee, enabling the Evaluation Committee to reach its standpoint within the deadline stipulated by the Statute or by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau.
3. A meeting of the Evaluation Committee is attended by members of the Evaluation Committee. The meeting and individual proceedings may be attended without the right to vote also by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau, a Vice-Chair of the Accreditation Bureau, a relevant member or members of the Board listed in Article 29 par. 2, the director of the Office or another employee of the Office designated by the director and other persons invited by the chair of the Evaluation Committee or by the Evaluation Committee. Should it be necessary for deliberation of the matter, the chair of the Evaluation Committee will invite a representative of the concerned higher education institution via its rector to the meeting of the Evaluation Committee, alternatively the meeting of the Evaluation Committee or proceedings of the Evaluation Committee's members will take place on the premises of the concerned higher education institution upon agreement of the rector; the meeting of the Evaluation Committee or proceedings of the Evaluation Committee's members will always take place on the premises of the concerned higher education institution in the case of Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings of institutional accreditation or its expansion.
4. An Evaluation Committee has a quorum if more than a half of all its members are present. An Evaluation Committee adopts a standpoint or a draft of a report on external evaluation of a higher education institution by more than a half of all members present, but at least by a third of all its members.
5. An Evaluation Committee may request additional documents, typically through the Office. An Evaluation Committee may request an expert statement through the director of the Office; the Evaluation Committee is obligated to substantiate this request.

6. The minutes are taken from a meeting of the Evaluation Committee and approved by the chair of the Evaluation Committee.
7. The chair of the Evaluation Committee will send the standpoint of the Evaluation Committee or the draft of a report on external evaluation of a higher education institution as well as the minutes from the meeting of the Evaluation Committee without delay to the relevant member or members of the Board and to the Office.
8. Further details on the activities and meetings of Evaluation Committees, including deliberation and vote per rollam and details on activities and meetings of subcommittees under Article 30 par. 2, are stipulated in the Rules of Procedure for Evaluation Committees.
9. Provisions of the Code of Administrative Procedures on the duty to maintain confidentiality apply to the members of Evaluation Committees.

Article 32

The Expert Report, the Opponent Report

1. An expert report is a working document for deliberation of an Evaluation Committee that is produced mainly on the basis of documents submitted by the higher education institution and documents at the disposal of the Accreditation Bureau, including publicly available information. An expert report contains mainly an expert assessment of compliance with requirements determined by the Higher Education Act and Standards for Accreditation⁹. If the expert report states that these requirements are not met, this statement must be particularly substantiated.
2. The chair of an Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings of accreditation of a degree programme or the habilitation procedure or the procedure for appointment of professors will charge one member of this committee with producing the expert report; in a case under Article 29 par. 1 a) and the same degree programme or in a case under Article 29 par. 1 b) the chair of the Evaluation Committee may decide that a joint expert report will suffice. If necessary, the Evaluation Committee or the chair of the Evaluation Committee may, always with the approval of the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau, charge other members of the Evaluation Committee to produce additional expert reports; the Chair of the Evaluation Committee or the Evaluation Committee will typically do so on the basis of the conclusions of an opponent report to the expert report (hereinafter "opponent report") or in the case of an extensive or complicated matter. The Chair of the Evaluation Committee may also charge several members of the Evaluation Committee to produce the expert report in collaboration.
3. An opponent report is a working document for deliberation of an Evaluation Committee and contains mainly an expert review of the quality and comprehensiveness of an expert report with emphasis on whether the expert report appropriately assessed compliance with requirements determined mainly by the Higher Education Act and Standards for Accreditation⁹. If the opponent report states that the expert report is deficient or disagrees with the conclusion of the opponent report, this statement must be particularly substantiated.

4. An opponent report will be produced if the Evaluation Committee or the chair of the Evaluation Committee decides so. The opponent report will be produced by a member of the Evaluation Committee designated by the Evaluation Committee or the chair of the Evaluation Committee. If necessary, the chair of the Evaluation Committee or the Evaluation Committee may, always with the approval of the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau, charge another member of the Evaluation Committee to produce another opponent report.
5. If the subject of activities of an Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in the matter of accreditation of a degree programme or the habilitation procedure or the procedures for appointment of professors is also assessment of general requirements for accreditation under Article 33, a separate expert report for this assessment will be produced; provisions of par. 2 sentence 2 and 3 as well as par. 4 for possible opponent report of this assessment apply accordingly.
6. In the case of Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings of institutional accreditation, separate expert reports will be produced for assessment of requirements under Section 78a (2) a) pt. 1 of the Higher Education Act and further of requirements under Section 78a (2) a) pt. 2 of the Higher Education Act for each field of study in which the higher education institution intends to engage; provisions of par. 2 sentence 2 and 3 as well as par. 4 for possible opponent report of this assessment apply accordingly. If joint proceedings are conducted of an application for institutional accreditation and an application for accreditation of the habilitation procedure or the procedure for appointment of professors, separate expert reports will be also produced for assessment of requirements under Section 78a (2) c) of the Higher Education Act for the fields of habilitation procedure or procedure for appointment of professors that are applied for; provisions of par. 2 sentence 2 and 3 as well as par. 4 for possible opponent report of this assessment apply accordingly.
7. In the case of an Evaluation Committee for state approval, separate expert reports will be produced for each degree programme mentioned in the application for state approval; provisions of par. 2 sentence 2 and 3 as well as par. 4 for possible opponent reports of this assessment apply accordingly.
8. In the case of an Evaluation Committee for preparation of a report on external evaluation of a higher education institution, the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau will decide, on the basis of a proposal of the chair of the Evaluation Committee, on the number and focus of expert reports for preparation of this report, taking into consideration the evaluation of the higher education institution that has been conducted by a widely recognized evaluation agency⁵³ if applicable; provisions of par. 2 sentence 2 and 3 as well as par. 4 for possible opponent report of this assessment apply accordingly. Provisions of par. 1 do not apply.

Article 33

The Assessment of General Requirements for Accreditation

⁵³ Section 84 (3) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

1. An Evaluation Committee established for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings of accreditation of a degree programme does not need to conduct assessment of activities of the higher education institution related to the part of Standards for Accreditation of a degree programme under Section 78a (2) b) pt. 2 and 3 of the Higher Education Act and assessment of the functionality of the quality assurance system for educational, creative and other related activities and internal evaluation of quality of educational, creative and other related activities, including a report on internal evaluation and the last supplement to this report (hereinafter “assessment of general requirements for accreditation”)⁵⁴, if the report on internal evaluation and the last supplement to this report have already been assessed⁵⁵ and no more than 12 months have passed since the last assessment of general requirements for accreditation, counted from the date of issue of the relevant decision on granting, expansion or extension of accreditation. Provisions of the first sentence will not apply if the higher education institution requested it in its application for accreditation of a degree programme or if the Board decided upon it in the case of administrative proceedings under Article 13 par. 4 or 5.
2. Provisions of par. 1 apply proportionately for assessment of an application for accreditation of the habilitation procedure or the procedure for appointment of professors.

Article 34

Remuneration of Members of Evaluation Committees

1. The base for determining remuneration of members of Evaluation Committees is
 - a) 400 CZK for a member of an Evaluation Committee,
 - b) 1 200 CZK for the member of an Evaluation Committee who has produced an opponent report,
 - c) 2 000 CZK for the member of an Evaluation Committee who has produced an expert report,
 - d) 2 000 CZK for a vice-chair of an Evaluation Committee,
 - e) 2 400 CZK for a chair of an Evaluation Committee.For members that have produced an expert report in collaboration, the base is 400 CZK supplemented by the share of 1600 CZK, which is determined proportionately according to the number of these members.
2. Members of Evaluation Committees are entitled to remuneration⁵⁶ determined as product of the base under par. 1 and the following coefficient:
 - a) 1.5 in the case an of Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings in the matter of an application for accreditation of a degree programme, its expansion or extension,

⁵⁴ Mainly Section 77b of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

⁵⁵ Also Section 85 d) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

⁵⁶ Section 83a (4) sentence 3 of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

- b) 1.25 in the case of an Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings in the matter of an application for accreditation of the habilitation procedure or the procedure for appointment of professors,
 - c) 3.5 in the case of an Evaluation Committee for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings in the matter of application for institutional accreditation or its expansion,
 - d) 1.25 in the case of an Evaluation Committee for assessment of deficiencies in carrying out accredited activities and for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings in the matter of restriction or revocation of accreditation of a degree programme, suspension or revocation of accreditation of the habilitation procedure or the procedure for appointment of professors, including proceedings towards abolition of these corrective measures,
 - e) 2.0 in the case of Evaluation Committee for assessment of deficiencies in carrying out accredited activities and for preparation of a standpoint in administrative proceedings in the matter of restriction or revocation of institutional accreditation or proceedings towards restriction and termination of authorization to carry out a degree programme on the basis of institutional accreditation, including proceedings towards abolition of these corrective measures,
 - f) 3.5 in the case of an Evaluation Committee for preparation of a report on external evaluation of the activities of a higher education institution,
 - g) 2.0 in the case of an Evaluation Committee for issuing a standpoint in the matter of state approval.
3. Provisions of the previous paragraphs apply proportionately to remuneration of members of the committees established under Article 2 par. 7; details are stipulated in the rules under Article 3 par. 1 d).

PART FOUR THE APPEALS COMMITTEE

Article 35

The Activity of the Appeals Committee

The Appeals Committee makes decisions on appeals against decisions of the Board and against decisions of the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau (Article 4 par. 3) issued in the first instance and carries out other tasks of a superior body to the Board outlined in the Code of Administrative Procedures.

Article 36

Meetings of the Appeals Committee

1. Meetings of the Appeals Committee are attended by members of the Appeals Committee.

2. Unless the Code of Administrative Procedures stipulates otherwise²⁸, meetings of the Appeals Committee are attended without the right to vote by an employee of the Office that has not participated in the previous administrative proceedings in the matter to be deliberated by the Appeals Committee, designated by the director of the Office as a record-keeper after agreement with the Appeals Committee; other persons invited by the Appeals Committee may attend as well.
3. A meeting of the Appeals Committee to each individual matter is chaired by a chairperson on whom the Appeals Committee has resolved in compliance with the Rules of Procedure for the Appeals Committee; the chairperson carries out the tasks under Section 134 (1) sentence 2 of the Code of Administrative Procedures.
4. The Appeals Committee may request additional documents to a deliberated matter, typically through the Office.
5. The Appeals Committee may request an expert statement, typically through the director of the Office.
6. For the purpose of determining a quorum of the Appeals Committee or counting votes, it is always considered that the Appeals Committee has the number of members stipulated by the Higher Education Act¹².
7. The record-keeper takes minutes from a meeting of the Appeals Committee that are subject to approval by the chairperson in the parts related to individual deliberated matters. The minutes are sent to members of the Appeals Committee and the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau.
8. Details on deliberation of the Appeals Committee are stipulated by the Rules of Procedure for the Appeals Committee that are subject to approval by the Appeals Committee⁵⁷. The Rules of Procedure for the Appeals Committee are made public.

Article 37

The Remuneration of Members of the Appeals Committee

Members of the Appeals Committee are entitled to remuneration²⁷ of 10,000 CZK monthly.

PART FIVE COMMON, TRANSITORY AND CLOSING PROVISIONS

Article 38

The Office

1. The Office carries out tasks related to material, administrative and technical support of the activities of the Accreditation Bureau and to expert support for the activities of the Accreditation Bureau.
2. The Office carries out tasks stipulated by the law on archiving and filing services⁵⁸.

⁵⁷ Section 134 (5) of the Act No. 500/2004 Coll.

⁵⁸ Act No. 494/2004 Coll., on archiving and filing services and on amendments of some other acts, as resulting from later amendments.

3. The Director of the Office carries out tasks as obligatory subject under the law on free access to information⁵⁹.
4. The Director of the Office approves work-related trips of evaluators enrolled in the Pool of Evaluators and members of advisory bodies of the Accreditation Bureau, providing advances on travel expenses and their administrative processing; provisions of Article 4 par. 4 sentence 2 apply accordingly.
5. The Office secures fulfillment of other obligations assigned to the Accreditation Bureau by legal regulations under directions of the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau.

Article 39 **Common Provisions**

1. In the public part of the Accreditation Bureau's website, the following information is made public:
 - a) information that the Higher Education Act requires the Accreditation Bureau to make public on the website of the Ministry⁶⁰,
 - b) information that the Statute requires to be made public, or
 - c) information that the Code of Administrative Procedures requires to be made public on the official notice board.

The web address of the Accreditation Bureau's website is made public on the website of the Ministry along with information that the information under par. 1 a) is made public there.

2. The Accreditation Bureau makes information listed in par. 1 c) public on its official notice board. The official notice board is accessible at Karmelitská 529/5, Malá Strana, 118 12 Praha 1.
3. The address of the Accreditation Bureau to be used for delivery of hard-copy documents is „Národní akreditační úřad pro vysoké školství, Karmelitská 529/5, Malá Strana, 118 12 Praha 1“.
4. The ID of the Accreditation Bureau's data box for electronic delivery can be found in the public part of the Accreditation Bureau's website.
5. The Accreditation Bureau uses an official round seal with the state coat of arms of the Czech Republic⁶¹ and writing „Národní akreditační úřad pro vysoké školství“ in the cases stipulated by legal regulations. The design and rules of use of other seals are determined by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau in a provision.

Article 40 **Transitory Provisions**

⁵⁹ Act No. 106/1999 Coll., on free access to information, as resulting from later amendments.

⁶⁰ Section 83c (5), Section 83e (4) and (7) and Section 93k of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.

⁶¹ Section 6 of the Act No. 352/2001 Coll., on the use of national symbols of the Czech Republic and on the amendments of some other acts.

1. Resolutions of the Board adopted by the Board prior to the date when the Statute takes effect are deemed adopted according to the Statute.
2. Provisions issued by the Chair of the Accreditation Bureau prior to the date when the Statute takes effect are deemed adopted according to Article 4 par. 2 a).

Article 41
Closing Provisions

1. A proposal of the Statute was approved by the Board⁶² on 20 September 2016.
2. The Statute takes effect on the fifth day following its approval by the Government.

.....
prof. Ing. Stanislav Labík, CSc.
Chair of the Accreditation Bureau

⁶² Section 83c (2) a) of the Act No. 111/1998 Coll., as resulting from the Act. No. 137/2016 Coll.