



External Evaluation Report

Charles University

Introduction	2
1. Procedure of External Evaluation	3
2. Setting of the internal quality assurance system	5
2.1 Basic foundations of the quality assurance system	5
2.2 Internal Evaluation Board and its functioning as the highest body for quality assurance.....	6
2.3 The Role of Department for the Quality of Education and Accreditation (DQEA) and other bodies	9
2.4 Quality Assurance Processes at the Faculty Level	11
2.5 Student Involvement in Quality Assurance	12
3. Implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System	14
3.1 Approval of Degree programs	14
3.2 Evaluation of Degree Programs	15
3.3 Ongoing Monitoring of the Quality of Degree Programs	17
4. Conclusions	19
5. Recommendations	20
Annexes:.....	22

Introduction

Based on the decision of the National Accreditation Bureau for Higher Education (hereinafter "NAB"), an external evaluation of the educational, creative, and related activities of Charles University (hereinafter also "CU" or "the university") was initiated on January 19, 2023. The impetus for this external evaluation, as well as for previous external evaluations of universities granted institutional accreditation, came from a proposal by the Deputy Minister of Education, Youth and Sports to conduct an external evaluation of universities with institutional accreditation. The general aim of the external evaluation of CU was to assess the experiences so far with institutional accreditation as a new element of the quality assurance system, which CU received by the decision granting institutional accreditation issued by the NAB on March 21, 2018 (for details, see Appendix 1).

The external evaluation specifically focused on the area of the internal quality assurance system for educational activities, the functioning of the Internal Evaluation Board (IEB), and the process of approving and continuously evaluating degree programs, as well as the overall involvement of students in these processes and the development of a quality culture as such. Specifically, the evaluation committee focused on the issue of the interconnection of the internal quality assurance system with the strategy and concept of CU, the overall consistency and functionality of internal regulations and standards, and the adequacy of staffing in the internal quality assurance bodies in terms of expertise, qualifications, elimination of conflicts of interest, and time capacity. Furthermore, the evaluation committee addressed the control and evaluation mechanisms of the internal quality assurance system, both from the perspective of periodic mechanisms and in terms of overall responsiveness and the ability to react flexibly to emerging situations. Finally, the evaluation committee also focused on the involvement of students in quality assurance processes and the general mechanisms for reflecting the student perspective and its subsequent incorporation into teaching and the overall institutional setup.

In accordance with the NAB Statute, the following evaluation committee was appointed on April 28, 2023, to conduct the external evaluation:

- prof. PhDr. Vladimíra Dvořáková, CSc. – Chair
- doc. Mgr. Daniela Jobertová, Ph.D. – Vice-chair
- prof. Ing. Roman Čermák, Ph.D.
- prof. Ing. Milena Pavlíková, Ph.D.
- doc. Ing. Martin Kocour, Ph.D.
- Ing. Ondřej Havelka
- prof. MUDr. Julie Dobrovolná, Ph.D.
- prof. RNDr. Zuzana Bílková, Ph.D.
- Mgr. Natália Antalová
- doc. PhDr. Jiří Němec, Ph.D.
- prof. PhDr. Milan Pol, CSc.
- Ing. Mgr. Jan Pokorný
- doc. Mgr. Marek Otisk, Ph.D.
- doc. Mgr. Anna Pumprová, Ph.D.
- prof. PhDr. Mgr. Tomáš Knoz, Ph.D.
- Mgr. Michal Nguyen

During the external evaluation, the following meetings took place between representatives of the evaluation committee and NAB and representatives of CU:

- May 15, 2023 – Initial meeting attended by the leadership of the evaluation committee and NAB representatives with the CU Rector and her associates
- October 16, 2023 – On-site visit by the evaluation committee with representatives of CU's university-level administration
- October 31, 2023 – On-site visit by the evaluation committee with representatives of CU's faculty-level administration, part 1
- November 1, 2023 – On-site visit by the evaluation committee with representatives of CU's faculty-level administration, part 2

The evaluation committee based its work primarily on the following documents:

- Key strategic, conceptual, and evaluation materials from CU
- CU's key internal regulations
- Publicly available sources, especially CU's website, cuni.cz
- CU's self-assessment report prepared according to the given framework
- Overviews of internally approved study programs provided by CU
- Complete approval documentation, documentation related to any corrective measures, and documentation of the internal evaluation of educational activities for a selected sample of study programs
- Data in CU's information system for selected study programs
- Results of student evaluations of teaching for selected study programs
- Defended theses in selected study programs
- Methodological materials from IEB and materials produced within IEB's activities
- Minutes of the meeting with CU's leadership on October 16, 2023 (authorized by CU representatives)
- Minutes from on-site visits on October 31, 2023, and November 1, 2023, produced by the evaluation committee
- Supplementary materials requested following the on-site visits
- Outcomes of CU's international external evaluation by EUA (Institutional Evaluation Programme European University Association)

1. Procedure of External Evaluation

On April 20, 2023, the basic strategic, conceptual, and evaluative materials of Charles University, along with its key internal regulations, were requested for the activities of the evaluation committee. After the evaluation committee was appointed, its chair and vice-chair, together with the chair and vice-chair of the National Accreditation Bureau (NAB), met with the Rector and the Vice-Rector for Concept and Quality of Education at Charles University to clarify the process and nature of the external evaluation. The evaluation committee, in collaboration with the NAB, prepared a "Framework for the preparation of a self-evaluation report for the external evaluation of the activities of Charles University" and sent a request to the Rector of Charles University for the preparation of the self-evaluation report by August 25, 2023, in accordance with Article 2(b) of the NAB's Methodological Guidelines for External Evaluation of Higher Education Institutions for the purposes of external quality evaluation.

At the same time, the evaluation committee requested the provision of complete approval documentation, documentation related to any corrective actions, and documentation of the internal evaluation of educational activities for a selected sample of study programs (details in Appendix No. 2) conducted by Charles University based on the authorization resulting from institutional accreditation (hereinafter referred to as "selected study programs"). The selected sample comprehensively included all types and profiles of study programs, all forms of study, and both Czech and English as languages of instruction. The sample of study programs was selected representatively across Charles University faculties, and the disciplinary focus of the areas of education covered all four panels of the Internal Evaluation Board (IEB) of Charles University: natural sciences, medical, social sciences, and humanities.

In addition to the requested documentation, the evaluation committee also requested access to data in Charles University's information system, the results of student evaluations of teaching, and defended theses in the selected study programs.

On October 16, 2023, the evaluation committee visited Charles University's rectorate, where it held discussions with the university's leadership and representatives of university bodies involved in ensuring and evaluating quality, specifically with the IEB and the Department for the Quality of Education and Accreditation (DQEA). Separate meetings were held with students who are members of the IEB. On October 31 and November 1, 2023, the evaluation committee conducted visits at the faculty level, with the first visit focusing on humanities and social sciences faculties and the second on medical and natural sciences faculties. During these on-site visits, the committee met with the leadership, representatives of the academic senates (AS) and scientific councils (SC) of all faculties, as well as with guarantors, key teachers, and students of the selected study programs.

In connection with the evaluation of the submitted materials and on-site visits, the evaluation committee requested additional supplements to the submitted materials and information as needed. Charles University provided or made available all the materials necessary for the preparation of the evaluation, as requested during the external evaluation process. The university also provided excellent cooperation in organizing and facilitating the evaluation committee's on-site visits.

In preparing the external evaluation report, the committee took into account the overall development and progress that Charles University has made since the initial granting of institutional accreditation. The committee is aware that the first period after the granting of institutional accreditation was particularly hectic; it was necessary to newly approve all ongoing study programs (fields) within a short period, while decision-making practices were still being established, and internal decision-making mechanisms were being implemented. Similarly, the evaluation committee perceives the overall dynamism and variability of the internal quality assurance system, which it considered when interpreting the statements of respondents from the on-site visits and when interpreting all the materials submitted by Charles University.

2. Setting of the internal quality assurance system

The evaluation committee aimed to assess the overall internal quality assurance system within the framework of institutional accreditation, focusing on the legislative or institutional setup, the effectiveness, functionality, and transparency of processes, as well as the definition of roles and the position of individual bodies and organizational units, particularly in the processes of approving study programs and their ongoing evaluation. Specifically, the committee examined how the related internal regulations are reflected in the approval and evaluation processes of study programs, analyzing the functionality and administrative demands of these regulations. It investigated the transparency of the processes, their predictability and meaningfulness, including the understanding of their importance within the wider academic community at the faculty level (leadership, academic senate, program guarantors, etc.) and at the university level. The committee also assessed institutional anchoring and communication both horizontally and vertically (in both directions). It monitored the substantive aspects of study program approval and evaluation, with an emphasis on setting quality standards, and also considered whether the evaluation processes and the internal setup and refinement of the system reflect the strategic goals of the university or individual faculties.

2.1 Basic foundations of the quality assurance system

Charles University has a well-developed Strategic Plan for the years 2021-2025, which outlines the main directions for the university's development and the goals it aims to achieve. This plan is complemented by Annual Implementation Plans, which allow for the ongoing fulfillment of the strategic plan with an emphasis on clearly formulating priorities for the given year, taking into account the results of the previous year. The area of quality education represents a key part of this strategy and is effectively reflected in almost all areas covered by this strategy. From the perspective of direct quality assurance, the educational strategy relies on tools adopted in 2017 in the form of the Rules of the Quality Assurance and Internal Evaluation System, the principles of which refer to European approaches, particularly those stemming from the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).

The Rules of the Quality Assurance and Internal Evaluation System are, on the one hand, very comprehensive, with varying levels of generality and specificity in individual articles. On the other hand, as will be further elaborated in this report, it seems that not all rules and requirements are implemented in practice. There may also be a question of whether some rules merely add administrative burden without significantly affecting quality assurance. As an example, we can refer to Article 9 of the Strategic Plan, annual, review, and evaluation reports of the university, where there are six different types of reports among the strategic documents of the university's quality assurance and internal evaluation system (the preparation of many of these, however, is required by Act No. 111/1998 Coll., on Higher Education Institutions, as amended, some by the University Statute, and others depend on leadership decisions) as well as documents prepared by the faculties:

- a. University Strategic Plan and its annual implementation plan,
- b. Review report on the implementation of the strategic plan, c. Annual activity report and annual financial report of the university,

- c. University's self-evaluation report,
- d. Report on the internal evaluation of the quality of educational, creative, and related activities (hereinafter "internal evaluation report"),
- e. Self-evaluation report describing and evaluating the fulfillment of individual requirements derived from the standards for institutional accreditation,
- f. Similar documents prepared by the faculties or other parts of the university.

The whole system remains rather complex, and the relationships and connections between various reports and the strategic plan, their usefulness, and particularly their application in quality assurance practice are not always clear. From interviews conducted at the faculty level, it was evident that many program guarantors, senate representatives, or leadership members have only sporadic knowledge of these documents and do not actively engage with them.

One of the most important documents the university prepares is the "Report on the Internal Evaluation of the Quality of Educational, Creative, and Related Activities of Charles University," with annual supplements following its 2017 text. These supplements are well-prepared, demonstrating the university's ability for self-reflection and incorporation of experience into the quality system setup; the report also evaluates pilot quality assurance projects, further proving the capacity for analyzing and reflecting on feedback.

Charles University anticipated that in 2024, it would use its experience from institutional accreditation to adjust and clarify internal regulations and standards and to analyze the fulfillment of the indicators in the strategic plan. It is recommended that the clarification of internal regulations and standards takes into account the results of the NAB evaluation and the changes in the proposed amendment to the Higher Education Act, and that this process be completed by the end of 2026 at the latest, so that the results of these changes can be reflected in Charles University's new application for institutional accreditation. The university has a clearly defined procedure for the approval of study programs in its Accreditation Code, which outlines the individual steps and bodies involved in the internal approval of new study programs, including deliberations and approvals, both for study programs in areas where Charles University has obtained institutional accreditation and for programs in areas where the National Accreditation Bureau makes the decision on accreditation. The university has also prepared the Statute of the Internal Evaluation Board.

2.2 Internal Evaluation Board and its functioning as the highest body for quality assurance

The Internal Evaluation Board (hereinafter referred to as IEB) is the most significant university body for assessing and setting quality standards. As such, it is responsible for both approving the intent of study programs—i.e., evaluating the initial proposal of a study program and its alignment with the overall strategy of the university—and granting the final authorization to conduct the study program. It also carries out continuous evaluations of study programs, reviews monitoring reports, and discusses major changes in the implementation of approved study programs. While these activities are clearly key and well-known to the academic community, the other roles of the IEB, which are directly related to the quality assurance system setup, should not be underestimated. These roles receive less attention and are less well understood within the broader academic community. They include preparing methodological materials, applying quality assessment rules in various educational fields, submitting proposals, and

formulating opinions on suggestions for the development of the internal quality assurance system (see the IEB Statute).

Given the size and number of educational fields at Charles University, the structure, composition, and number of IEB members (30) appear to be entirely appropriate. The system of expert panels, organized by broader subject clusters, is also considered highly suitable. There are four panels corresponding to areas of education and scientific disciplines: natural sciences, medical sciences, social sciences, and humanities. This allows related educational fields to be taken into account in quality assurance and evaluation while also supporting interdisciplinary and cross-field educational activities.

The system for appointing IEB members and the operations of the IEB are governed by the Statute of Charles University (Article 9). The Chair of the IEB is the Rector, and the Vice-Chair is appointed by the Rector; the Vice-Chair must be a professor or associate professor who is a member of the academic community at Charles University. The Chair of the Academic Senate is a member of the IEB by virtue of their position. Other members are appointed by the Rector, with one-third nominated by the university's Scientific Council, and one-third by the Academic Senate. The position of Dean is entirely incompatible with membership in the IEB. At least four IEB members must be external individuals who are not part of the academic community of Charles University, and four must be students. When appointing an IEB member, the Rector also designates the panel in which the member will serve. The panel chair is appointed by the IEB upon the panel's recommendation.

The evaluation committee encountered several issues or uncertainties regarding the structure and specific activities of the IEB.

The panel system, while advantageous in its setup, also presents certain risks: it has become apparent that different panels have varying workloads (e.g., social sciences versus medical sciences). Within panels, some practices are similar, while others differ significantly (e.g., methods for preparing reviews by reporters, the involvement of students in preparing reviews, etc.). There are no guidelines regarding the age structure of IEB members; it would be advisable to ensure a certain level of intergenerational diversity and career structure. It is important to ensure that experience is passed on to the next generation of academics, and the current composition of the IEB and its panels may not fully allow for this in some respects.

The incompatibility of the position of dean and IEB member is important for preventing direct reflections of interfaculty "competitive conflicts" or the formation of purposeful faculty coalitions during IEB meetings. However, the fact that vice-deans can be IEB members still leaves room for undue influence. It must be emphasized that the IEB is not established as a representative body, i.e., an IEB member does not act as a representative of a specific faculty; rather, they should act in the interest of quality assurance for the entire university. The IEB Statute (Article 2, Section 6) regulates potential conflicts of interest, stating that an IEB member should not participate in decision-making if there is a conflict of interest, such as a working relationship with the entity being decided upon (IEB Statute, Article 2, Section 6). Although the rule that the member in question does not vote is followed, the member still participates in discussions, according to IEB records. Interviews with panel members revealed that if a panel member belongs to the faculty concerned, they provide additional explanations beyond the accreditation file. This, however, creates unequal access for faculties without such a representative on the IEB and contributes to a perception within the academic community that the IEB is composed of "representatives" of faculties, with unequal "representation" perceived as discriminatory. A potential solution could be the inclusion of the study program guarantor or the vice-dean of the respective faculty in IEB discussions when approving new study programs or discussing significant issues related to specific programs.

According to the IEB Statute, panels should keep records of discussions and prepare draft resolutions, including their justification. If a working group is established, its activities should also result in a written opinion. However, written documentation of panel-level discussions is often unavailable, and the reporter's (panel member's) opinion, which should be based on the panel's discussions, often merely reproduces formal verification of the basic parameters of the application by the administrative apparatus (DQEA). However, in some cases, more detailed written evaluations of the quality of proposed study programs are produced by the reporter. While this seems to be the exception rather than the rule, the evaluation committee considers these more detailed evaluation reports to be good practice, contributing to quality improvement by providing concrete evidence of the quality of the proposed program. These reports can serve as the basis for subsequent evaluation reports or more extensive justifications for IEB resolutions, which should then be communicated to both the program submitters and the academic community as a whole, thereby indirectly influencing the quality of future program proposals.

The role of external members is not entirely clear. Each panel has one external member who is not an academic staff member of Charles University, meaning there are a total of four external members in the entire IEB, all from outside Charles University. Given the IEB's size of 30 members, this can be considered adequate representation, as the Higher Education Act does not require the involvement of external members in the IEB. However, the committee perceives an issue with the involvement of external members in the accreditation process for study programs or in evaluating their quality. Consultants should play a significant role here, but the evaluation committee received no information about their involvement. A list of consultants is available, but it contains very few true externals (outside the university). Charles University considers internal employees from other faculties as external consultants for programs under review, which, given the number of study programs, makes sense due to the immense workload that would be involved in engaging external consultants. However, it could be expected that an external perspective would be emphasized during the steps before the panel evaluation. At the faculty level, this external viewpoint can provide valuable input, examples of best practices, and highlight trends in specific fields. In short, the current involvement of external members in approval and evaluation processes undoubtedly helps maintain objectivity and quality control at the university level, where it offers an overall view of educational activities and related broader issues. However, it is less helpful at the level of specific study programs and their particular challenges. Given the highly centralized approach to internal quality assurance, one might expect the university to make greater use of external perspectives during program approval and evaluation processes at the faculty level, and to clarify the added value that this external voice brings to the quality assurance system. Under the current system, the external perspective on quality assurance is provided by the four external IEB members (one in each panel) and through evaluations conducted every few years by the EUA (European University Association). The fact that Charles University voluntarily undergoes this demanding evaluation is commendable as an effort to seek external reflection on its operations. However, regarding quality assurance in educational activities, this evaluation has limited value, as it focuses primarily on strategic management and change management.

The IEB Statute (Article 4) outlines the possibility or requirement for establishing working groups composed of IEB members and consultants. According to IEB records from 2017–2023, such working groups were established to address issues like doctoral study programs, student evaluations, internationalization, and courses taught in foreign languages (information from meetings with Charles University leadership). However, it is unclear how these groups operated, who their members were, and what their specific outputs were (these were not provided in the materials given to the evaluation committee, but it can be assumed that they served as supporting documents for the relevant items discussed at IEB meetings).

The principles of predictability and transparency in IEB decision-making have evolved over the six years of its existence. IEB records from 2016–2023 show a shift toward greater specificity in both the documentation of discussions and the wording of resolutions, especially regarding study programs, moving from very brief or nonexistent justifications to clearer and more communicative ones. This shift is particularly evident when files are returned to faculties or when study programs are internally rejected; the reasons for decisions are now briefly but clearly stated in the resolutions. The same can be said for corrective measures, which appear more often in records from the latter half of the period, after faculties started submitting required reports based on input from study program guarantors.

During on-site meetings, when asked whether IEB decisions were transparent and predictable for study program guarantors, responses were both positive and negative, with the timing of study program approvals playing a key role. Guarantors remembered the practices of 2017 and 2018 only vaguely but were much clearer about the practices of 2020–2023. It can therefore be stated that the transparency and predictability of IEB decision-making is improving, although a subjective perception of "unfavorability" from the IEB persists among faculty representatives, particularly in the case of negative decisions. It also appears that faculties have yet to fully exercise some of their rights (e.g., the dean's right to appeal an IEB decision to the rector), and the aforementioned perception may stem from an incomplete understanding of the entire system as something more than just an administrative burden without added value. It would be beneficial if IEB decisions included information on the possibility of appeal (similar to administrative proceedings).

IEB records contain information on key milestones in the development of the quality assurance system itself (introduction of internal evaluations, setting parameters for doctoral programs, etc.), as well as the development of applications, methodologies, and templates for accreditation and evaluation purposes. However, it is unfortunate that no reports on the outcomes of annual conceptual (mostly off-site) IEB meetings are publicly available to the academic community. As a result, the IEB's role in shaping and implementing Charles University's educational vision is unclear, the topics discussed at these meetings are unknown, and the development of the IEB's "position" as a whole and its awareness and cultivation of its role within the university is not evident. Yet this role is crucial for the development of the quality assurance system. In short, while the approval and evaluation of study programs primarily serve a monitoring function, ensuring compliance with basic standards, the ability to respond to input from various educational fields and to develop the internal quality assurance system presents an opportunity to raise the level of quality even higher. Now that the relatively hectic first period of study program approvals and evaluations has been managed, these roles should receive greater attention. To this end, a mechanism must be established for gathering input from faculties (from guarantors, students, faculty leadership) or suggestions related to developments in specific educational fields.

2.3 The Role of Department for the Quality of Education and Accreditation (DQEA) and other bodies

In terms of other university bodies (besides the IEB, see above) involved in quality assessment, we can distinguish between bodies whose roles are enshrined in the fundamental internal regulations and organizational units that were created as administrative and methodological support and as a means of communication between the rectorate and the faculties.

The Academic Senate of Charles University (AS) does not directly participate in the approval process of new study programs or the evaluation of their quality, but it plays an important role in the nomination of one-third of IEB members; the chair of the Academic Senate is also a member of the IEB.

Furthermore, the AS approves key university documents related to quality assurance, specifically the Rules of the Quality Assurance and Internal Evaluation System of Charles University, the Accreditation Code, and the Statute of the Internal Evaluation Board. It also approves the Strategic Plan and the Annual Implementation Plan of the Strategic Plan; likewise, the AS approves the Report on the Internal Evaluation of the Quality of Educational, Creative, and Related Activities at Charles University, as well as its annual supplements.

Similarly, the Scientific Council of Charles University does not directly participate in the approval and evaluation process of specific study programs. The chair of the Scientific Council, the Rector, is also the chair of the IEB. The Scientific Council discusses the Strategic Plan, the Annual Implementation Plans of the Strategic Plan, as well as the Report on Internal Quality Evaluation and its annual supplements. The Board of Trustees of the university also plays a role, approving the Strategic Plan and the Annual Implementation Plans of the Strategic Plan, and reviewing the Report on Internal Quality Evaluation and the annual supplements.

A specific role in the accreditation process is played by the extended Rector's Collegium, where, in the case of the preparation of a study program that has not yet been accredited, the Rector informs the deans of the other faculties of the intention of the faculty (or its dean) and, along with their potential input, submits it for approval to the Internal Evaluation Board (Accreditation Code, Article 22, Section 2).

The Vice-Rector for Concept and Quality of Education is responsible for the accreditation and evaluation agenda at the leadership level. The main organizational unit is the Department for the Quality of Education and Accreditation (DQEA), which provides the necessary administrative and methodological support for both the faculties and the IEB. This department plays a significant role in unifying accreditation and evaluation practices with regard to compliance with basic standards and procedures, providing methodological and, where necessary, legal support (especially for joint degree or double degree programs). It also prepares documents for other evaluators (reporters, IEB panels, and the IEB), including basic formal verification of whether the study program meets the required standards.

Through the development of the university's information systems, a high-quality and accessible data infrastructure has been created, providing all relevant actors (including study program guarantors) with information that enables analyses and decision-making based on a wide portfolio of data. The assessment of DQEA's work by other actors involved in the process is very positive. DQEA also plays a positive role in communication with the faculties, particularly through flexible collaboration and communication with faculty coordinators.

However, the evaluation committee found that the quality administrative verification of standards is often taken up by reporters or the IEB without additional value, i.e., without deeper evaluation that would assess the study program in terms of its content, overall design, compatibility of its components, the professional aspect of its provision, or even the fulfillment of key indicators of the Strategic Plan. The frequent absence of decision-making materials for the IEB that would include substantive expert assessments of the relevant standards beyond the verification of basic formal requirements is considered by the committee to be a significant problem. This negatively affects both the IEB's role in setting and refining rules or requirements in individual areas of education, as well as the transparency and credibility of the entire process within the academic community.

2.4 Quality Assurance Processes at the Faculty Level

Charles University consists of 17 faculties, each with considerable internal autonomy and tradition, which differ significantly from one another. The evaluation committee approached the quality assurance processes at the faculty level with an awareness of this diversity and the benefits and challenges that the heterogeneity of the faculties brings.

University documentation related to quality assurance does not, in principle, contain provisions that explicitly anchor certain competencies at the faculty level or transfer them to faculties (e.g., in the area of internal evaluation). Regarding the approval of study programs, the key formal documents are the minutes of the meetings of faculty academic senates, faculty scientific councils, and letters from the deans, which are typically included in the accreditation files as they enter the evaluation process beyond the faculty. Additional information was obtained during on-site visits.

The legally required procedures, such as the discussion of the accreditation file at the faculty level by the academic senate and its approval by the scientific council, are adhered to. However, the level of detail or depth of these discussions is difficult to assess, as the minutes of the meetings primarily contain information on voting and resolutions. Study program content is typically handled by the academic senate study committees, where such committees exist. At least at some faculties, these are advisory or working bodies for both the dean and the senate, composed of senate members and other volunteers outside the senate. The work of these committees can be considered examples of good practice, especially since they allow a broader range of academic community members (including students) to participate in the evaluation of study programs and foster deeper discussions about program content at the faculty level.

Faculties also have other “platforms” where quality assurance issues are addressed, such as sectional scientific councils, vice-deans for accreditation; in the area of evaluations, there are student ambassadors, student subject councils, and coordination councils for doctoral study programs. In many cases, the committee considers these practices beneficial and believes they should be monitored, supported, and cultivated at the university level, and potentially extended to other faculties.

The positions of faculty quality coordinators emerged during the second phase of the system’s existence, and their function has proven to be a key positive element at the faculties, serving as a communication tool between the university and faculty levels in terms of administrative and methodological support. In addition to the chairs of IEB panels, who—as mentioned in meetings—communicate directly with faculties as needed, faculty coordinators are the consistent and ongoing “point of contact” for internal quality assurance processes. Interviews with the DQEA and faculty representatives confirm this. However, the role of faculty coordinators in quality assurance processes is not formally defined, and it varies according to faculty needs. It would be beneficial to formally establish methodological and administrative support in the system, particularly regarding feedback from the rectorate to faculties and vice versa; in this sense, it is also important to clearly define the basic responsibilities of these coordinators.

Interviews indicated that the feedback from the IEB following the internal approval or quality evaluation of study programs is not seen as sufficient, even though it is formally provided. After the study program is approved, the guarantor and faculty coordinator receive notification, but this information offers little guidance for faculties on how various aspects of the program were evaluated and what should be emphasized in its further development. In the case of evaluations, the dean receives the full report with

the option to provide comments within a month, while the guarantor can track the evaluation process electronically and comment on partial results. However, the results of IEB discussions do not typically reach the faculty bodies involved in the initial internal approval process of the study programs. Faculty members interviewed by the committee expressed a clear interest in the quality assurance agenda for study programs and in receiving feedback to better understand any critical views. Ultimately, it is up to each faculty to decide whether to include these topics in its meetings or initiate discussions on specific issues.

The evaluation committee found no examples of shared experiences in quality assurance between faculties. Vertical communication from the rector and vice-rectors to deans or vice-deans takes place naturally, with the agenda typically driven top-down, while faculty-initiated input is less common. However, there is a lack of horizontal communication, for example, among quality coordinators, where very specific examples of good practice could be shared during this still-developing phase of the entire system. In interviews with faculty representatives, the committee identified elements of the internal system that could benefit other faculties—such as classroom observations as a tool for academic staff development, the role of student ambassadors, functioning study committees, or a well-defined role for the faculty coordinator. In this regard, interaction between faculties should be encouraged, creating space for the transfer of these experiences.

A separate issue is the submission of suggestions “from below” (from students, teachers, study program guarantors, academic senates, scientific councils, or deans) to the IEB. These suggestions could pertain to both the quality assurance system itself and its setup, as well as specific issues related to the implementation of study programs that exceed the scope of a single program or department. The evaluation committee concluded that there is no established mechanism (even informally) for forwarding these suggestions or seeking them out by the IEB, even though faculties have expressed a demand for certain issues to be addressed at the university level.

Another issue, which is not unique to Charles University but is more generally applicable, concerns the definition of the relationships and powers of deans, department heads, and study program guarantors, which are often not clearly defined at the faculty level. This primarily impacts quality assurance, particularly in relation to responsibilities for staffing. A positive trend at Charles University is the growing role and responsibility of study program guarantors.

2.5 Student Involvement in Quality Assurance

The self-evaluation report of Charles University on page 14 mentions the culture of quality in relation to the high number of student representatives in both university and faculty bodies. Within the Internal Evaluation Board (IEB), 4 out of 30 members are students, which can be considered a relatively high level of representation. The Statute of the IEB, Article 2, Section 4, states that a member of the IEB must be a student who has achieved good results during their studies: this criterion is quite debatable in terms of its relevance for the effective performance of an IEB member. Additionally, the evaluation committee is critical of overlapping roles, i.e., situations where one person serves as a student representative in one body and as a representative of academic staff in another body.

From discussions across various respondent groups, it became clear that students within the IEB are not assigned a proactive role, nor are they given specific issues to focus on where they could contribute a distinct student voice. Their involvement in the panels varies: in some panels, especially during the early period when there was a high volume of accreditation files, students were tasked with preparing reports, while in others, as noted in discussions, this activity was not entrusted to them at all. It is impossible to

assess whether and how student members of the IEB or its panels are involved in evaluating study programs. According to the Rules, a working group should be established for each internal evaluation, and it is assumed that a student should (or could) always be a member of such a group. However, based on available information, no working groups for internal evaluation have been established yet, so the student voice has only been considered “from below,” through evaluations or via the reflection of student feedback by the study program guarantor in the Self-Evaluation Report of the study program.

The entire evaluation process is currently undergoing transformation. The evaluation of study programs was piloted in 2022, and the experiences gained will, according to the university, be reflected in future amendments to internal regulations. Establishing a working group for each study program is seen as unmanageable; however, the principle of working groups with broader student representation (and also external members) could be considered for the parallel evaluation of study programs in related fields (this evaluation method already exists and seems to be effective). Based on these experiences, evaluation now takes place through an interactive web form, though questions remain about how the student voice (as well as that of external experts or industry representatives) will be ensured in practice through this electronic mechanism.

Charles University systematically collects feedback from students regarding teaching through centralized electronic surveys, with the results made available to the academic community. The effectiveness of this system is naturally influenced by the size of the study programs (it has proven less effective for small programs), and it can be said that the response rate for surveys is generally low. However, this should be considered a common or frequent problem in any large-scale survey, as seen at many other universities, and Charles University cannot be faulted for a lack of interest or effort in trying to increase participation. Some adjustments to the process could be proposed, such as keeping surveys open beyond the end of the semester, as block teaching may still be ongoing during the exam period. Additionally, for inspiration, it could be suggested to expand the questionnaire to cover some new specific areas, such as adherence to course syllabi, the use of learning aids, etc. The current question setup does not allow for deeper insight into how the study program operates, for example, whether learning aids were available and useful, or whether assessments were based on the competencies that were meant to be acquired during the course. It would be appropriate to extend the survey period until the end of the exam period.

Some meetings during the evaluation committee’s visit indicated a certain level of distrust among students towards the teaching evaluation system and its anonymity. These aspects should be better communicated to students, and alternative mechanisms for gathering open feedback should be explored in cases where anonymity cannot be guaranteed (for example, in very small study programs or study groups). Another weak point is the communication back to students about the results and impacts of evaluations, an area Charles University should also focus on improving.

From individual discussions with students, specific problems emerged, some of which can be addressed systematically (as mentioned above), some through communication (particularly at the department and faculty level), and others through awareness-raising (not all students are fully aware of the options available to them as outlined in the Study and Examination Regulations). Some issues likely cannot be resolved systematically and need to be addressed individually through the faculty’s study department.

Interviews with student representatives revealed that they see a lack of courses offered in foreign languages at some faculties and the practical necessity of extending their studies when participating in study abroad programs. The evaluation committee considers it necessary to emphasize the priority of internationalization, as stated in both the university and faculty strategies, particularly in the form of support for student mobility and faculty flexibility in recognizing credits earned abroad. The

accreditation standards state that universities should have rules for integrating mobility into study programs; this issue should be addressed at a systematic level, and pressure should be applied by the IEB to incorporate student mobility into standard study plans.

Another topic highlighted in Charles University's strategic documents is the establishment of equal opportunities and access for students with specific needs. The evaluation committee encountered examples of well-designed support and services for these students, but also heard critical feedback (for instance, regarding access barriers inside some buildings or the insufficiently flexible adaptation of academic requirements to different types of identified specific needs). The issue of creating suitable conditions for students with specific needs is not assessed as part of the approval or evaluation of study programs, and it is therefore unclear whether or how it is considered in the internal quality assurance processes.

3. Implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System

3.1 Approval of Degree programs

The process for approving degree programs within institutional accreditation is determined by Charles University's Accreditation Code, Articles 10-20, and the established practice based on these articles. The process has several phases, involving multiple bodies at both the faculty and university levels. The first phase is the so-called intent to submit a proposal for a new degree program, which the dean submits to the rector. The rector informs the deans of other faculties, who can provide feedback on the proposal; this feedback is then submitted to the IEB. During the period immediately following the granting of institutional accreditation, when a large number of degree programs underwent formal internal approval (even though this was essentially a transformation of existing study fields), this procedure was often not followed. However, it is now formalized, and each year by a certain date, inputs from all faculties regarding matters related to degree programs are collected for discussion by the IEB in the following year. This includes a complete overview, including changes to existing degree programs, reapprovals, and proposals for entirely new degree programs. The data on the outlook for these applications is collected by the DQEA based on faculty submissions and is presented to the extended rector's collegium by the vice-rector for concept and quality of education. This seems to go beyond the requirements of the Accreditation Code, which, in Article 22, Section 2, establishes the obligation to discuss the intent only for degree programs that have not yet been conducted at the faculty and to submit it for approval to the IEB along with any comments from other deans. This is important if the university wants to strengthen synergy in education and reduce duplication between degree programs.

Before the dean (or deans) officially submits a degree program proposal (now similarly for initial or reapproval) to the rector for submission to the IEB, it must be discussed by the faculty's academic senate and approved by the faculty's scientific council. The IEB, through the rector, may return the application for revision if it does not meet all the requirements or has significant shortcomings. If major revisions are required, the degree program proposal must be re-discussed and reapproved by the relevant faculty bodies. The IEB decides on granting authorization to conduct the degree program, and it may also deny authorization. Such a decision must be justified, and an appeal can be made to the rector.

Discussions with representatives of approval bodies across faculties revealed that no specific areas are identified for the different bodies to focus on when reviewing accreditation files. While the evaluation committee does not dispute the right of individual bodies to assess all aspects of the accreditation file, it would be helpful to narrow down the topics each body should specifically address during review or approval. These topics should then be reflected in the meeting minutes and provided to the IEB. Given the position and agenda of the academic senate and the faculty's scientific council, it logically follows that the faculty's academic senate should focus primarily on matters such as the resource demands of the proposed (new) degree program, its alignment with the strategic plan of the faculty or university, its sustainability perspective, its societal or faculty necessity, the availability of space, and synergies within the faculty or potential collaboration with other faculties. On the other hand, the faculty's scientific council should focus primarily on the creative work associated with the degree program, including the work of key academic staff. However, meeting minutes tend to be very brief. These minutes are not submitted to the IEB from the faculty level (the dean declares in the accompanying letter that the degree program proposal has been discussed by the relevant faculty bodies, as required by internal regulations), and the IEB does not work with them.

The evaluation committee monitored the internal approval processes of selected degree programs and found that, especially in the initial period after institutional accreditation was granted, it is not always possible to trace the specific process. This is understandable, given the hectic and demanding nature of the entire process at its start. Over time, the situation improved, thanks in part to the formal administrative and methodological support provided by the DQEA. The committee also noted that the internal approval process for degree programs is, in most cases, focused on checking compliance with basic criteria, which are prepared for the IEB evaluators by the DQEA. However, no outputs are produced from the quality evaluation of degree programs that could be considered formative feedback for the program implementers. The DQEA can certainly check whether, for example, the publication activity of instructors, particularly the guarantors of core theoretical and other profile-defining courses, is listed, but it is difficult for them to assess the relevance of this publication activity in relation to the degree program or specific courses. Although it can be assumed that deeper discussions about some degree programs take place within the panels, these discussions rarely reach the deans and guarantors. It would be beneficial to make greater use of the possibility of having guarantors or deans attend panel meetings, and in cases of more serious issues, to have them attend the IEB meetings directly. The transparency of the evaluation processes within the IEB is discussed in more detail in section 2.3.

The evaluation committee also identified a certain effort to steer the development of degree programs from the university level, specifically in the case of the integration of doctoral degree programs. In general, this can be seen as a positive trend, and in many cases, it indeed leads to improved quality and synergy within the university. However, the evaluation committee also noted that in some cases, this process is more directive and does not sufficiently reflect the actual needs of the faculties or is inadequately discussed with them.

3.2 Evaluation of Degree Programs

The processes for internal evaluation of degree programs are legislatively anchored in the Rules of the Quality Assurance and Internal Evaluation System (hereinafter referred to as the "Rules"), Article 5. In addition to this framework, Section 9 of Article 5 of the Rules states that the details of the organization and conduct of the evaluations are to be set by the rector's decree, which, according to representatives of Charles University, has not yet been issued. The evaluation committee was informed during meetings

that such a decree is planned for the future, following an update of the current legislation and after evaluating existing practices.

The Rules initially set a number of parameters for internal evaluation; however, discussions on methodology have taken place in the meantime, and internal evaluations are currently conducted somewhat differently than described in the Rules. Based on the available documentation and information from meetings, the process can be outlined as follows:

The guarantor of the degree program prepares a self-evaluation report for the program according to a predefined structure, using various data generated by university systems. The assigned IEB reporter then adds a brief comment for each section of the report. If necessary, the reporter can request additional information from the guarantor, ask for an external review, or invite the guarantor of the degree program or another faculty representative to attend a panel meeting. The next step is the evaluation report of the final panel meeting (no minutes are taken), which includes a summary of the program's strengths and weaknesses and a list of recommendations; space is left for the guarantor's final comments. According to the Rules, after the report is approved, a summary of the results is published on the university's website, and one section of the form is explicitly titled "Public Summary."

According to the Rules, the evaluation is to be conducted by a "working group formed by the relevant IEB panel at least once during the program's accreditation period." The Rules state the following about the working group: "The self-evaluation report is discussed at a joint meeting of the working group of the Internal Evaluation Board, the guarantor of the evaluated degree program, and at least one academic staff member involved in delivering the program. The dean or a designated employee, the chair of the faculty's academic senate or their representative, and a student representative nominated by the faculty's academic senate may also attend the meeting. A member of the working group of the Internal Evaluation Board is to prepare minutes from the meeting." In practice, none of these aspects of internal evaluation can be confirmed or documented: there is no evidence of a working group, regular discussion of the report, participation of another academic staff member (or other faculty representatives, including students), or the existence of minutes. The evaluation committee also believes that summaries of the results of degree program evaluations are published on the faculty website only in the form of an IEB report, which merely states that the report was approved. The discussion of the self-evaluation reports at the IEB thus appears to be more of a formal procedure.

It is also important to note that internal evaluations take place entirely outside the faculties, only at the IEB or panel level. By not discussing the evaluation report with the participation of at least the guarantor and the experts involved in delivering the degree program, a significant opportunity for developing a culture of quality—something Charles University commits to in its strategic and other documents—is missed. Additionally, it is unclear what happens after the degree program is evaluated, how the implementation of recommendations is monitored, etc. This phase of the evaluation is currently being developed by Charles University, with the expectation that the results of the evaluation and the actions taken will be a key source when considering reapproval of degree programs. It is difficult to trace the link to the purpose of internal quality evaluation, which, according to Article 1 of the Rules, is "to support the development of the university" and to fulfill the idea of quality evaluation as "an assessment of whether and to what extent the university is achieving its mission and goals, adhering to the standards it sets for its activities, and how its activities exceed these goals and standards."

Specific steps to initiate internal evaluations of degree programs can be found in the IEB records starting around 2020. It is clear that Charles University first established approval practices, and only then moved on to evaluation practices. Internal evaluations were initially conducted as pilots at selected departments, and now they are being conducted regularly. Of the sample of degree programs presented to the

evaluation committee, only two have undergone internal evaluation so far, so it is not possible to draw broader conclusions; however, reflections based on the analysis of both the submitted and publicly available documents support the findings formulated in the previous paragraph. In discussions on-site, program guarantors agreed that they are aware of the requirement to undergo internal evaluation—some have already gone through it—and they understand the methodology. They consider the structure of the self-evaluation report to be relevant, and the data sets provided for their own reflection to be well-prepared, useful, and clear.

The evaluation committee views the decision of some panels to conduct parallel internal evaluations of related degree programs as good practice. This ensures comparison, and these processes can reveal similarities, overlaps, and opportunities for collaboration in both curriculum development and related creative activities. However, this presupposes that conclusions from these evaluations and discussions are conducted with the participation of guarantors, external evaluators, and other stakeholders involved in these degree programs.

Outside the mechanism of internal evaluations of degree programs, it appears that Charles University does not have a system in place for monitoring data on the functioning of individual degree programs and does not conduct ongoing evaluations, which could provide early warnings of issues (e.g., student failure rates, admissions data, etc.). Work with these indicators seems to be conducted to varying degrees only at individual departments.

3.3 Ongoing Monitoring of the Quality of Degree Programs

The fundamental document that should document the ongoing monitoring of the quality of degree programs at the university level is the Report on Internal Evaluation and its annual supplements. From the IEB (Internal Evaluation Board) minutes, it is clear that the supplements are prepared by a representative of the administrative-methodological department, which is, of course, a standard procedure. In the various reports and supplements, identical passages between different years can be found (e.g., regarding the results of graduate evaluations), which seems to be an oversight. In general, these documents are comprehensive, informative, and specific, and they are published for the academic community in accordance with the law.

Charles University has several tools available for ongoing monitoring of the quality of degree programs. In addition to internal evaluations during the accreditation period of the degree program, these include the return of accreditation files for revision, control reports, restrictions on internal authorization for student admissions, and the complete withdrawal of the authorization to conduct the degree program. The IEB minutes indicate that the IEB has used all (or almost all) of these measures, especially in the second half of the review period, following the first wave of internal approvals and the beginning of reapproval processes, or when interim control reports are submitted. This is also the period when the IEB increased the specificity and clarity of its resolutions. Thus, it can be stated that the use of these measures is carried out with quality and transparency.

Nevertheless, in cases where there are problems with a degree program, such as when a control report is required or even sanctions are imposed, clearer communication with the program guarantor, the department head, deans, or, where applicable, the faculty's academic senate and scientific council, is recommended.

The Rules of the Quality Assurance and Internal Evaluation System do not consider one aspect of educational activity that became a "leitmotif" in many meetings: cooperation with professional practice,

the involvement of professionals in internal approval and evaluation processes, and the setup and evaluation of student internships at institutions outside the university. Certain measures can be found in the Rector's Measure No. 13/2019, as amended by OR 22/2022, which explicitly states: "The faculty develops cooperation with professional practice, taking into account the types, relevant area(s) of education, and the profiles of degree programs. This includes practical teaching, the assignment of theses and dissertations, the granting of scholarships, and the involvement of professionals in the educational process, etc."

The evaluation committee did not encounter any example where representatives of the professional field were involved in the approval or evaluation of degree programs. There is no evidence of such involvement in any documents, and the absence of professional field representatives was confirmed by participants during the on-site visit. The lack of involvement of professional representatives throughout the system is surprising; they are not engaged even in professionally oriented degree programs. It is not necessary for them to participate in the activities of the IEB itself, but they should be involved at the level of individual departments (e.g., academic departments). The IEB should also take cooperation with the professional sector into account, meaning it should be included in the parameters monitored in quality assurance processes.

The evaluation committee also noted that, during both the approval process for degree program authorization and the evaluation of program quality during its implementation, little emphasis is placed on the quality control of professional internships: it is unclear how the expertise of mentors and student support at internship sites is ensured and guaranteed, how feedback from students on internships is gathered (beyond the submission of a final internship report by the student). The form used to assess a degree program during the authorization process asks about the quality assurance of this part of the study, but the evaluation committee found no comments on these questions from either the IEB reporter or in IEB resolutions. The committee registered a case where a degree program was approved without contractual assurance of internships, and there was no documentation of these internships being provided later. The evaluation form for degree programs during their implementation does not ask about the course and quality of internships or mentors, only the possibility (not the requirement) to reflect feedback from the internship providers. It is not verifiable whether students can or have expressed their opinions on the quality of their professional internships during their studies.

The issue of internships also came up in discussions with faculty representatives and students, particularly concerning the credit load associated with internships. Internships sometimes have very low credit value, which does not correspond to ECTS standards. The most significant limitations in terms of credit distribution, and also in terms of support for internationalization, apply to programs that prepare graduates for regulated professions. The IEB should be directly or indirectly involved in any discussions with regulators or at least be sufficiently informed about the progress of these discussions.

The on-site visit also revealed other problematic aspects of professional internships, particularly the reflection on completed internships. The committee encountered cases where targeted reflection on the outcomes of internships in the study program was not conducted. Therefore, the IEB should focus more on the specific aspects of professional internships described above, both in the approval of degree programs and in internal evaluation processes.

4. Conclusions

The general objective of the external evaluation of Charles University was to assess the experiences to date with institutional accreditation as a new element in the quality assurance system, which Charles University received more than five years ago. Despite pointing out some specific issues, the evaluation committee can state that Charles University has successfully managed the transition to the conditions of institutional accreditation. The university has established internal regulations related to the assurance of the quality of creative and educational activities, which logically follow each other and form a functional whole. These regulations are generally adhered to. However, the large number of individual regulations and the multitude of matters they address can, in some cases, complicate navigation and lead to their formal fulfillment without effectively improving quality. At the faculty level, quality control mechanisms are harder to grasp, as they often occur through methodological procedures and customs that are not clearly defined or standardized in internal faculty regulations. The evaluation committee, however, focused on the central setup of the internal quality assurance and evaluation processes for degree programs.

More than five years of institutional accreditation has also led to some innovative practices, introduced several examples of good practice, and created new administrative-methodological tools and organizational units at both the faculty and university levels. The university itself recognizes the need to make partial adjustments to the current legislation, incorporating changes, particularly examples of good practice. It must be noted that there is now sufficient experience with the approval of degree programs and, to some extent, with the evaluation of the quality of existing programs, which could be positively reflected in legislative changes.

In terms of improving quality, the university faces several additional tasks. Communication between the rectorate and its units needs to be improved, and it is especially necessary to establish two-way communication processes. Quality is primarily based on the concrete activities of the faculties. Therefore, it is essential to strengthen the culture of quality directly within the faculties, to provide space for initiatives from the faculty environment (students, program guarantors, academic senates, and scientific councils), and to actively seek them out. Many of the problems faculties face can be solved with the help of the rectorate or the IEB. The IEB faces tasks related to its currently underestimated role, as defined in the IEB Statute. This includes methodological materials, the application of quality evaluation rules in various educational areas, submitting proposals, and creating positions on suggestions for developing the internal quality assurance system. This may also involve updating standards or forms for applications and evaluation reports to address, for example, the societal role of universities and other issues raised by the evaluation committee (credit load for internships, internationalization, incorporating the goals of the strategic plan of the university and faculties into curricula, etc.).

Based on the external evaluation, the evaluation committee also formulates several recommendations that should assist Charles University in its efforts to improve quality.

5. Recommendations

- I. Update the legislation, assess more than five years of experience, and reflect it in the Rules of the Quality Assurance and Internal Evaluation System. Simplify and streamline the outputs related to quality assurance, connect them (e.g., balance reports, annual reports, updates to the strategic plan), and clarify how they translate into practical quality assurance measures.
- II. Consider the position and role of individual bodies and organizational units. Specify the focus on particular topics that faculty bodies (academic senates, scientific councils) should prioritize when discussing or approving degree programs.
- III. Ensure clear and accessible outputs from the activities and meetings of the IEB panels, so they can be further utilized at both the IEB and faculty levels. In the interest of equal access for all faculties, invite the guarantor of the respective degree program to panel meetings when approving new programs or programs with issues.
- IV. Clearly define conflicts of interest, and for student members of the IEB, ensure the maximum possible exclusion of overlapping roles to ensure that the student perspective is genuinely student-specific and not influenced by other aspects.
- V. Clarify the role and expectations of student members of the IEB, and possibly define a specific agenda for them to take long-term responsibility for, meaning to initiate, bring suggestions, present, promote, and communicate.
- VI. More actively involve external experts (outside Charles University) in the approval process and especially in internal quality evaluations, using working groups (including external experts and students) for the internal evaluation of degree programs. These external experts should mainly include academic staff from other universities in the Czech Republic and abroad, as well as professionals from industry, employers, and sectoral organizations. The evaluation committee recognizes the number of degree programs and the complexity of such an organization. It may be worth considering whether external perspectives should be more focused at the faculty level and monitored by the IEB.
- VII. Strengthen the IEB's role in methodology and strategy, establish mechanisms for faculties to submit suggestions and have them addressed promptly, and enable more effective two-way communication between faculty and rectorate levels, ideally also fostering the sharing of good practices and experiences among faculties.
- VIII. Strive for greater decentralization of internal evaluation processes for degree programs, leading to increased involvement of faculty stakeholders beyond the program guarantor. Develop both formalized and informal mechanisms for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of degree program implementation and encourage faculties to take on some responsibility for addressing the findings.
- IX. Improve two-way communication on issues related to quality assurance processes, both at the vertical level (university, faculties) and horizontally (inter-faculty communication). Use communication channels to share good practices and cultivate an environment that supports a shared culture of quality.
- X. Place greater emphasis on explicitly working with the strategic plan of the university and faculties and systematically incorporating its priorities into the parameters that the IEB consistently and purposefully monitors and requires during approvals and internal evaluations. This includes areas such as mobility, specialized courses in foreign languages, the internationalization of degree programs, collaboration with industry (including its integration into study plans and appropriate credit allocation), and the development of support for vulnerable students and students with special needs.

NAB Board conclusions

The National Accreditation Bureau (NAB) Board reviewed the results of the external evaluation of Charles University at its meeting No. 2/2024 held on February 22, 2024.

The NAB Board, in accordance with § 83c paragraph 2 letter f) of Act No. 111/1998 Coll., on Higher Education Institutions and on the Amendment and Supplementation of Other Acts (the Higher Education Act), as amended, approved the Report on the External Evaluation of Charles University.

Annexes:

Annex No. 1

Institutional Accreditation of Charles University

The decision to grant institutional accreditation to Charles University was issued by the National Accreditation Bureau (NAB) on March 21, 2018. According to § 81b paragraph 1 of Act No. 111/1998 Coll., on Higher Education Institutions and on the Amendment and Supplementation of Other Acts (the Higher Education Act), as amended, the NAB granted Charles University institutional accreditation for the following areas of education:

- a. Area of education: Biology, Ecology, and Environmental Sciences, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- b. Area of education: Economic Sciences, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- c. Area of education: Pharmacy, including master's and doctoral degree programs,
- d. Area of education: Philology, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- e. Area of education: Philosophy, Religious Studies, and Theology, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- f. Area of education: Physics, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- g. Area of education: Historical Sciences, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- h. Area of education: Chemistry, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- i. Area of education: Informatics, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- j. Area of education: Mathematics, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- k. Area of education: Media and Communication Studies, including bachelor's and master's degree programs,
- l. Area of education: Non-Teacher Pedagogy, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- m. Area of education: Political Science, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- n. Area of education: Law, including master's and doctoral degree programs,
- o. Area of education: Psychology, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- p. Area of education: Social Work, including bachelor's and master's degree programs,
- q. Area of education: Sociology, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- r. Area of education: Physical Education and Sports; Kinanthropology, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- s. Area of education: Teacher Training, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- t. Area of education: Arts and Culture Studies, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- u. Area of education: Earth Sciences, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs,
- v. Area of education: General Medicine and Dentistry, including master's and doctoral degree programs,
- w. Area of education: Health Care Studies, including bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs.

- x. Additionally, on June 29, 2018, the NAB issued a decision granting authorization to independently create and conduct doctoral degree programs in the above-mentioned areas of education in cooperation with the institutes of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.

Annex No. 2

Overview of the Degree Programs Examined in Detail

Name of Degree Program	Faculty	Type of Degree Program	Profile of Degree Program	Language
Southeast European Studies	Philosophical Faculty	B	Academical	CZE
Humanities Studies	Faculty of Humanities	B	Academical	CZE
Church and General History	Katolic Theological Faculty	D		CZE
Education and Interpretation in the Field of Cultural Heritage	PedF	M	Academical	CZE
Public Administration and Records Management	FF	B	Professional	CZE
Primary School Teaching	PedF	M	Academical	CZE, CZE
Didactics of Chemistry	PedF; PrF	D		CZE, ENG
General Nursing	LFHK	B	Professional	CZE
Bioanalytical Laboratory Diagnostics in Healthcare	FaF	M	Professional	CZE
Biochemistry and Pathobiochemistry	1.LF; 2.LF; 3.LF; LFP	D		CZE, ENG
Science	MFF; PrF	B	Academical	ENG

Chemistry and Physics of Materials	PřF	N	Academical	CZE
Parasitology and Infection Biology	PřF	N	Academical	ENG

B – bachelor degree program, M – master degree program; NMSP – consecutive master's degree program; D – doctoral degree program

CZE – language of teaching Czech; ENG – language of teaching English