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Faculty: …………………

Academic year…………………………………………

1. Report on the implementation of corrective measures recommended in the previous academic year.
2. Assessment of verification methods for learning outcomes.
3. Results analysis of student surveys, class inspection minutes and graduates surveys excluding their professional careers.
4. Opinion of external stakeholders, including units where field internships are carried out (opinion of the internship supervisor from the provider), regarding the preparation of future graduates for professional work and the validity and correctness of the preparation of new curriculums.
5. Assessment of selected theses and the graduation process.
6. The assessment of doctoral studies conducted in the faculty in cooperation with their head.
7. The assessment of postgraduate programmes conducted in the faculty in cooperation with their heads.
8. Giving an opinion on curricula for the education cycle starting in the following academic year.
9. Assessment of the degree of implementation of modern teaching methods.
10. The scope of recommended corrective measures with respect to individual fields of study and the faculty as a whole.
11. Summary and conclusions

………………………………………………….
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**APPENDICES**

**Re. 6**

**Survey results for doctoral students**

**Survey results for the assessment of classes and the lecturer in doctoral studies**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Survey questions Appendix 2 | % of positive marks | % of negative marks |
| The assessment of the way classes are conducted |
| Did the classes help to broaden your general knowledge enabling you to understand your discipline more fully? |  |  |
| Did the classes allow developing practical skills in editing scientific texts, preparing papers, poster (applies mainly to the seminar)? |  |  |
| Were the conditions for carrying out the course suitable (date, room equipment)? |  |  |
| Were the criteria for completing the course clear, publicly available and respected by the lecturer? |  |  |
| The assessment of the lecturer  |
| Did the lecturer present the subject content in a communicative and understandable way? |  |  |
| Did the lecturer offer individual content assistance in the form of consultation? |  |  |
| Did the lecturer enable active participation in classes (initiated discussion, allowed expressing private opinions)? |  |  |
| Did the lecturer show an appropriate attitude towards course participants (punctuality, reliability, personal culture)? |  |  |

Assessment scale used in the survey - Appendix 2:

positive: (answers 5-3)

negative: (answers 2-1)

**Doctoral graduates survey results**

Number of graduates/number of assessing graduates: .................../....................

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Survey questions Appendix 2 | Assessment scale used in the survey compilation |
| 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 1. Availability of information on the university and faculty websites concerning doctoral studies (is it accessible and comprehensive?). |  |  |  |
| 2. The clarity of the recruitment criteria for doctoral studies. |  |  |  |
| 3. Clarity of presentation (at the beginning of doctoral studies) of the rules of their course, obtaining credits, passing exams, opening and closing of the doctoral dissertation process, etc  |  |  |  |
| 4. The possibility for the doctoral student to participate as an observer in classes in courses that he or she will later pursue with students. |  |  |  |
| 5. Assistance given by more experienced research and teaching staff when preparing for teaching activities. |  |  |  |
| 6. Being able to access a computer at all times and having personal workplace. |  |  |  |
| 7. Number (offer) of facultative courses proposed. |  |  |  |
| 8. Curriculum for doctoral studies |  |  |  |
| 9. Support received from an organisational unit or university during doctoral studies: |  |
| - financial support of research work |  |  |  |
| - help with obtaining a research grant/scholarship |  |  |  |
| - creating opportunities for writing publications |  |  |  |
| - availability of literature needed for the doctoral dissertation in the university library |  |  |  |
| 10. Decision to undertake doctoral studies |  |  |  |
| 11. The quality of administrative support for doctoral students in the dean's office. |  |  |  |
| 12. Involvement and care of the thesis supervisor. |  |  |  |

**Re. 7**

**The results of postgraduate students' survey**

Name of the study programme………………………………………………………………………………………...

Number of course / number of assessing course participants................/...........

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | % of positive marks | % of negative marks | % no opinion |
| 1. Satisfaction with the curriculum |  |  |  |
| 2. Class level  |  |  |  |
| 3. The relevance of the curriculum content  |  |  |  |
| 4. Were students given the opportunity to suggest changes to the curriculum? |  |  |  |
| 5. usefulness of teaching materials provided during the course of study |  |  |  |
| 6 Teaching methods used |  |  |  |
| 7. She way the head of studies communicates with students  |  |  |  |
| 8. Degree of fulfilled expectations |  |  |  |
| 9. Upgrading professional qualifications |  |  |  |
| 10. The usefulness of studies in professional development |  |  |  |
| 11.Preferred lecturers (% of responses): |  |
| 1. research and teaching staff
 |  |
| 1. eminent practitioners
 |  |
| 1. equally research and teaching staff as well as practitioners
 |  |
| 1. other persons
 |  |