

**CIT QAU HANDBOOK
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ON QUALITY OF
EDUCATION AT
“CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY”**

Contents

I. INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE UNIT	4
I.1 Internal Quality Assurance Unit.....	4
I.2 Some of the competences of Internal Quality Assurance Unit.....	4
I.3 External quality assurance	4
I.4 Accreditation.....	4
II. COMPONENTS AND PRINCIPLES OF QUALITY ASSURANCE	5
II.1 Main Documents.....	6
II.2 QAU (Quality Assurance Unit).....	6
QAU Activity.....	8
Study Quality Assessment and Improvement.....	8
The quality assurance system	8
Roles in quality assurance work.....	9
Student democracy.....	9
Recruitment, information and reception of new students.....	9
Permanent Committee for Programs and Curricula's	10
Evaluation of teaching and courses/ study programmes	10
Course evaluation	10
Programme evaluation	11
Permanent Committee for Programs and Curricula's	11
Periodic revision of study programmes and information to students.....	12
Education reports.....	12
III. ESTABLISHING AND DISCONTINUING COURSES AND STUDY PROGRAMMES	14
New study programmes.....	14
New courses.....	17
Curriculum Committee and curricula evaluation.....	17
Guidelines for programme auditors at CIT (members of Curriculum Committee).....	18
IV. PROCEDURE FOR SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF STUDY PROGRAMS	20
Purpose	20
Scope.....	20
Definitions.....	20
1. Responsibility.....	21
2. Program monitoring and review	21

3. Course evaluation 21

4. Assessment of the Quality of Instruction..... 22

5. Committees responsible for the evaluation of programs and quality of teaching..... 25

Annex No.1 (Template) 26

I. INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE UNIT

I.1 Internal Quality Assurance Unit

1. University College "Canadian Institute of Technology" establishes Internal Quality Assurance Unit, a structure which is responsible for developing policies and procedures with regard to internal quality assurance.
2. Internal Quality Assurance Unit is a collegial body. It consists of five members, two of whom are representatives of academic staff of the main units (one for each unit)', one representative of Students' Council and one *expert* who heads the unit. Unit members are appointed by Academic Senate upon the proposal of Rector with a 4-year mandate.
3. Unit chairman, who is an external expert, is proposed by Rector and approved by Academic Senate.

I.2 Competences of Internal Quality Assurance Unit

Competences of Internal Quality Assurance Unit are related to:

1. Developing policies and procedures with regard to internal quality assurance, acts which are approved by Academic Senate.
2. Developing standards for quality assurance in accordance with Code of Quality.
3. Assessing periodically the results of teaching and scientific research activities in the main units in accordance with standards.
4. Conducting investigative studies to evaluate the efficiency of programs of study and students' employment opportunities.
5. At the end of each semester, before the exams, internal quality assurance unit organizes students' survey through questionnaire on the quality of teaching for each subject of study programs.
6. After each evaluation, internal quality assurance unit reports the results to Academic Senate along with relevant proposals.

I.3 External quality assurance

External quality assurance is realized by external quality assurance processes and accreditation in accordance with terms, procedures and authorities set out in current legislation on higher education.

I.4 Accreditation

1. Accreditation is realized in accordance with procedures, deadlines and designated bodies defined in the legislation in force.
2. Each accredited program/institution undergoes periodic evaluation and accreditation.
3. Periodic evaluation and accreditation is conducted every 6 years.
4. Costs for external quality assessment are borne by institution itself.
5. Results of external evaluation and accreditation are made public.

II. COMPONENTS AND PRINCIPLES OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

Three main components of study quality system are:

1. **Good quality study programs.** Both University teachers and social partners take part in program development. Existing study programs are regularly analyzed and updated by improving contents of the program and intended learning outcomes. Quality and improvement of study programs is responsibility of “Permanent Committees for Programs and Curricula’s”, consisting of instructors, as well as student and social partners' representatives.
2. **Competent teachers, fit for delivering study programs.** Certification of teachers includes assessment of teachers’ professional competence, research activities, educational development as well as student opinion. University provides possibilities to improve educational skills, University organizes competence improvement courses or training for teachers.
3. **Student need oriented study process.** Study regulations are clearly defined in the university with set procedures for study schedules, student achievement assessment, appeals and reassessments, social and academic support.

Level of study quality is assured by these fundamental principles and processes:

1. **Student participation in decision making.** Student representatives take part in all bodies, concerned with studies from highest ruling bodies (Senate, Faculty councils) to committees and work groups. Social partners if needed help to ensure that program contents, knowledge and skills students acquire, are up to date and correspond to labor market needs.
2. **Collection and analysis of information, important for quality assessment.** Various quantitative and qualitative data, describing study process and study quality is collected – surveys of student, teacher and alumni opinion, statistical data, discussions on selected study quality topics. Collected information is analyzed, assessed in Quality Assurance Unit and University governing bodies: Rectorate, faculty councils, Senate.
3. **Feedback about assessment results and study quality improvement measures.** Results of study quality assessment are presented not only to governing bodies of the university, but also academic community: main assessment results are published in the quality section of the university web page. Public information about study quality raises community awareness, helps to develop quality culture in the institution.

II.1 Main Documents

Quality system in the institution has been developed and is updated according to the “European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance” and Public “Accreditation Agency for Higher Education in Albania” documents and procedures.

At the core of University study process regulations and study programs' improvement is student centered learning and principles of European Higher Education Area (EHEA), formulated in Bologna process.

All Study programs at CIT comply with Directives of the Ministry of Education and Sport in Albania.

II.2 QAU (Quality Assurance Unit)

QAU coordinates monitoring, assessment and improvement of study quality at the Canadian Institute of Technology.

CIT Internal Quality Assurance Unit guaranties the quality of academic activities, cultural and social activities of the academic staff and students, as well as the administrative activities of CIT.

I. The principles on which the Internal Quality Assurance (QAU) is build are:

- I.1 Creation of a clear and realistic picture of the current state of CIT;
- I.2 Establishment of the Internal Assurance Quality system and create of the culture of quality in the Institution.
- I.3 Ensuring transparency on the information of all stakeholders and the public on the performance of CIT, its entities, programs, curricula, services etc.

II. Goals of QAU are:

- II.1 Continuous growth of the CIT's quality management, through the creation and implementation of policies, strategies and contemporary procedures, as well as the continuous growth of commitment at all managerial and organizational levels.
- II.2 Continuous application of the philosophy of CIT through implementation of an academic program in line with the goals of CIT.
- II.3 Continuous increase of training quality of students, by providing them with up to date knowledge, methods and teaching techniques. Encouraging students to be proactive and critical on daily challenges of life.

III. The QAU's objectives are:

- III.1 Continuous monitoring of the institutional management.
- III.2 Continuous monitoring of the situation of the curriculum - implementation, review, update - through creation and continuous improvement of performance of official mechanisms.

III.3 Continuous monitoring of the quality of academic and supporting staff, as well as improvement of its qualifications.

III.4 Continuous monitoring of evaluation of both teachers' and student's performance.

III.5 Continuous monitoring of research progress in the institution.

III.6 Monitoring the level of students' involvement in the daily activities of the institution.

III.7 Following up the progress of the CIT's cooperation with other academic and non-academic institutions on national and international level.

III.8 Extending the internal system of quality assurance at all organizational levels of the institution.

IV. Structures responsible for Internal Quality Assurance are:

IV.1 Internal Unit of Quality Assurance (IQAU or QAU) - by assessing the effectiveness of activities conducted in CIT, with a view to continuous quality improvement.

IV. Hierarchical organizational structures (governing bodies and authorities) of the CIT.

V. Internal Unit of Quality Assurance (QAU) – composition, selection and functions

V.1 QAU is set up at University level. Its members are approved by the CIT Senate.

V.2 The Unit consists of a Chairman; a representative for each Faculty; a representative of the academic support or administrative staff and a representative of Student's Council.

V.3 The Head of QAU is proposed by the Rector and appointed by the Academic Senate. Members are nominated by the Deans of respective faculties and approved by the Senate.

V.4 During members' selection the following criteria should be considered:

a. Professional competence;

b. Impartiality;

c. The possibilities for gathering information to carry out assessment;

V.5 QAU evaluates periodically the effectiveness of educational, research or administrative activities, as well as the efficiency of financial activities of the institution.

V.6 The QAU shall have operational autonomy and access to the data of institution.

V.7 The QAU's results are published in an internal report sent to the Rector. Parts of the report relating to the respective faculties will also be made available to the Deans of Faculties.

V.8 The QAU's Chairman regularly participates in meetings of the Rector's office and Senate meetings.

VI. QAU's relations with PAAHE (Public Agency for the Accreditation of Higher Educations in Albania)

VI.1 QAU shall build cooperative relations with PAAHE and, in coordination with, drafts a plan of contacts and visits to the institution.

VI.2 QAU shall establish and continuously maintain relationships with institutions of Quality Assurance, which after the decision of the Rector, can be invited to conduct the external audit of CIT.

QAU Activity

The QAU has regular meetings, where questions of study quality at CIT, its assessment and improvement, instruments of quality assessment or regulations are discussed.

QAU meetings are held and protocols (minutes) are recorded.

Study Quality Assessment and Improvement

Study quality analysis and assessment is performed at various University levels – from departments and individual teachers to University bodies, such as Permanent Committee for Programs and Curricula's, Student Union, Rectorate and Senate. This section has University level presentations of study quality assessment and improvement measures.

The quality assurance system

The university's quality assurance system was established to maintain and further develop the quality of study programs in a manner that can be documented. The system is wide ranging and comprises all processes that affect the quality of the education that CIT offer. Maintenance and further development of the quality in education can be achieved through a quality assurance system that:

- Systematizes knowledge of activities and improving the circumstances that permit students and employees better understand these activities and each other's' views and perspectives
- Encourages work on learning issues
- Produces the information necessary to be able to propose and implement measures to improve the quality of education and study performance
- Clarifies the responsibilities of students and staff to ensure that efforts to improve the quality of education succeed
- Helps to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for study programs and support systems.

A well-functioning quality development system emphasises the responsibility each of us has for the institution's activities, and involves all groups in the university community in the educational process. It is therefore a precondition and goal that all significant information about planned and implemented evaluation measures be made freely available and communicated to the students and staff concerned.

Quality assurance takes place in accordance with a plan that ensures continuity and an overview. Schematically, it can be described as a recurring process consisting of four phases. During the planning phase, the educational objectives are defined and teaching planned. In the implementation phase, knowledge, skills and general competence are acquired, and evaluations are carried out to determine whether the work's progress and direction are in accordance with the objectives. On completion of a course or study programs, evaluations and results are reviewed with a view to improving the course or study programs and/or correcting the objectives.

Roles in quality assurance work

All study programs must be headed by a programs chairman that might be even the head of department (in the case that the university is still small and growing). In organizational terms, the program may be subject to one or more departments, but one faculty has the administrative and financial responsibility for the study programs. Cross-disciplinary programs must be operated in accordance with adopted guidelines for cross-disciplinary cooperation. Other relevant functions with responsibility for education are teaching supervisors and heads of teaching at the various departments. The distribution of responsibility between the various functions varies between the departments. Separate instructions may be drawn up for course coordinators. In addition, the programs auditor scheme is used.

Student democracy

Both the faculties and the central university administration are responsible for ensuring that the competence represented by student democracy through the work of the academic committees, student committee and the Student Government is used in the efforts to improve study quality at all levels of the organisation. The university can provide training for these student representatives.

Recruitment, information and reception of new students

The rules for admission to basic studies at CIT are determined by the Rectorate, Academic Senate and Faculty Councils. The Division of Student Affairs is responsible for the practical implementation of the admission process, which is conducted in cooperation with the faculties. Information on study programs at the University are prepared and disseminated by the Division of Student Affairs in cooperation with the departments and faculties. All written information used by the University in connection with promoting study programs must be approved by the faculty concerned.

The information is reviewed annually in accordance with experience and feedback. Expected learning outcomes must be communicated in connection with the promotion of each individual study programs. Social and student-oriented services and activities that the University is responsible for in the first semester, are evaluated and may be improved every year based on

evaluations. The Division of Student Affairs, in cooperation with the faculties, is responsible that such evaluations are carried out and that changes are considered.

[Permanent Committee for Programs and Curricula's \(Internal Programs auditing\)](#)

What is a program auditor?

The program auditor must assess the organization and implementation of a study program or a part of this, and must once yearly draw up a written report on the study program based on the mandate provided by the faculty.

[Evaluation of teaching and courses/ study programs](#)

The university carries out evaluations at two levels: on an ongoing basis with the emphasis on the system for and implementation of teaching of individual courses (course evaluation), and in the form of more comprehensive evaluations focusing on individual study program and the education offered in a program perspective (study program evaluation). The chair of the program committee is responsible for evaluation of the study program. The evaluation of courses and study programs must be documented in written reports. Reports on courses must be considered by the program board in question. The reports must be made available to students, employees and other interested parties in the Study Quality Database.

[Course evaluation](#)

At least 1/2 of the courses that at any given time are taught, must be evaluated each year. The individual faculty decides which courses that are to be evaluated for one year of study at a time, while QAU and registrar, in cooperation with the student administration, are responsible for planning and implementing the evaluation. Course evaluations must at least include:

- A student evaluation of the course, preferably in the form of a midway evaluation.
- An evaluation of whether or not the progress made and course implementation are in accordance with the stated objectives, comments on the student evaluation and any other forms of evaluations, and proposed measures.
- Assessment of the relation between stipulated learning outcome, teaching and examination methods in the course.
- A description of how previous evaluations have been followed up. The main results from the evaluations must be communicated to the students by way of course and program reports in the Study Quality Database or by publishing the most findings in the CIT web page. The faculties by their representative in the QAU may decide to also include other matters and questions in the course evaluation, such as the function of the course in different study programs. Major changes to a course curriculum should be followed up by an evaluation at the first opportunity. All courses must be evaluated at least once every three years.

Program evaluation

A more comprehensive evaluation of the study program offered must be carried out at least every 5 years, while new study programs should be evaluated sooner. In this context, education offered may be study programs at Bachelor's or Master's level, completed elements of professional programs or the education offered represented by courses or modules. It is up to the faculties to decide what study programs to evaluate; the Curricula Program Committee plans and carries out the evaluation in collaboration with the academic administration. Program evaluations should normally be in the form of self-evaluations. The evaluation of study programs should include:

- The study program's profile and structure, the use of joint teaching and courses specially developed for the study program and academic and social activities
- Whether the chosen methods of teaching and assessment are in accordance with the objectives of the study program
- Practical implementation
- The number of applicants/in relation to places offered, program completion, percentage of students that fail or drop out of the program
- Grade distribution
- Available resources
- Comments on the student evaluations
- Study program information and documentation
- Availability of relevant literature
- The department/program head's evaluation and suggestions for improvements. It is up to each faculty to adopt further guidelines for the evaluation of its own study programs. There must be an implementation plan, which must be available online or distributed to the concerned people.

Permanent Committee for Programs and Curricula's

The PCPC is the highest body that contribute in the evaluation and improvement process of the study programs.

PCPC is composed by 6 members. All PCPC members are elected in the Academic Senate. They are proposed by the academic Senate members. In their election the experience in teaching should be taken in to account. The chair of the committee should be a senior professor.

The PCPC evaluates the institutional needs to open new programs; to evaluate the situation in the existing programs; to propose changes/discontinue for the programs that don't fulfill the institutional needs; etc.

PCPC evaluates and propose action or changes upon the request of the Academic Senate or other relevant actors in the institution (like Faculty Councils, deans or head of departments).

PCPC mandate the Curricula Program Committee to conduct the evaluation process based on a periodic scheduling.

Periodic revision of study programs and information to students

The members of the Curricula Program Committee are elected from the Permanent Committee for Programs and Curricula's. They can be members of the Permanent Committee or elected from the academic staff of the study program.

The chair of the Curricula Program Committee must ensure that the course/study program is reviewed annually with a view to improving and making corrections to the course/study program and how it is presented. This is done in connection with the annual revision of program and course descriptions. In the case of major changes to course or program descriptions, transitional schemes for affected students must be included. Information about study programs must be based on the adopted program descriptions. All information on courses and program descriptions, as well as timetables and reading lists must be updated and openly available at www.cit.edu.al no later than 1 October. All information on education offered and study programs is online and available at www.cit.edu.al.

Education reports

The education report must include a description and assessment of the quality of the faculty's/department's study programs and an overview of the results and measures used in the quality assurance efforts and describe particular challenges. The report must include a discussion of the learning environment (infrastructure, framework conditions, etc.). Reports must discuss plans for the educational activities and quality assurance work for the coming year, including plans for program evaluations and results from recent evaluations. The department's and faculties' education reports are extremely important for quality assurance of the study programs at the university. For this reason both academic staff and students must be included in preparing and discussing the content of education reports. The annual education report for the institution is prepared on the basis of the faculties' education report. This report is intended to provide an overall assessment of the study quality of the institution, as well as an overview of the strategy and measures for quality assurance. The education report is the first notification from the faculties on which programs they wish to establish or discontinue, and it also includes a proposal for the internal allocation of places for the next year (dimensioning of the program).

The Curriculum Committee of the Program processes the education report before this is presented to the Academic Senate. The education report form the basis for the long-term planning of education activities at the university. The education report shall conclude with an overall assessment and provide proposals for measures and topics for further development in the years to come. This provides a basis for resource management and priorities in subsequent budgets at the department, faculty and institution levels.

III. ESTABLISHING AND DISCONTINUING COURSES AND STUDY PROGRAMMES

New study programs

Study programs that the faculty plans to establish must be connected to an academic environment that can demonstrate an active research or artistic development environment within all or part of the study program's academic field. Study programs are either organised within a single department, as a collaboration effort between two or more departments, or between two or more faculties.

The university may also enter into binding agreements on educational cooperation with foreign institutions, in the form of joint degrees or joint study programs. The approval process for a new study program can be divided into two phases.

In the first phase an academic program committee must be appointed from the PCPC. The program committee's task is to define the study program's objectives, scope (potential courses) and relevance to society, as well as opportunities for further studies. The department/faculty will thereafter assess the financial and resource-related aspects of the planned program and how its establishment will affect the faculty's overall dimensioning of the study portfolio. Following approval by the Academic Senate and University Board, phase two starts with a decision to establish a representative program board, and a decision on which department that will have the academic and administrative responsibility for the planned program. The full program description for the new study program will be developed by the program board. During this phase, the learning outcomes for the entire program are defined by describing what knowledge, skills and general competencies candidates are expected to have acquired upon completing the program. It must be possible to measure or observe expected learning outcomes. The courses to be included in the program shall also be defined, as well as their scope (number of credits). Teaching and assessment methods must underpin the expected learning outcomes.

The program descriptions must comply with the requirements set out by the Albanian Ministry of Education and Agency for Quality Assurance in Education's for the study programs. Notification of the establishment of new study programs must be given in the faculties' education reports one year before the program is due to start. The results from the initial phase of the development work must be enclosed with the education reports. Faculties proposing new study programs must finalize the program and course descriptions and be able to provide a plan for the financial aspects by mid-October or November. A complete program description must be submitted to the faculty council and checked by QAU and PCPC before the study program can be finally approved by the Academic Senate and University Board.

Responsibility for and the dynamics of the process of approval of new study programs are shown in the table below:

When	Task	Party responsible	Contributor	Approval
September	Evaluation of the study program portfolio; decide which study programs should be established/discontinued.	Relevant academic staff and academic group Department(s)	Senate; Faculty	1. Academic Senate 2. PCPC 3. Faculty Council 4. Department(s) 5. Faculty/faculties
September	Planning of any new study programs, including a consideration of the relevance of the program and financial consequences.	PCPC propose the Curriculum committee* members, consisting of academic staff	Relevant academic staff Department Faculty	1. Department(s) 2. Faculty/faculties
October	Education reports: Faculties report which study programs they wish to establish/discontinue and attach a draft(s) for the program description(s)	Faculty/faculties	Curriculum committee Department	Faculty/faculties
October	Faculty Council agenda item on the establishment/discontinuation of study program(s).	Student Affairs Office or Marketing Office	Curriculum committee Department Faculty	The Curriculum Committee considers the faculties' proposals.
October	The University Board or Top managers consider the education report	The Administrator prepares the matter.	Academic Senate	The University Board or Top managers passes a resolution concerning programs and studies offered
November	Develop a program	Curriculum	Academic	1. Curriculum

	description, including any new courses, in accordance with the template. Estimate costs.	Committee	environment Students	Committee 2. Department 3. Faculty/faculties
December	Deadline for completing the program descriptions and approving them at faculty level	Curriculum Committee	Department	Faculty
January	The Curriculum Committee recommend final approval of the completed program descriptions.	Student Affairs Office or Marketing Office		The Curriculum Committee
January	Consulting the drafted program with CIT Quality Assurance Unit	QAU+PCPC/Faculty	QAU/Faculty	QAU
February	Submission to the PAAHE and Ministry of Education and Sport	Protocol	Protocol	President and Administrator

** Curriculum Committee (or Program Committee is an ad hoc committee and not permanent)*

Due to the fact that based on the guidelines of the Ministry of Education and Sport, there is a dead line when to submit the application for opening the new programs, the top managers must conduct this process (according to the table) and finalize it until February 28th of each year.

New courses

Responsibility for and the dynamics of the process of approval of new courses are shown in the table below. The faculties have internal deadlines for this work.

When	Task	Party responsible	Contributor	Approval
May	Evaluation of the relevance of the course and its place in a study program	Curriculum Committee	Relevant experts and academic environments	1. Department 2. Faculty
May	Describe the objectives for the course and what the students must have learnt on completion of their studies (learning outcomes).	Curriculum Committee	Relevant experts	1. Curriculum Committee 2. Department 3. Faculty/faculties
June	Identify and propose learning methods and forms of assessment.	Curriculum Committee	Discipline group or Curriculum Committee	1. Curriculum Committee 2. Department 3. (Faculty)
July	Communicate objectives and contents	Responsible department/faculty	Course Coordinator, Department Faculty/faculties	1. Curriculum Committee 2. Department 3. (Faculty)
July	Final approval of the course	Curriculum Committee, Responsible department/faculty	Department	1. Curriculum Committee 2. Department 3. (Faculty)

Curriculum Committee and curricula evaluation

In the Bologna context any program should be of relevance for society, lead to employment, prepare for citizenship, be recognized by academia and sufficiently transparent and compatible to facilitate mobility and recognition. Furthermore, it should be understood, valued by and thought to be sufficiently attractive to appeal to significant numbers of good students, either in a national and/or an international context. The adequacy of the approach to achieve the objectives, consistency and coherence of the constituent elements of the program are further proofs of its quality.

Any degree program must develop subject specific competences, that is, knowledge, skills, abilities and values, specifically needed for the subject area(s).

Program design and delivery must be continually monitored and evaluated to find out whether the aims are actually being achieved and whether they continue to be appropriate or should take into account changes and developments in the subject areas and in society.

A curriculum evaluation can be considered under three main headings:

- the educational process,
- the educational outcome and
- the means and facilities required for program delivery.

Each of these main headings contains a number of elements to be considered:

- Educational Process:
 - degree profile (aims of the educational program)
 - learning outcomes to be achieved and competences to be obtained
 - degree/educational program structure and order of program components to ensure progression
 - coherence of degree / educational program
 - division of workload over the semester and the academic year
 - feasibility of program (check)
 - teaching, learning and assessment methods
 - international cooperation and student mobility
- Educational outcome:
 - study rate, cessation of study and switch-overs (output)
 - output of 1st and 2nd cycle
 - employability
- Means and facilities required:
 - structural and technical facilities
 - staff and material means
 - student support: student counsellors

[Guidelines for program auditors at CIT \(members of Curriculum Committee\)](#)

A program auditor is a member of the Curriculum Committee elected from the Faculty Council to be part of the ad hoc committee. He/she is mandated to revise the program and to submit the final report.

1. The faculty will appoint one or more program auditors for its study programs or parts of them.

2 The program auditor shall evaluate the organisation and implementation of a study program, or part of it. The program auditor must be given relevant information and can request further documentation. Evaluations by program auditors shall include views on the following in particular:

- Curriculum, organisation of the study program and teaching
- The assessment system that is used in the study program. As a basis for his/her evaluation, the program auditor shall be given an overview documenting the evaluation system and the assessment system for the individual courses in the study program. Those responsible for the program of study must decide whether the program auditor needs to be given further information about the assessment procedures.
- The extent to which the program auditor has participated in discussions with the academic staff about quality development of the study program.
- IV. Any special factors relating to implementation of the study program during the period.
- V. The role and tasks of the program auditor. The faculty can issue more detailed rules about the program auditor's tasks.

3. The program auditor shall produce a written report on the study program based on the mandate defined by the faculty. The program auditor is also free to submit comments regarding any matters relating to the teaching, structure and contents of the study program.

5 The reports from the program auditor is part of the background information for the education report that the relevant department or Faculty will produce. The program auditor's work can also be organised so that several successive annual reports together constitute an external program evaluation. The annual report can be written in Albanian or English.

IV. PROCEDURE FOR SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF STUDY PROGRAMS

Purpose

Quality assurance and continuous improvement of the CIT educational programs are fundamental to our mission. This policy establishes the framework for evaluating the quality and viability of all programs and for the systematic monitoring and review of programs and courses. It is based on the following principles:

- a) CIT is committed to a cycle of evaluation and improvement as part of academic planning. Within this cycle, academic staff and teaching teams are required to: review the content and focus of their courses; evaluate and reflect on student learning resulting from their teaching practice, curriculum design and approaches to assessment; and make appropriate revisions when required.
- b) CIT recognizes that the resources available to develop and sustain programs may affect their quality. CIT will evaluate the value, relevance and viability of its programs to ensure available resources are used to maximum effect.
- c) CIT will use multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data in the evaluation of its courses, programs and teaching, including feedback from students and stakeholders.

The evaluations and reviews conducted under this policy and their outcomes form part of the College program approval and review procedural framework.

Scope

This policy applies to all programs offered by the College Canadian Institute of Technology (CIT).

Definitions

Continuous improvement means the ongoing review cycle designed to progressively improve courses, programs and teaching outcomes.

Institutional Effectiveness represents the interaction between institutional research and institutional planning—and has:

- a) service goals, service objectives, policies, and procedures for each of its academic, student, and administrative support units; the objectives derive from the goals and are measurable;
- b) program goals and program outcomes for each of its academic programs; the outcomes derive from the goals, are measurable, and are linked with the outcomes of the courses comprising the program;
- c) learning outcomes for each of its academic courses; the outcomes of each course are measurable and contribute to the outcomes of the program.

Evaluation of quality means:

- a) the systematic consideration of stakeholder views and benchmarking activities about the quality of programs and courses; and,
- b) the aggregation, analysis and interpretation of students' feedback about their perceptions of their courses to inform judgments about the quality of programs.

Evaluation of viability means the assessment of the viability of programs based on performance against an agreed set of indicators, and referenced against CIT-based targets.

Quality assurance means the application of monitoring, review and evaluation processes to ensure that the College's teaching and learning processes and outcomes are meeting the standards defined by CIT, through this policy and its broader strategic goals.

1. Responsibility

1.1 The Responsibility for implementing the arrangements outlined in this policy rests jointly with the Faculty, Departments, and Quality Assurance Unit (QAU).

2. Program monitoring and review

2.1 On an annual basis, CIT reviews the performance of its programs based on the College's program performance data and any additional strategic measures as determined by the Quality Assurance Unit.

2.2 The annual review of performance may identify amendments to ensure the ongoing success of the program.

2.3 Programs whose performance is consistently below CIT targets and benchmarks may be required to show cause as to why the program should not be withdrawn.

2.4 A review of performance for all coursework programs will be undertaken every year as specified in this policy.

2.5 The Dean, Head of departments, PCPC and the Quality Assurance Unit will meet to discuss teaching and learning review and the performance of each program associated with the faculty.

2.6 Programs identified for review will form part of the annual schedule of program evaluation

3. Course evaluation

1.1 The Quality Assurance Unit will develop, review and monitor the course and teacher evaluation survey, for the evaluation of courses and teaching.

1.2 CIT evaluates each course each time it is offered, or if offered more than once in an academic year, at least annually, using the approved course and teacher evaluation survey.

1.3 Every course must be evaluated using the College's course and instructor evaluation survey each time it is offered, or if offered more than once in an academic year, at least annually.

1.4 Other evaluative mechanisms may be used to complement the course and instructor evaluation survey, for example, learning analytics data and trends, focus groups, peer review and benchmarking.

1.5 A short summary of changes and improvements arising from the course and teacher evaluation will be placed on the Course Report or equivalent before the course is next taught, to inform students about the value of their feedback.

4. Assessment of the Quality of Instruction

4.1 Overview

Expectations on the faculty are that they will contribute to the three institutional goals of CIT directly relevant to the experience of students:

- Create a distinctive environment for efficient acquiring of adequate knowledge
- Create a distinctive environment for efficient developing of skills.
- Create a distinctive environment for enhancing quality of life.

4.2 Assessment Criteria and Documentation

Key assessment criteria and their documentation are as following:

- The instructor shall give evidence of ability and commitment to lead students of varying capabilities into a growing understanding of the subject matter, tools, and materials of their disciplines.
- The instructor shall demonstrate his/her continuing concern for instructional effectiveness through continued development of methods of presentation and evaluation of students.
- The instructor shall demonstrate a willingness and ability to work with students to improve their understanding of course material as well as the larger programmatic context and its application to future practical experiences.
- The instructor must complete all the necessary paperwork that is included in the course file at the end of the term in a timely and diligent manner.
- The instructor should work closely with the program chair to ensure that the course is delivered in a manner that is consistent with the overall plan of the academic program. This is most germane during course planning and the writing of the syllabus for a course.
- The instructor should show effort towards development through cooperation with the dean during the annual review process.

4.3 Resources Used for Evaluation of Teaching Quality

In the self-assessment report, faculty members address their performance according to the expectations for instructional quality as listed above. This report is augmented by evidence collected by the program chair through assessment of the following materials:

- **Course Files:** Submitted at the conclusion of each term with the grades; syllabus; clean copies of all exams, tests and quizzes; descriptions of all homework assignments, projects, and exercises used to assess student performance; and, student work including all of the graded final exams/projects by the students.

- **Instructor Observation**: conducted once per semester by the program chair and signed by both the professor and the chair.
- **Course Evaluations by Students**: conducted and compiled by the Office of Development and Planning.

Also considered are the professor's participation in workshops that address pedagogy, technological tools, and library facilities.

The review of instructional quality is a process undertaken by the program chair as part of the chair's mandate to ensure the proper implementation of an academic program. It entails a formal write-up of the chair's assessment of the course file material and the summaries for the course evaluations of students and incorporates the instructor observation. This assessment is intended to be instructional for the professor and is targeted at ensuring that the faculty member continues to improve their understanding of how the courses fit into the program matrix and how they can develop as instructors. The analysis by the program chair contains suggestions for changes and allows the professor opportunity to respond by either defending his/her practices or taking into account the suggestions of the program chair. Both the program chair and professor sign and date the evaluation materials and a copy of these are forwarded to the school dean to be included in the dean's annual review of the faculty member.

4.4 Assessment of Advising

All full-time faculty plus program chairs and school deans are assessed on their student advising at the weight of 10%. In order that students at CIT are fully informed about career choices, educational opportunities, program details, and the registration process, advisors must be both conscientious and knowledgeable.

Assessment of advising quality by the faculty and the program chairs is performed by the school dean (and, in turn, the dean is assessed by the Vice President for Academics) according to how well the following categories are met:

- A thorough knowledge of the program curriculum;
- Knowledge of transfer credits and transfer options;
- Knowledge of general education requirements for undergraduates;
- Knowledge of the registration process;
- Knowledge of school and program annual schedule;
- Knowledge of offerings for current term/semester;
- Willingness to track the performance and assist "at risk" students with poor academic performance;
- A clear understanding of career choices in Albania and the region;

- Attending meeting about the registration process; and,
- Dutifully conducting registration activities during registration and drop/add period.

Assessment methods are a combination of self-assessment made by the professor and evaluations made by supervisor – typically made by the dean with input from the program chair and registrar. An important recourse for this component is student satisfaction surveys, which ask students to name and rate their advisors.

4.5. Assessment of Research, Development and Creativity

As professional educators in a university, faculty members are expected to continue to keep pace with developments in their discipline. At a minimum, this means participating in professional associations and reading current publications in the field. This required minimal level of activity is sufficient for the assessment of the minimum weight for this category of 10% for all full-time faculty members, program chairs, and deans of academic schools. At this minimal level, the corresponding weight for administrative duties of 40%.

As noted above, full-time faculty can negotiate with their deans for a higher emphasis in this category as illustrated in the scheme 1.

The elevated level of emphasis on research, development and creativity carry an obligation for the professor to maintain higher levels of achievements in their fields. Owing the difference in academic disciplines reflected at CIT, there is recognition that achievements are measured differently by discipline, but can include the following:

- Refereed articles and book chapters
- Patents and copyrights
- Professional reference books
- Conference proceedings or presentations
- Funding support from external sources
- Significant research projects accomplished on or off campus
- Recognition by professional organizations
- Exhibits or publicly recognized events
- Editorial activities

As part of the annual review, the professor must submit evidence of these accomplishments and should also provide plans regarding contribute future plans for review by the school dean.

5. Committees responsible for the evaluation of programs and quality of teaching

5.1 Program Committee

- Instance: For each program a committee should be set up.
- Main objective: Continuously examining the running-well of the program.
- Frequency of Meeting: The committee should meet at least at the end of each semester.
- Recommendations: Its recommendations are transmitted to the Dean.
- Composition:
 - Program Chair
 - All faculty member involved in the program
 - One representative for General Education courses
- Responsibilities:
 - Compiling and analyzing the academic results of the students.
 - Identifying any problems and/or difficulties and provide solutions,
 - Examining existing resources (such as labs, consumable for projects, IT assistance) for offering the courses with respect to their sufficiency and efficiency
 - Periodically analyzing the performance of advising and providing corrections if necessity be handle particular case of students (such as difficulties, special needs).
- Is chaired by the Program Chair.

Annex No.1 (Template)

Report on the program of ...

1. Academic year: xxx

2. Faculty: xxx

3. Program name: xxx

4. Year of start: xxx

5. Modifications of this program:

xxx

6. Success rate:

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Graduated	In thesis	others	total
# students							
Success rate							
Average GPA							
A-students							
B-students							
C-students							
D-students							
F-students							
Students in difficulty							
Students leaved							

Senate section		
Satisfaction: Low, Medium, High	What went well	What needs to be improved

7. Statistics:

Xxxx

Senate section		
Satisfaction: Low, Medium, High	What went well	What needs to be improved

8. Students' mobility:

number of students moved abroad:

Among them, # number of students obtained a scholarship:

Main hosting countries: xxx, xxx, xxx

Senate section		
Satisfaction: Low, Medium, High	What went well	What needs to be improved

9. Courses where students faced difficulty (if any):

Course 1:

Improvement suggested 1:

10. Overall What went well:

Xxx

11. Overall What needs to be improved:

Xxx

12. Study plan:

Signature of Head of department:

date:

Comments of the dean:

Xxx

Signature of the Dean:

date:

Senate section – Overall evaluation		
Satisfaction: Low, Medium, High	What went well	What needs to be improved

Signature of the Chair of the Senate:

date: