



**University of Nova Gorica**

# Quality Manual

---

Quality Monitoring, Assessment and Assurance

January 2023

**The UNG Quality Manual has been edited by:**

prof. dr. Iztok Arčon, Chair of the UNG Quality Commission

**The following members of the UNG Quality Commission have been involved in drawing up the UNG Quality Manual:**

prof. dr. Juš Kocijan, School of Engineering and Management  
doc. dr. Blaž Belec, School of Environmental Sciences  
prof. dr. Franc Marušič, School of Humanities  
prof. dr. Egon Pavlica, School of Science  
dr. Jan Rešič, School for Viticulture and Enology  
doc. dr. Martina Bergant Marušič, Graduate School  
prof. mag. Tina Smrekar, School of Arts  
Aleksa Kojčinović, student representative

Terms used in the Quality Manual that are written in the grammatical form of the masculine gender are used in a gender-neutral way to refer to men and women and to any gender or other characterisation of identity.

The UNG Quality Manual was considered and adopted by the UNG Senate at its 117th regular session on 18 January 2023.

## Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	4
2. Monitoring and quality assurance methodology.....	5
2.1. Structure of self-evaluation reports.....	6
2.1.1. University self-evaluation report.....	6
2.1.2. Self-evaluation reports of the Schools .....	8
2.2. Guidelines for the preparation of the School self-evaluation reports .....	10
2.3. Methodology for the evaluation and updating of study programmes .....	15
2.4. Involving students in the quality monitoring and assurance process.....	16
2.4.1. Interviews with students.....	16
2.4.2. Student surveys .....	17

## **1. Introduction**

The Quality Manual of the University of Nova Gorica (UNG) sets out the strategies and methodologies as well as the procedures and mechanisms for monitoring, identifying and ensuring quality at UNG. It sets out the self-evaluation procedures. It defines the rules, responsibilities, working methods and quality monitoring and improvement measures to be followed by the competent UNG bodies and all other stakeholders in quality monitoring and assurance.

Quality and international competitiveness in the areas of pedagogy and research are at the heart of the institution's commitment. UNG believes that its mission is to create new knowledge in a harmonious relationship between students and researchers and to transfer this knowledge to younger generations and to the business and wider social, including cultural, environment. In all areas of UNG's work, the importance is placed on collaboration with industry, business and the wider society. This also improves graduates' employability.

UNG is a co-signatory of the Resolution of the Rectors' Conference of the Republic of Slovenia on the Commitment of Slovenian Universities to the Development of a Culture of Quality (29 March 2012) and follows the adopted objectives of this Resolution. Moreover, the UNG Senate, at its 51st regular session on 11 July 2013, made a commitment that UNG will continuously develop a culture of quality, work to establish a quality loop and upgrade its procedures and strategy to ensure and continuously improve quality in all its activities. Quality assurance processes involve all stakeholders, including students and external stakeholders (employers, representatives of the local and wider social environment).

Quality assurance procedures, policies and strategies at UNG are developed in accordance with national legislation and the recommended European standards and guidelines for internal quality assurance within higher education institutions (ESG). All UNG quality assurance procedures, policies and strategies are formally adopted by the competent UNG bodies and are published on the UNG website.

Quality and international competitiveness in the areas of pedagogy and research are at the heart of the institution's commitment. In doing so, UNG pursues its mission and vision as well as strategies to achieve the objectives pursued.

UNG is continuously developing a culture of quality, establishing and maintaining a quality loop and improving its procedures and strategy to ensure and continuously improve quality in all its activities.

The Rector, the Vice-Rector and other UNG bodies are responsible for monitoring, assessing and ensuring quality at UNG, in accordance with the provisions of the Higher Education Act, the UNG Statutes and other UNG acts. The Deans, Directors of Study Programmes, Senates and other School bodies are responsible for monitoring, determining and ensuring the quality of study programmes and other activities at the UNG schools within their respective competences. The heads of the research units are responsible for ensuring the quality of research work in the UNG research units in

accordance with their respective competences. All UNG staff and students, as well as other external stakeholders, are responsibly involved in quality assurance processes.

The UNG Quality Commission is responsible for the implementation of activities related to the monitoring, identification and assurance of quality at UNG and for making proposals and initiatives for the development of a quality culture and the completion of procedures and strategies for the assurance and continuous improvement of quality at the UNG level, while within the Schools these fall under the responsibility of School Quality Coordinators, who are also the members of the UNG Quality Commission, within the framework of which activities are coordinated. The UNG Quality Commission is a permanent expert commission of the Senate of the University of Nova Gorica. Its tasks and activities are defined in the Rules of Procedure of the Quality Commission of the University of Nova Gorica. The Commission is to report on its work to the Senate of the University on an annual basis.

## **2. Monitoring and quality assurance methodology**

Monitoring, identification and quality assurance of UNG study programmes are organised in accordance with the Higher Education Act and the acts adopted by the Council of the Slovenian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (SQAA): *Criteria for accreditation and external evaluation of higher education institutions and study Programmes, Criteria for transitions between study programmes, Criteria for credit evaluation of study programmes according to ECTS, Minimum standards for election to the titles of higher education teachers, researchers and higher education associates at higher education institutions and other acts.*

At the UNG, the basic mechanism for quality monitoring, assessment and assurance, developing quality culture and perfecting the procedures and strategies for quality assurance as well as continuous quality improvement is self-evaluation. UNG conducts self-evaluation according to a uniform methodology in all teaching units of UNG and the University as a whole on an annual basis. As part of the self-evaluation, it analyses its overall activities and achievements and proposes measures for further development. At the UNG Schools, self-evaluation on quality assurance of study programmes is carried out on an annual basis. Evaluation of research work is carried out on a University-wide basis. It covers all UNG research units (UNG laboratories and centres).

At UNG, quality management is also embedded into the University's management structure. Key decisions in the day-to-day organisation and management of issues related to the quality of teaching and research are coordinated at the University level. The Rector of UNG, the two Vice-Rectors, the Deans of the Schools and the Heads of the Research Units play an important role in this process and regularly discuss and adopt the short-term development strategy. Regular weekly meetings of the Rector, Vice-Rectors, Deans and Heads of Research Units are held to resolve current issues related to the provision of human resources, material, space and other conditions and support activities necessary to ensure quality teaching and research work in all UNG units. In this context, suggestions for improvements and corrections of identified deficiencies are continuously collected, and the impact of adopted measures is monitored.

The pedagogical units regularly collect suggestions from educational staff, support services, students and external stakeholders to improve the content and quality of the curriculum. From time to time, seminars and workshops are organised for educational staff to address topical issues relevant to the quality of pedagogical work. Training for professional associates is organised from time to time.

The annual self-evaluation reports are a central element of the self-evaluation process. The self-evaluation report is prepared by each UNG pedagogical unit (Schools). At the University level, an institutional self-evaluation report on the monitoring and quality assurance of teaching and research at UNG is prepared separately. The annual self-evaluation reports of the Schools are adopted by the Senate of an individual School. The University report is considered by the UNG Senate.

The self-evaluation reports of the UNG schools and the report of UNG as a whole are published annually on the UNG website and are therefore available to all UNG staff, students and other stakeholders or the general public.

The external monitoring over quality assurance of the overall functioning of UNG is monitored through external evaluations in the process of reaccreditation of the UNG and through sample or emergency evaluations of programmes by SQAA, in accordance with the provisions of national legislation. External evaluation is one of the important tools in the process of improving the quality assurance system at UNG, contributing to the development of a quality culture at UNG and to the development of the institution's own quality control.

The reports produced by the expert teams in individual external evaluation processes, which identify strengths and examples of good practice, weaknesses and vulnerabilities or make recommendations for improvement and the elimination of any inconsistencies, are taken into account in the self-evaluation and quality assurance processes. This process provides for short and long-term actions to address identified weaknesses and deficiencies in order to ensure continuous quality improvement in all areas of the University's activities and to maintain compliance with the applicable legislation.

## **2.1. Structure of self-evaluation reports**

### **2.1.1. University self-evaluation report**

The self-evaluation report of the University covers an overview of the performance of the University as a whole in all areas of its activities (mission, vision and strategic orientations of the University, internal organisation of the University and the internal system for monitoring and quality assurance, educational and research activities, cooperation with the social environment, financial management, human and material conditions, students at the University). The UNG self-evaluation also analyses the functioning of the UNG common services and other support activities that operate at the University level and provide support to all teaching and research units of the UNG (Student Office, International Office, Career Centre, Alumni Club, UNG University Library, UNG Publishing House, Project and International Office, UNG Quality Commission and other professional services). The research activities carried out by UNG

research units and the research achievements at UNG are analysed in more detail in the annual UNG Work Report.

The UNG Quality Commission is responsible for the preparation of the University's self-evaluation report and for collecting data relevant for the University's institutional self-evaluation analysis. The latter prepares the University's self-evaluation report in cooperation with the University's management, the UNG Student Council and UNG's common services (Student Office, Project and International Office, Career Centre, Alumni Club, UNG University Library, UNG Publishing House, UNG Accounting, Legal and HR Services and other professional services).

Throughout the year, the Quality Committee monitors all the elements in all areas of quality assurance at the University that are covered in the University's self-evaluation report. It collects suggestions for improvement from the University's management and the management of its teaching and research units, the UNG common services and other UNG staff, the UNG Student Council and student representatives in the UNG bodies and from other stakeholders.

Student representatives in the University Senate and the School Senates and in the UNG Quality Commission inform the UNG Student Council and other students about decisions, strategies and activities for quality assurance or quality improvement and solicit their suggestions for improvement. These proposals are forwarded to the UNG Quality Commission.

The data for each area of activity are collected and forwarded to the Quality Commission by the relevant UNG common services and the secretariats of the UNG teaching and research units and other support services that offer support to all UNG teaching and research units (Student Office, International Office, Career Centre, Alumni Club, UNG University Library, UNG Publishing House, Project and International Office and other professional services). Data for all these areas of the University's activities are compiled by academic year in a separate document entitled: "**Data for the University's Self-Evaluation Report**", which contains all the necessary data relevant for the University's institutional self-evaluation analysis. This document is edited and prepared by the UNG Quality Commission.

At the end of the year, the UNG Quality Commission, in cooperation with the management of the University and its teaching and research units, prepares an analysis of the situation based on the data collected. The analysis of the performance of the common services is provided by the services themselves and forwarded to the UNG Quality Commission.

The self-evaluation report of the University presents a brief and concise analysis of the situation and the realisation of the objectives set in the previous academic year, with the aim of ensuring the monitoring of developments and progress in the realisation of the objectives set in previous academic years. This is followed by an action plan based on the findings of the situation analysis. This enables the self-evaluation report to be an effective tool for developing or improving the performance of the University as a whole.

The UNG self-evaluation report is prepared annually, normally by the beginning of March for the previous academic year. The report is discussed and adopted by the UNG Senate, usually at its regular meeting in March.

The self-evaluation report of the University is published on the UNG website and is therefore available to all UNG staff, students and other stakeholders or the general public.

### **2.1.2. Self-evaluation reports of the Schools**

The self-evaluation reports of the UNG Schools are prepared according to a common methodology and follow the same structure, which is presented below. The reports cover all areas of the School's activities.

The self-evaluation reports of the Schools cover the following areas:

- The mission, vision and strategy, the functioning, organisation and governance of each School and the commitment to quality.
- Analysis of the implementation of all study programmes of the School (compliance of the implementation with the accredited content and scope of the programme, enrolment conditions, methods of study, teaching methods, syllabus, content of courses, regular updating of the content of the courses, timetable of studies, methods of examination and assessment of knowledge, ensuring an appropriate proportion of electives within the programme).
- Traceability of changes to study programmes, where proposals are made for changes or updates to the content and structuring of the programme, methods and formats of teaching and student work.
- Study statistics (pre-enrolment information, first-year enrolment, transition between academic years, success rates by courses, number of graduates and average duration of studies, student-teaching staff ratio, student and graduate awards and achievements, etc.).
- Monitoring and analysis of the implementation of practical training of students in enterprises (for study programmes including practical training) and of any other collaborations with external partners within the study process.
- Monitoring and promoting student mobility and enabling choice within study programmes through the ECTS credit system.
- Monitoring the employability of graduates and collecting feedback from graduates on the relevance of the skills acquired in the labour market; assessing the visibility of the study programme in the environment.
- Staffing conditions, structure of academic and administrative staff (selection and habilitation of education teachers, professional qualifications of administrative staff, ensuring an appropriate ratio of teaching staff to students, monitoring and promoting the scientific and professional advancement or training of academic and administrative staff).



- Material conditions, facilities and teaching aids (lecture rooms, computer room, library, study materials, websites, equipment for teaching and study, various ICT platforms and tools).
- Financing of study activities (sources, structure).
- Cooperation of the School with the economy or non-economy and integration into the regional and wider environment.
- Students' organisation and participation in co-decision procedure.
- Obtaining students' opinions on the quality of the content and implementation of the programme and on informing applicants prior to the enrolment through thematic student surveys or other complementary ways of gathering feedback (e.g. semester or annual interviews with students by the management or quality coordinator of the unit or programme or by teachers).

The data for all these areas of activity for all study programmes implemented by the School are compiled for each academic year in a separate document entitled "**Data for the School Self-Evaluation Report**", which contains all the necessary data relevant for the self-evaluation analysis of the School's programmes and for the institutional self-evaluation of the School. The data for each area of activity are collected and forwarded to the Quality Commission by the relevant UNG common services and the secretariats of the UNG teaching and research units and other support services that offer support to all UNG teaching and research units (Student Office, International Office, Career Centre, Alumni Club, UNG University Library, UNG Publishing House, Project and International Office and other professional services).

At the UNG Schools, **the School Quality Coordinators** are responsible for the coordination of data collection and for the coordination, arrangement and preparation of the annual self-evaluation reports. The reports are prepared in cooperation with the Dean, the Directors of the School's study programmes, members of the Senate, all teaching staff in the study programmes, student representatives, the School's secretariat, the UNG common services and other external stakeholders related to the School's activities. In doing so, they follow the "*Guidelines for conducting self-evaluation and preparing self-evaluation reports*", set out below.

Data for individual areas of the School's activities are collected and forwarded to the School Quality Coordinator by the relevant UNG common services and the secretariats of the UNG teaching and research units and other support services that support all UNG teaching and research units (the Student Office, the International Office, the Career Centre, the Alumni Club, the UNG University Library, the UNG Publishing House, the Project and International Office and other professional services).

During the year, the School Quality Coordinator monitors all elements in all areas of quality assurance covered by the School's self-evaluation report. The School Quality Coordinator collects suggestions for improvement from the management, all academic and professional staff and students of the School, the UNG common services and other stakeholders related to the functioning of the School. The School Quality Coordinator is regularly invited to meetings of the Senates of the School and regularly meets with the

Dean and the Directors of the School study programmes in order to be effectively informed of all quality-related activities. He/she documents the activities in a document entitled: "**Data for the School self-evaluation report**".

The Quality Coordinator is to report annually to the UNG Quality Commission on the progress of the quality monitoring and assurance activities and on significant successes or improvements, examples of good practice and observations on the current situation and trends at the UNG School. The UNG Quality Commission coordinates the work of all Quality Coordinators.

Student representatives in the School Senate inform the Student Council and the students about decisions, strategies and activities for quality assurance or improvement and collect suggestions for improvement. These proposals are forwarded to the Dean, the Programme Directors, the Senate or the Quality Coordinator.

The self-evaluation reports of the Schools are prepared each year, usually by the beginning of March for the previous academic year. The report is considered and adopted by the School Senate, normally at its regular meeting in March.

The Dean and the Directors of the study programmes regularly inform all the staff of the School about decisions, action plans, strategies and activities for quality assurance or quality improvement.

The School self-evaluation reports are published on the School's website and presented through this channel to all UNG staff, students and other stakeholders or the general public.

## **2.2. Guidelines for the preparation of the School self-evaluation reports**

**The School self-evaluation report** presents, in a brief and concise manner, an analysis of the situation and the realisation of the set objectives from the previous academic year, with the aim of ensuring the monitoring of development and progress in the realisation of the set objectives from the previous academic years. Moreover, it includes an action plan based on the findings of the situation analysis. In this way, the self-evaluation report can be an effective tool both for developing or improving the performance of the School and for ensuring the development of all study programmes.

The School self-evaluation report contains two sections: The **Institutional Self-Evaluation Report of the School as a whole** and the **Programme Self-Evaluation Report for each individual programme separately**. The authors of the individual sections are to ensure that the content of the two sections is not duplicated; any discrepancies, duplications or ambiguities are to be resolved by the School quality coordinator in the final revision of the document.

**Institutional self-evaluation of the School as a whole** considers the internal organisation and functioning of the School as a whole. The evaluation covers the implementation of the mission, vision and strategic orientations of the School, the functioning of the quality assurance system at the School, the material conditions for the functioning of the School as a whole, the functioning of the professional and

administrative support services of the School, the financial conditions for the functioning of the School, and the involvement of students and external stakeholders in the quality assurance process.

**The institutional self-evaluation report of the School as a whole** contains the following elements:

- **analysis of the situation,**
- **realisation of the objectives set in the previous self-evaluation report,**
- **an action plan for improvement and development, and for addressing weaknesses.**

**The programme self-evaluation report** is prepared separately for each study programme. It presents findings on the strengths and weaknesses of the study programmes. Moreover, it sets out proposals for improving the quality of the delivery of study processes and an action plan for their implementation.

**The programme-specific self-evaluation report** contains the following elements:

- **analysis of the situation,**
- **realisation of the objectives set in the previous self-evaluation report,**
- **an action plan for improvement and development and for addressing weaknesses,**
- **chronology of study programme updates.**

The self-evaluation of the study programme and of the School as a whole is provided by an **analysis of the situation** and findings for the previous academic year, based on the relevant data collected for all areas of assessment. The situation analysis is presented in a concise way, in a short and clear format, by evaluation area. The **realisation of the objectives set in the previous self-evaluation report** is analysed in particular, with the aim of monitoring the development and progress in the realisation of the objectives set in the previous academic years.

Based on the analysis of the situation, an **action plan for the next academic year** (or longer period) is drawn up, containing the objectives set and the necessary measures for their achievement, with concrete and clear indicators and deadlines, and the body responsible for implementation, so that the annual implementation of the action plan can be monitored.

The self-evaluation of the study programme also presents a **chronology of study programme updating**. All planned and implemented changes or updates to the content and structuring of the programme and the methods and forms of teaching and student work, separately for each study programme, are listed in a chronological manner. The

methodology for evaluating and updating the content, structure and delivery of study programmes is presented in more detail in the following section.

The self-evaluation reports therefore clearly set out all the steps involved in making improvements and correcting weaknesses, from the identification of the shortcomings, the proposal for improvements with a corresponding timetable and the responsible authority in charge of implementation to the final report on implementation. Reports are an effective tool to ensure a closed quality loop (*analysis - action plan - implementation - action - verification*).

The **Dean, in cooperation** with the School Quality Coordinator, **prepares the analysis of the situation of the School as a whole**. He/she analyses all areas relevant to the functioning of the School as a whole. The analysis takes into account relevant data collected in a separate document entitled: "*Data for the School Self-Evaluation Report*" and based on interviews of the Dean, the Study Programme Directors and the School Quality Coordinator with all stakeholders related to the functioning of the School (School Senate, academic staff, support services, student representatives, members of the School Council and other stakeholders). The Dean presents the findings on the strengths and weaknesses of the organisation and the functioning of the School in a concise and brief manner.

**The evaluation of the implementation of the objectives set out in the previous institutional self-evaluation report for the School as a whole is prepared by the Dean** in cooperation with the School Quality Coordinator. He/she is to indicate which objectives from the previous self-evaluation report have been realized, whether they have been fully realized or not and why not, which objectives are still in the process of being realized, what are the new deadlines for realization and whether the set objectives are still relevant. **Institutional self-evaluation report of the School as a whole**

**The action plan for the School as a whole is prepared** by the Dean in cooperation with the Programme Directors and the School Quality Coordinator. When preparing action plans, it is necessary to ensure that short-term objectives are aligned with the mission and vision of the School, the specific long-term strategic orientations of the School and the strategic objectives of UNG. The implementation of the action plan is supervised by the Dean in cooperation with the School Quality Coordinator.

**The analysis of the situation for each study programme is prepared by the Programme Director** (or Dean if the programme does not have a Programme Director) in cooperation with the School Quality Coordinator. The Programme Director is to analyse all the areas listed in the section "*Methodology for evaluating and updating study programmes*". The analysis is based on data collected in a separate document entitled: "*Data for the School Self-Evaluation Report*" and interviews with all stakeholders related to the study programme. It presents in a concise and brief way the findings on the strengths and weaknesses of the study programme.

**The evaluation of the realisation of the objectives set in the previous self-evaluation report is prepared by the Study Programme Director** (or Dean if the programme does not have a Programme Director) in cooperation with the School Quality Coordinator. He/she is to indicate which objectives from the previous self-evaluation report have been realized, whether they have been fully realized or not and why not, which objectives are

still in the process of being realized, what are the new deadlines for realization and whether the set objectives are still relevant.

**The action plan for each study programme is prepared by the Programme Director in cooperation** with the Dean and the School Quality Coordinator. When preparing action plans, it is necessary to ensure that short-term objectives are aligned with the mission and vision of the School, the specific long-term strategic orientations of the School and the strategic objectives of UNG. The implementation of the action plan is supervised by the Programme Director (or the Dean if the programme does not have a Programme Director).

**The responsibility for planning and implementing study programme updates rests with the Programme Director** (or Dean if the programme does not have a Programme Director). The Programme Director consults and collects suggestions and initiatives for renewal directly from all stakeholders related to the study programme. The Programme Director harmonises all proposals for updates and changes to the programme together with the Dean. The Programme Director and the Dean submit a harmonised proposal for changes to the study programme to the School Senate, which considers and approves the proposal. The Dean then forwards the harmonised proposals for changes to the UNG Senate, which considers and adopts the proposals. The UNG is to inform the Slovenian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (SQAA) of changes to the compulsory components of study programmes within 30 days of their adoption. The School Secretariat is responsible for entering data on approved programme changes into the e-SQAA system. The correctness of the data entry is monitored by the Programme Director and the Dean, who propose to the UNG Rector to officially submit the entered changes on the part of UNG. The Programme Director (or Dean if the programme does not have a Programme Director) is responsible for ensuring that all changes to the study programme are chronologically recorded in the self-evaluation report in the section "*Chronology of study programme updates*". The documentation and decisions on changes to the programme are archived in the School Secretariat. Students and the general public are informed of any changes to the programme via the programme's website.

**Course holders are responsible for updating the syllabus.** Before the start of each academic year, they check and update, if necessary, the core literature references and sources and data on holder's references. Syllabus updates do not need to be approved by the UNG Senate. The course holders are to communicate the updates to the programme secretariat and the UNG Library, where the updated information is entered into the e-information system and on the programme's website. The course holders are to propose other changes to the syllabus to the Programme Director and the Programme Scientific Council. Substantive changes to the syllabus are considered and approved by the UNG Senate.

All stakeholders related to the study programme or to the functioning of the School are directly involved in the preparation of the annual programme and institutional self-evaluation reports of the School (students, course holders, non-teaching staff and professional services of the School as well as the UNG common services, heads of programmes and programme scientific councils, School quality coordinators, the UNG Quality Commission, the Dean, the School Council and other stakeholders). Each year,

proposals are collected from all these stakeholders to improve the content and quality of study programmes and the functioning of the School.

All stakeholders and the general public are informed of the key results of the self-evaluation, i.e. the situation analysis and the action plans, which are prepared in a brief and concise form following the above-mentioned guidelines in order to ensure efficient, rapid and transparent information. All educators are provided with the results of student surveys on the assessment of course performance via the UNG IT system. All stakeholders are informed of where the annual reports will be published through several parallel channels, both directly and through the websites of the programme or the School and UNG as a whole.

Particular attention in self-evaluation processes is paid to optimising the collection of feedback and suggestions from students (detailed below in the section "*Involving students in the quality monitoring and assurance process*"). In order to increase the proportion of students who give their opinions and evaluations through student surveys and to raise students' awareness of the importance of their participation in the processes of quality assurance and improvement of study programmes, the Study Programme Director or the Dean or the School Quality Coordinator inform students once a year (before the start of the student surveys) about the findings of the student surveys and the interviews with students from previous years and about the measures taken by the School based on the student comments and recommendations for improvement. Moreover, they may conduct annual or semester interviews with a representative group of students in each programme.

Considering the small number of students in most programmes, feedback from students, in addition to the regular student surveys, is organised through direct interviews between the Programme Directors (or the Dean or the School Quality Coordinator) and the students in the programme. Direct interviews with all students on the programme are organised at least once a year. The findings and suggestions of the students obtained during such interviews are formally reported in the document "**Data for the School Self-Evaluation Report**" and taken into account in the analysis of the situation in the self-evaluation report, in combination with the results obtained from the anonymous student surveys.

**The School Councils** operate to improve cooperation with external stakeholders; they are composed of representatives of employers, research institutions, business, non-economic activities, the public sector, the local environment, graduates of the study programme or other external stakeholders in the study programme, whose task is to advise and assist the directors of the study programmes or the management of the School in making strategic decisions on the development of the School and on the updating and modification of existing study programmes and the planning of new ones. Meetings with the members of the School Council are organised by the Dean at least once a year. The findings and suggestions of the members of the School Council are used in the self-evaluation process to analyse the situation and to formulate action plans.

The Dean and the Directors of the Study Programmes and the School Quality Coordinator monitor the implementation of the annual action plans in accordance with their responsibilities and, if necessary, make recommendations to those directly responsible for the implementation of an individual action plan, in order to ensure that the

quality loop is closed in all areas of UNG's activities. The School Quality Coordinator reports annually to the UNG Quality Commission on the implementation of the action plans at the School.

### **2.3. Methodology for the evaluation and updating of study programmes**

The School regularly evaluates and updates the content, structure and implementation of all its study programmes. The analysis is carried out for each study programme separately and covers the following segments:

- The topicality of the contents of the existing programme and the inclusion of new knowledge acquired on the basis of scientific research, professional or artistic work and other achievements in the field of the study programme.
- The consistency of the proposed changes with the vision and strategy for the development of the School and the University.
- Cohesion between the contents of the study programme, their relation to applied or fundamental knowledge in the field and discipline and the conceptual selection of contents, clearly defined and meaningfully related to the current situation and development trends in science, the profession or art.
- Consistency and compliance of the objectives, competences or learning outcomes set out in the curricula with the objectives and competences of the study programme and with its content, according to the type and level of study.
- Order of courses or distribution of courses by semester and year (horizontal and vertical integration) and their credit evaluation.
- Suitability of the implementation of the study Programme, methods and forms of pedagogical work and the work of students. (Conditions for the practical education of students, especially in professional study programmes.)
- Evaluation of student opinions on the content and quality of study programmes.
- Evaluation of student workload, progression and study completion.
- The adequacy of study materials and bibliography and other resources, the introduction of study materials in electronic format for e-learning, distance learning and the adaptation of materials and access for students with disabilities.
- Achieving the competences or learning outcomes as planned.
- Adequacy of knowledge assessment and grading.
- Analysis of enrolment and progression by academic year.
- Verification and analysis of graduates' employability.
- Identification of new knowledge needs and employment needs in the environment, labour market needs or society's goals in terms of knowledge needs.

These analyses are used to determine whether changes and supplementation to the content and/or the way of implementing study programmes are needed in the future.

The self-evaluation report includes a section on **Chronology of study programme updates** that covers all changes in the content and the way of implementing individual study programmes. It presents the planned changes or updates to the programme content

and structure as well as the way and format of teaching and student work. Justifications are given for all the changes envisaged. The following section lists all implemented changes and updates to the study programme approved by the UNG Senate in the past academic year. The list of changes is given chronologically, indicating the date of adoption by the UNG Senate and the date on which the University informed SQAA of the adopted changes to the compulsory programme components by entering this information in the e-SQAA portal. Moreover, the indication is given on when the confirmed changes take effect and for which generation of students they apply.

Students and the general public are kept up-to-date on changes via the programme's web pages on the UNG portal.

## **2.4. Involving students in the quality monitoring and assurance process**

Students are involved in the process of monitoring and assurance of quality study programmes at several levels. On the one hand, UNG and students cooperate through the UNG Student Council. Students have their representatives in the UNG Governing Board, the UNG Senate, the Senates of the individual Schools and the UNG Quality Commission.

All UNG students are directly involved in monitoring and ensuring the quality of the pedagogical process through student surveys and through interviews between all students in the programme and representatives of the School management or study programme.

### **2.4.1. Interviews with students**

Due to methodological reservations in the analysis and evaluation of student survey results in cases where the number of collected student responses is small and the results are not statistically significant or are of questionable validity, the results of surveys are used as a qualitative indicator that needs to be complemented by other tools for obtaining feedback from students (e.g. semester or annual interviews with representative groups of students).

To this end, the Dean, the Programme Director or the School Quality Coordinator organises interviews or other forms of contact with students during the academic year to obtain additional feedback. The results of these interviews (proposals and possible conclusions) are presented in the document "**Data for the School Self-Evaluation Report**" for each study programme separately and are used complementarily, together with the results of the analyses of the student surveys, in the analyses of the situation in each study programme.



### 2.4.2. Student surveys

All study programmes at the University of Nova Gorica are regularly evaluated through student surveys. Student opinions on the quality of the content and implementation of the programme are collected through five thematic surveys:

- Course quality assessment survey,
- Student workload verification survey,
- Study programme assessment survey,
- Practical training assessment survey,
- Questionnaire on the provision of information to candidates before enrolling in the study programme,

The surveys are anonymous. Students may fill out the surveys in electronic form via the UNG electronic system. The electronic format of the surveys aims to improve the efficiency of data collection and automate the analysis.

The surveys are integrated into the UNG electronic and data system. Students have access to the surveys when they log in to the UNG electronic system with their password. Each student is offered to complete only the surveys that relate to the study programme in which he/she is enrolled and to the courses he/she has taken in the current academic year. The survey analysis software outputs a statistical analysis of the results of the surveys and collects the comments, remarks and opinions given by the students in the second part of the survey, which contains open-ended questions. The School secretariats collect and enter this information in the document "**Data for the self-evaluation report of the School**" for each study programme separately.

The analyses of all surveys are presented in the self-evaluation reports of the Schools and are made publicly available to all students, UNG staff and other stakeholders. The only thing that is not publicly available is results by name for individual teachers in the *course quality assessment survey*. In the self-evaluation report, the results of these surveys are presented in an anonymous format, so that only the average scores of all teachers and assistants are shown, without mentioning the names.

We regularly collect students' opinions on the quality of teaching in individual courses through the **course quality assessment survey**. The first part of the survey consists of general questions, to which students answer by selecting the appropriate number on 1 to 5 rating scale; 1 is very poor and 5 is very good. The second part of the survey is intended for students' comments, remarks and opinions. At the end of the lectures in each course, before the exam period, students evaluate the teaching performance of each lecturer and assistant by giving their evaluations on general questions and by writing down their opinions on what they liked best about the course, what bothered them, what they would like to see changed and other suggestions and comments for improvement.

The individual results of these surveys are not public, however access to the surveys of all courses is granted to the Dean, the Study Programme Director, the School Quality Coordinator and the School Secretariat. Every teacher and teaching assistant has the right and duty to see the results of the survey on his/her own work; the course holder also has

the right to see the results of the survey on the work of assistants teaching his/her subject. At the end of the academic year or at the end of the semester, the programme secretariat forwards to all teachers the relevant results of student surveys. The results of the analysis of these surveys for each teacher are used in the habilitation process, in the student evaluation of the teacher's education work.

The results of these surveys are publicly presented for all programme courses in the self-evaluation reports of the Schools in an anonymised format. The average score per lecturer is shown collectively for all courses in each programme, without indicating the names of the teachers, the names of the teaching assistants and the names of the courses. The average score for each course is calculated from the average scores of the general questions in the survey.

**Student workload verification survey** is designed to check the actual student workload in each course within the study programme. Verification is carried out by surveying students directly after the exams. Students complete the survey electronically via the UNG electronic system after having taken the examination for each course or other unit of study assessed by ECTS credits. This enables us to analyse whether the credit evaluation of individual courses or units of study is appropriate.

When completing this survey, each student will rate how much work they have put in studying the course. The survey is to be completed by evaluating the time spent on all activities related to the course: attendance at lectures and tutorials, preparation of the seminar paper, laboratory or field work, collection of literature and learning materials, independent learning outside lectures or organised meetings and any other activities directly related to the course work.

Similarly to the course quality assessment survey, each teacher and teaching assistant has the right and duty to consult the results of the survey on his/her own performance, and the course leader also has the right to consult the results of the surveys on the performance of teaching assistants in his/her course.

In addition to questions about the study programme, **the study programme assessment survey** also includes questions about the library, computer rooms, student office, student council and students' extracurricular activities. The survey is carried out every year when students enrol to the next academic year. Based on the results of the survey, the School aims to eliminate any weaknesses or maintain the strengths of the study programme.

**The practical training assessment survey** is carried out among students of professional higher education study programme after their practical training. For this purpose, two versions of the student surveys have been developed: one to evaluate the practical training in companies provided by the School of Engineering and Management and the other to evaluate the practical training within the programmes of the School of Viticulture and Enology, which is provided in different partner wineries and wine-growing farms. Through these surveys, the two Schools regularly collect information from students on the quality of the implementation of practical training programmes. Additional information about the practical training is also obtained through surveys filled in by mentors in the company or partner institution, so that we can get a better understanding of this part of the educational programme, which is carried out outside the School.

**The pre-enrolment information questionnaire**, which is filled out upon enrolment by all first-year students of all study programmes, provides information on the adequacy and effectiveness of pre-enrolment information.