

*Secretariat of the Accreditation Commission
Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Karmelitská 7,
118 12 Praha 1
☎ 234 811 488 / fax: 234 811 351, e-mail: smrckaj@msmt.cz*

Annual Report of the Accreditation Commission for 2008

March 2009

authors: Jiří Smrčka
Jan Dvořák
Jana Koziolová

Annual Report of the Accreditation Commission for 2008

I. Introduction

Statutory definition

The Accreditation Commission (hereinafter referred to as “ACCR”) was established in accordance with Act No 111/1998 on higher education and amending other laws (the Higher Education Act). The ACCR’s activities are regulated, in particular, by Part Eight of that Act. The operating procedures of the ACCR and its work groups are regulated by the ACCR Charter approved by the Czech Government under Resolution No 744 of 28 July 2004.

Under Article 4 of the Charter, the ACCR is required to publish an annual report containing the results of assessments, a summary of the ACCR’s opinions, and other conclusions adopted.

ACCR mission

In accordance with the Higher Education Act, the ACCR maintains the quality of higher education and comprehensively examines the educational, scientific, developmental, artistic or other creative activities of higher education institutions. For this purpose, it delivers opinions on applications for the accreditation of degree programmes and fields of habilitation procedure [*habilitace* is a post-doctoral university teaching qualification] and procedure for appointment as a professor, evaluates the activities of higher education institutions and the quality of accredited activities, and subsequently publishes the results of such evaluations, delivers opinions on the establishment, merger, division or closure of faculties of public higher education institutions, on the granting of State approval to legal persons wishing to operate as private higher education institutions, and on the type-designation of higher education institutions, and, not least, delivers opinions on higher-education matters referred to it by the Minister for Education, Youth and Sports.

II. The ACCR, permanent work groups and the Secretariat

Composition of the ACCR

The ACCR is composed of 21 members appointed by the Government of the Czech Republic. Members of the Accreditation Commission are appointed for a term of six years; they may be appointed for a maximum of two terms. As, in the first appointment of ACCR members, the government designated the names of one third of the members whose tenure would expire after two years, and one third of the members whose tenure would expire after four years, one section of ACCR members is replaced periodically (in even-numbered years).

In 2008, the following changes were made to the composition of the ACCR:

1) the following were removed from the ACCR:

Jiří Mareš
(expiry of his second term of office)

Pravoslav Stránský
(expiry of his second term of office)

Tilman Berger

(expiry of his second term of office)

Petr Hájek
(at his own request)

2) the following were appointed to the ACCR:

Iva Stuchlíková
(for her first term of office)

Michal Anděl
(for his first term of office)

Pavol Vincúr
(for his first term of office)

Zdeněk Strakoš
(for his first term of office)

The composition of the ACCR in 2008 was as follows:

Chairperson:
Vladimíra Dvořáková

Vice-Chairman:
Milan Sojka

Members:
For a list of members of the Accreditation Commission in 2008 – see annexes.

Structure of permanent work groups

To ensure the expert preparation of its meetings, the ACCR sets up advisory work groups whose structure corresponds to the individual areas of accredited activities. These work groups deal primarily with the technical aspect of assessments of submitted degree programmes and fields of habilitation procedure and the procedure for appointment as a professor.

In 2008, the ACCR had 22 permanent work groups. There were no changes in their structure.

For an overview of permanent work groups in 2008 – see annexes.

Composition of work groups

In 2008, 247 members were involved in the activities of permanent work groups. The vast majority of members came from a higher education institution; the number of representatives from the Academy of Sciences increased slightly.

Year	HEI	ASCR	Other institutions	foreign members	total
1999	146	21	19	9	186
2000	171	20	14	6	205
2001	171	20	15	5	205
2002	166	21	15	6	208
2003	172	21	13	6	206
2004	176	21	14	5	211
2005	177	23	15	5	220
2006	191	23	20	7	241
2007	194	23	21	6	242
2008	193	25	23	6	247

Activities of the ACCR Secretariat

Under the Higher Education Act, the material and financial requirements of the ACCR's activities are met by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports. The administration and technical support of the ACCR's activities is in the hands of the ACCR Secretariat, which is an organizational unit of the Research and Higher Education Group at the Department of Higher Education of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports. In 2008, the ACCR Secretariat consisted of four members of staff from January to August and five members of staff from September to December. During the year, then, the number of staff rose by one; this partially corrected the decline in autumn 2006, when the number of staff was de facto reduced by two. This reduction, which was not preceded by an audit of individual work activities, had a negative impact in that the remaining members of staff did not have enough time to attend to all the ACCR's activities. The intensive preparations for evaluations of higher education institutions, particularly the evaluation of Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem, but also others, were another factor increasing the range of standard tasks performed by the Secretariat.

In 2008, the ACCR Secretariat was headed by Jiří Smrčka. Jana Koziolová joined the staff on 1 September 2008.

In 2008, in addition to its existing workload, the Secretariat had to deal with the challenges arising from the implementation of the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*.

III. ACCR activities in 2008

Evaluations of higher education institutions

In accordance with Section 84(1)(a) of the Higher Education Act, in 2008 Accreditation Commission conducted 13 evaluations of higher education institutions (of these, nine were closed and consulted at ACCR meetings during 2008). Some of the evaluations focused on the quality of the activities carried out by higher education institutions ("institutional evaluations"), others on the quality of accredited activities. Non-university

higher education institutions, university higher education institutions and their parts were evaluated. Particularly intensive evaluations are those involving a cross-cutting comparison of a certain type of accredited activity (evaluations of fields of habilitation and professorship procedure at faculties of art) and evaluations where representatives of the evaluated workplaces failed to show enough willingness to cooperate with the ACCR on the removal of any identified deficiencies and, instead of reflecting on and analysing issues with a view to improving the situation, looked for ways of maintaining the status quo (the Faculty of Law at the University of West Bohemia, Plzeň).

In this evaluation, the ACCR encountered a very problematic form of collaboration between the higher education institution and the relevant institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic in the implementation of the doctoral degree programme, where an agreement had been reached that grant-funded and other research activities would take place exclusively through the ASCR institute. The ACCR takes the view that this form of cooperation is highly detrimental to the faculty because on the one hand it diminishes the faculty's competitiveness (its research output falls short of other workplaces), and on the other it is missing an opportunity to obtain research funding (which has a negative effect on overheads, the cost of purchasing literature, field trips by academics and students, etc.); above all, the synergies this form of cooperation should generate have not materialized. In this respect, the ACCR reiterated the point that a prerequisite for the quality implementation of a doctoral degree programme is quality staffing and quality research activity at all the collaborating institutions.

In 2008, the ACCR undertook its first evaluation of a university-type higher education institution divided into faculties and other higher education institutes. This institution was the Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem. The evaluation focused on monitoring two planes – the university as a whole and its individual components running degree programmes. The ACCR formulated its recommendations separately for the two planes. One of the outputs of the evaluation was the delivery of an opinion agreeing to extend the accreditation of the bachelor's and master's degree programmes. This type of evaluation proved to be an extremely demanding process for both the ACCR and the institution itself, so it seems more suited for smaller and medium-sized universities. The advantages of this evaluation model are that certain areas of duplication can be tracked across the university and synergies in the cooperation of the university's departments can be strengthened. It also allows the logic behind the structure of the university (i.e. the faculties and their degree programmes, fields, creative and research activities) to be monitored. There is a certain downside to this model insofar as it gives rise to the misplaced expectation that one of the outputs will be a comparison of the faculties (a league table or "ranking" of faculties within the university). Rather than concentrating on the state of play (i.e. which departments are currently doing better or worse in a particular criterion), ACCR evaluations focus instead on the process (what trends have been established in the individual departments and what needs changing to make the department competitive and to safeguard quality arrangements for its educational and related creative and research activities).

All the evaluations of higher education institutions and their accredited activities were conducted in the standard manner enshrined in the ACCR Charter. The subsequent evaluation reports were discussed in plenary with the participation of the representatives of the institutions concerned and have been published on the ACCR website.

In its evaluations, the most common problems encountered by the ACCR were as follows: 1) the incapacity for internal self-reflection (caused by refusal to accept the facts or by deliberate efforts to hide failings from view); 2) mistaking consequences for causes

(where the evaluated institutions cite the absence of a master's or doctoral degree programme as a traditional root cause of staffing and research problems when in fact this is a consequence, not a cause); 3) the presentation of creative and research activities by staff actually carried out during postings at other departments as evidence of quality at their current department; 4) attempts by institutions to address a lack of publishing by setting up their own periodicals (in a bid to feature on the Research and Development Council's list) or publishing house; 5) failure to take on board the significance of analysing long-term trends (for example, developments in the age and qualification structure of teaching staff).

The total number and, in particular, the scope of evaluations of higher education institutions in 2008 indicated that these evaluations are becoming an increasingly important and time-consuming area of the ACCR's work. This trend is undoubtedly set to continue due to the ever expanding number and size of higher education institutions and to international conventions and standards (especially the Bergen Communiqué and ENQA membership), the fulfilment of which is one of the mandatory requirements for the recognition of the national system of quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area.

Another significant trend has seen evaluations of higher education institutions and their activities linked to the accreditation (or the renewal of accreditation) of degree programmes. The ACCR believes that interlinking accreditation and evaluations is highly effective and rational as this approach gives it the opportunity to gain a better insight into the degree programmes established within the given higher education environment and to assess the individual degree programmes and their fields in relation to others. This interweaving of accreditation and evaluation benefits higher education institutions by reducing red tape, placing more pressure on internal communication and cooperation, strengthening the conceptual framework, reviewing priorities, and making them contemplate accreditations in the longer term and within the context of the whole institution.

In the future, the ACCR will focus more on evaluations of degree programmes provided away from the main sites of higher education institutions (at field offices) and also on the quality of State viva voce examinations.

For an overview of all the institutions evaluated, conclusions and recommendations – see annexes.

Opinions on applications for the accreditation of

a) degree programmes:

In 2008, the ACCR issued 1,961 opinions on applications for the granting, expansion or renewal of accreditations. Of these, 1,832 were favourable and 129 were unfavourable.

In 2008, there continued to be a high number of applications for the accreditation of doctoral degree programmes; this trend can be traced to 2006 following an amendment to the Higher Education Act which allowed the standard period of study for a doctoral degree programme to be four years. Many higher education institutions responded to this amendment by submitting applications for the accreditation of doctoral degree programmes with a standard four-year study period that had previously been accredited with a standard three-year period of study. While in 2007 this trend was largely limited to degree programmes in technical fields and natural sciences, by 2008 it had spread to courses in humanities and social sciences.

In its assessments for the accreditation of doctoral degree programmes, the ACCR consistently focused on gauging how well the department for which the institution was seeking accreditation performed in the fields of science and research (or, where appropriate,

artistic activities). The ACCR believes that the proper education of quality postgraduate students (researchers) can only take place at departments which include fundamental research (or activities equivalent to fundamental research) in areas relating to the doctoral degree programme. This means that the department for which an institution is seeking accreditation must implement and attract major domestic and/or international projects and grants (e.g. from the Czech Science Foundation) in areas relating to the doctoral degree programme (or field of study if the programme is divided into several fields). If accreditation is being sought jointly by several departments, each department must meet this criterion independently (i.e. if one department has staffing and research failings, it cannot make up for this by joining forces with another institution).

A certain trend detected by the ACCR in its assessments of applications not only for the accreditation of doctoral programmes, but also for bachelor's and master's degree programmes, is the excessive fragmentation of the structure of programmes and fields (including from the perspective of the requirements regarding the professional eligibility and qualifications of graduates). One of the reasons for this lies in the pursuit, by some higher education institutions and their departments, of accreditation for the highest possible number of courses and fields in such a way that narrow specializations are "promoted" to the level of a field of study; in other cases, an institution accredits several fields which are virtually identical, differing only in minor changes to the range of subjects covered. The ACCR is trying to prevent the inefficient fragmentation of programmes and fields, which is generally intended solely for marketing purposes (superficially attractive titles and specializations with a very narrowly defined graduate profile) and to optically pad out the number of accredited degree programmes and fields.

The number of applications for the accreditation of programmes to teach in a foreign language (mostly in English and German, other languages exceptionally) is quite extraordinary. This high number of applications can be explained by the simplified rules for the submission of applications for the accreditation of teaching in foreign languages, where a proposed degree programme (field) is identical to a degree programme (field) accredited in Czech. Because, in assessing these applications, the ACCR pays close attention to the guarantees given by the rector, it is possible that certain institutions apply for the accreditation of degree programmes in foreign languages not out of any real interest in actually implementing such a programme, but for marketing purposes and to optically increase the number of accredited activities. In principle, however, the ACCR does not examine this aspect; it only issues unfavourable opinions in cases where doubts exist about the feasibility or credibility of the information presented (in 2008, for example, one non-university higher education institution claimed that the teachers of a degree programme in Czech were capable of providing it to the same extent and quality in Hungarian).

In 2008, the trend of previous years continued where non-university higher education institutions apply for the accreditation of master's degree programmes. In the context of not only non-university higher education institutions, but higher education institutions in general, the large number of unfavourable ACCR opinions on applications for accreditation of these programmes should be noted. This reflects the extensive efforts of numerous higher education institutions to step up their level of study to master's degrees without having adequate staffing or technical information facilities, and in particular without carrying out relevant research activities in the field for which accreditation is sought. In this respect, the ACCR met with incomprehension as regards the essence of a higher education institution's research activities and with cases where the research activities carried out by employees at other places of work were presented as proof of the quality of their current department.

In 2008, traditional master's degree programmes (with a standard study period of 4–6 years) were accredited only in particularly exceptional cases (law and jurisprudence, teacher training for the initial stage of primary education), or only for the extended tuition of existing students.

In the coming years, when assessing an application for the renewal of the accreditation of degree programmes, the ACCR will also focus on whether the courses provided off the campus of the higher education institution (i.e. at field offices) are delivered under the same conditions as at the headquarters of the institution (including staffing). In considering an application for renewal of the accreditation of Master's degree programmes, it will take account of the quality of the State viva voce examinations that have taken place.

For statistics on the number of accredited and non-accredited degree programmes – see annexes.

b) fields of habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor:

While 2007 was extraordinary in terms of the accreditation of fields of habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor in that most fields were newly accredited in that year because their accreditation was expiring, 2008 saw a return to the norm. The ACCR issued an opinion on 32 fields of habilitation procedure and on 29 fields of procedure for appointment as a professor. In most cases these were new fields. The number of unfavourable opinions (1) was proportionate to the number of applications. Accreditation was rejected in that case because of inadequate staffing with internal “habilitated” personnel with relevant publications in the field.

A significant increase in the number of applications for the accreditation of habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor should re-emerge in 2011 in view of the period for which accreditation was granted.

For statistics on the number of applications for the accreditation of fields of habilitation procedure and procedure on appointment as a professor – see annexes.

Opinions on applications for State approval

From the entry into force of the Higher Education Act (1999) to the end of 2008, 140 applications for State approval of legal persons seeking authorization to act as a private higher education institution were submitted for consideration. Of these 140 applications, in 8 cases the applicants aspired to run a university higher education institution; the others sought permission to operate a non-university institution. Of the total number of applications, the ACCR recommended granting State approval in 50 cases.

In 2008, the ACCR discussed 9 applications for State approval; in 3 cases it recommended granting this approval. In comparison with previous years there were no significant changes in the number of applications considered; further, the number of favourable opinions (3) can be regarded as average in relation to previous years (one case concerned an existing private higher education institution where the ACCR endorsed the granting of State approval to another legal person in light of the fact that State approval is transferable). The trend of repeat (in some cases multiple) applications by unsuccessful applicants has continued. Virtually all the projects of private higher education institutions intend to pursue degree programmes in economics, tourism, law, administrative activities, and psycho-pedagogical disciplines. These are invariably degree programmes that do not require high investment spending on technical, laboratory and information facilities and which are expected to attract keen interest among candidates, including candidates of a higher age,

studying on the job. For this reason accreditation for combined studies often sought at the same time as accreditation for full-time programmes.

All unfavourable opinions on applications for State approval were grounded in the fact that the opinion on the accreditation of the relevant degree programme had been unfavourable. The most common reason for ACCR to issue a rejection was the insufficient staffing of the proposed programme.

One positive trend is the improved cooperation with the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports in verifying the facts stated in applications for accreditation, which are submitted along with applications for State approval. One of the requirements set by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports as a condition for granting State approval was the coverage, within a prescribed period, of work commitments needed to comply with the particulars stated in the application for accreditation. Upon receipt of the information about the arrangements for these commitments, the Ministry asked the ACCR to consider whether such commitments were consistent with the declared staffing used as the basis for the ACCR's recommendation to grant accreditation and State approval. The ACCR considers this practice to be very useful and recommends continuing it in the coming years.

Despite the high number of applications for State approval, 2008 was the first time a reduction in the number of private higher education institutions was recorded (from 46 to 45); this was due to the fact that two terminated their existing educational activities (one became a faculty of a public higher education institution, the other had its State approval withdrawn). Given the number of newly submitted applications, however, it is unclear whether this was just a blip or whether we are beginning to see the quantitative stabilization of the sector.

For a summary of applications for State approval considered – see annexes.

Opinions on the establishment or division of faculties

In 2008, the ACCR dealt with applications from 6 public higher education institutions seeking an opinion on the establishment of 7 faculties. Unlike previous legislation, a condition for the establishment, division, merger or closure of a faculty is not a favourable ACCR opinion, but any ACCR opinion. In all the cases considered, the ACCR delivered a favourable opinion.

Overall, the number of faculties continues to expand. New faculties are being established at both smaller and larger universities; faculties were been at a university higher education institution which had not previously been broken down into faculties (the Police Academy of the Czech Republic in Prague). The trend of hiving off paramedical disciplines into separate faculties is also continuing.

For a summary of opinions issued – see annexes

Opinions on the type-designation of higher education institutions

In 2008, the ACCR did not issue any statements on the type-designation of higher education institutions. In previous years, these statements were always associated with opinions on applications from non-university higher education institutions for the accreditation of a doctoral degree programme. In 2008, the ACCR did not process any applications from non-university higher education institutions for the accreditation of doctoral degree programmes.

After a strong swing in the past year (2007: 4 applications; 2006: 1 application; 2005: 0; 2004: 0), this area stabilized.

For a summary of opinions issued – see annexes

Preparation of documents and policy materials

During the previous year (2007), the Accreditation Commission worked with the Department of Higher Education at the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports to draft a new version of a decree on the content of applications for the accreditation of degree programmes (currently covered by Decree No 42/1999). In the resultant comment procedure, the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports received observations from 11 institutions, including the Czech Rectors Conference and the Higher Education Council. In 2008, however, preparatory work began on new higher education legislation (the Tertiary Education Act), which will also encompass provisions on the accreditation process. As there was a risk that, if the new law was subsequently passed, the new decree would be in force only for a very limited time and would not be able to live up to expectations, the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports asked the ACCR to consider whether, in these circumstances, the preparations for the new version of the decree on the content of applications for the accreditation of degree programmes should proceed or be shelved. In light of the situation, the ACCR recommended postponing the issuance of the new decree.

In 2008, the ACCR's conceptual activities drew primarily on the conclusions and recommendations that emerged from an internal Commission evaluation conducted (for the first time) in autumn 2007. The aim was to improve the internal mechanisms for the functioning of the accreditation system, strengthen communication between the ACCR, its work groups and the ACCR Secretariat, establish clear rules for the transparent examination of applications, and to raise awareness of the criteria among as much of the academic community as possible. In this regard, in February 2008 the ACCR held a seminar for members of its permanent work groups to exchange experiences gained from the work groups' activities and from the implementation of ACCR standards and criteria in application assessments.

The seminar was followed up by the preparation of two documents: "Handbook for the Assessment of Applications for Accreditation" and "Assessment Form for Applications for the Accreditation of Degree Programmes". The aim of these documents is to provide guidance both to those examining applications for the accreditation of degree programmes and to higher education institutions as they prepare the applications. In the interests of maintaining the transparency of the accreditation process, the two documents are available on the ACCR website.

The ACCR also dealt with the way applications for accreditation were submitted in electronic form. It noted that in this respect there were major differences in the applications submitted. Some electronic versions are formally arranged in such a way that they severely impede the work of the evaluators. This is particularly true of those cases where the degree programme is chopped up into many sub-files, often in different formats. Assessing these degree programmes is very difficult and time consuming. In a move to improve this situation, the ACCR raised the requirement that the version of an application submitted on a hard electronic medium must be formally organized with a view to maximum transparency and consideration for the evaluators, with a structure corresponding to the prescribed format of applications submitted in paper form. Ideally, one file should represent one degree programme or, if a programme is split into several fields of study, one field of study. The file names should not be too long and should not contain accents. The ACCR recommends that applications be submitted in .doc, .rtf or .pdf format.

IV. External cooperation in 2008

Cooperation between the ACCR and other institutions in the Czech Republic

The ACCR's cooperation established with other institutions in previous years continued in 2008. This activity mainly involved collaboration with bodies representing higher education institutions – the Czech Rectors Conference and the Higher Education Council, whose representatives regularly attended ACCR sessions and contributed their experience to discussions on issues related to the quality of higher education. The ACCR chairwoman, for her part, attended meetings of the Czech Rectors Conference. In 2008, cooperation also continued with the Student Chamber of the Higher Education Council, with students participating in special work groups on evaluations of higher education institutions. This cooperation proved valuable. It became clear that students' views on the educational activities of the institutions being evaluated significantly enriched the work of the special groups. Consultations with students from the evaluated higher education institutions play a valuable role, both in terms of trust and the openness of student testimonies, and from the aspect of being able to make comparisons between the particular department being assessed and the parent higher education institution. The ACCR expects to develop this cooperation in the coming years.

Throughout 2008, the ACCR also worked closely with the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports. ACCR meetings were attended by the Deputy Minister in charge of the Research and Higher Education Group and the Director of the Department of Higher Education. Issues that the Minister for Education Youth and Sports referred to the ACCR for examination concerned appeals lodged against decisions to refuse accreditation. The Minister typically asked the ACCR to comment on the technical arguments raised in appeals.

In the assessment of certain applications for the accreditation of fields of study preparing students for specific professions (degree programmes with a medical specialization), the ACCR cooperated with the competent State administration bodies, especially the Ministry of Health. Fields of study offered at the *University of Defence* and the *Police Academy of the Czech Republic*, which are State higher education institutions managed by the relevant ministries, i.e. the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of the Interior respectively, are treated separately.

For an overview of opinions issued on the basis of requests from the Minister for Education, Youth and Sports – see annexes

International cooperation (ENQA, CEEN, INQAAHE, Slovak ACCR)

The ACCR remains a member of major organizations drawing together accreditation agencies, commissions and other evaluation bodies in higher education at regional level (*Central and Eastern European Network for Quality Assurance – CEEN*), pan-European level (*European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education – ENQA*) and global level (*International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies – INQAAHE*).

ACCR representatives attended the in the General Assembly of the Central and Eastern European Network for Quality Assurance (CEEN) in Durrës (Albania) on 25–26 May 2008, where an agreement was signed to transform the network into a legal entity in accordance with Hungarian law. The ACCR asked the competent State authorities for an assessment of whether the ACCR's legal form precludes membership of the transformed

CEEN. The Ministry of Regional Development did not reply; other institutions believe that the ACCR's legal status will probably prevent it from meeting the requirements for membership.

In September 2008, ACCR representatives attended the General Assembly of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), where the new leadership of the association was elected. Milan Sojka was elected to the nine-member member Board. This is the first time the ACCR has had a representative among the leaders of such an important institution. Mr Sojka is particularly involved in the work of a subcommittee assessing reports on external evaluations of accreditation agencies in accordance with the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*.

ACCR representatives took part in events under the "Qualitätsmanagement" project run by the Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (German Rectors Conference) and the accreditation agency ASIIN, which focuses on the accreditation of fields of study in engineering, informatics, natural sciences and mathematics.

There was significant progress in cooperation with the Slovak Accreditation Commission, mainly in the preparation of a project for the external evaluation of both commissions. Even closer cooperation in the future is guaranteed by the interlinking of staff – in 2008, a member of the Czech ACCR became a member of the Slovak Accreditation Commission.

Compliance with international criteria (ENQA)

In light of its obligations arising from ENQA membership, in 2008 the ACCR focused on meeting the requirements of the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* relating to external quality evaluations. This is reflected primarily in the greater emphasis on monitoring the results of internal evaluations of the higher education institutions assessed by the ACCR, the consistency of decision-making in the application of the criteria in question, and a stress on introducing a clearer and more relevant format for recommendations and the observations justifying these recommendations. Another area where the ACCR has made a significant step towards implementing the *Standards and Guidelines* is the creation and introduction of a periodic internal evaluation system and the preparation of a project for the external evaluation of the ACCR (as part of a joint project with the Slovak Accreditation Commission). For more details, see the section *Internal ACCR evaluation, external ACCR evaluation*.

Compliance with ENQA Standards is another prerequisite for admission to the EQAR (*European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education*), the establishment of which was agreed by higher education ministers from European countries at a summit in London in May 2007. The EQAR Register, set up in March 2008, is projected to function as an overarching institution for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area. Due to the high fees for EQAR country membership and fees for entering an agency in the Register, the ACCR believes it would be sensible to consider membership only after the ENQA endorses the report on its external evaluation (i.e. in 2010).

ACCR follow-up on internal evaluations of higher education institutions

The Accreditation Commission is placing an ever greater emphasis on monitoring the results of internal evaluations of higher education institutions. It monitors whether a higher education institution has its own internal evaluation system, what the mechanisms are, how it publishes the findings, and how it handles these findings. A functioning internal evaluation

system at higher education institutions is a prerequisite in fulfilling the requirements of the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*.

The ACCR expects that in the future the results of internal evaluations will play an important role not only in the external evaluation of higher education institutions, but also when assessing applications for the accreditation of degree programmes (in particular the renewal of accreditation).

V. ACCR evaluation

Creation of a system for the internal and external evaluation of the ACCR

The adoption of the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* has placed institutions that deal with quality assurance in higher education in a new situation. Under the Bergen Communiqué, well-functioning national quality assurance systems that meets its requirements to the fullest possible extent must be up and running in all signatory countries by 2010. The ACCR already meets most of the requirements imposed on accreditation agencies. However, one of the new obligations it is faced with is the creation of a system for periodic internal and external evaluations.

In order to meet these requirements, the ACCR, in cooperation with the Accreditation Commission of the Slovak Republic, started preparing a joint project back in 2006. The project objective is cooperation in the setting-up of a system for the internal and external evaluation of the ACCR and the Accreditation Commission of the Slovak Republic. The project is intended to ensure that both Accreditation Committees are fully compatible with the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* and therefore with the conditions for membership of the ENQA and the EQAR. The cooperation project covers common procedures for periodic internal and external evaluations. An internal evaluation will normally be carried out every year, with an external evaluation approximately once every five years. The external evaluation will involve the establishment of an evaluation committee consisting of 14 members equally represented from the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. The committee membership requirements will be based on the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*. The committee's activities are regulated by a statute approved by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (Czech Republic) and the Ministry of Education (Slovak Republic). The outcome of the evaluation committee's activities will be a report on the external evaluation of the relevant Accreditation Commission, which will be consulted with the relevant Accreditation Commission and then published.

The following factors will smooth the implementation of the project (external evaluations based on cooperation between the Accreditation Commission of the Czech Republic and the Accreditation Commission of the Slovak Republic): long-term shared history, a high level of mutual understanding and the development of cooperation between higher education institutions in the two countries, experience of mutual cooperation in the evaluation of higher education institutions (e.g. in the evaluation of the Brno University of Veterinary and Pharmaceutical Sciences and the Faculty of Pharmacy of Charles University, Prague) and the mutual understanding of each other's language (this aspect is particularly important because it avoids the need for all documents related to external evaluation to be translated into English).

Course of the internal ACCR evaluation

In 2007, the first internal ACCR assessment was conducted on the basis of the system described in the previous section. Subsequently, in 2008, a follow-up report¹ was submitted describing how the ACCR, in its activities, took into account the recommendations made in the report on its internal evaluation in 2007. The report specifically attempted to map out how and to what extent the recommendations from 2007 had been applied and what changes had been made in the ACCR's activities and in the legislative definition of its position, responsibilities and competence further to those recommendations.

In particular, the 2007 report set out the following areas for improvement:

1. The ACCR should seek to streamline its activities and create room for discussion on policy matters
 - a) the fundamental way of streamlining activities in the future should be the transition from the accreditation of fields of study to the accreditation of institutions (higher education institutions as a whole or their faculties); however, this is subject to the creation of functioning internal quality assurance systems at higher education institutions,
 - b) applications for accreditation should be submitted and processed primarily by electronic means,
 - c) further discussion is needed on the criteria to be applied in assessing master's and doctoral degree programmes and fields of study for habilitation procedure and the procedure for appointment as a professor.
2. Interaction between the ACCR and permanent work groups needs to be improved. In this respect, more use should be made of the website and the transmission of information via an internal FTP.
3. It is necessary to focus on raising awareness of the ACCR activities among higher education institutions and the general public.
4. The ACCR should discuss the issue of involving students and professionals in the work of the permanent and special work groups.
5. The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports should be approached to increase the ACCR's budget in view of the new challenges arising from the Czech Republic's participation in the Bologna Process and to improve the staffing and facilities of the ACCR Secretariat.

By reference to the areas identified in the *Report on the internal ACCR evaluation* from 2007, the following measures were adopted in the Report on the application of recommendations formulated in the 2008 *Report on the internal evaluation of the Accreditation Commission of the Czech Republic approved at the November meeting of the Accreditation Commission in 2007*:

As to 1a: *This is a long-term strategy that requires the establishment of well-functioning internal evaluation systems at higher education institutions.* This year, the MoEYS announced the Tertiary Education Evaluation project, to be implemented under the Education for Competitiveness Operational Programme (ECOP), which should, if adopted, create a model system covering the internal evaluation of quality

¹ *Report on the application of recommendations formulated in the Report on the internal evaluation of the Accreditation Commission of the Czech Republic approved at the November meeting of the Accreditation Commission in 2007*

for higher education institutions; this system should gradually be tested in a real environment at selected higher education institutions and steadily be put into practice.

The ACCR has focused on the comprehensive evaluation of higher education institutions as its main activity and is seeking to combine this on an increasing scale with assessments of applications for the accreditation and re-accreditation of degree programmes and for the accreditation of habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor.

In its work, it is also gradually trying (as documented by minutes of ACCR meetings) to discuss policy issues related to the quality of educational activities.

In this regard, the ACCR has drawn up suggestions on how to modify the competence of the ACCR legislatively in the upcoming new Tertiary Education Act.

As to 1b: The ACCR has taken steps to prepare a new decree, but has encountered a number of problems arising from the current Higher Education Act and regulations. The new decree will be drawn up in the context of the Tertiary Education Act now being prepared, in respect of which the ACCR is making important change proposals.

As to 1c: At its meetings, the ACCR has devoted considerable attention to this issue and significantly differentiated the criteria (for bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programmes, for professorship and readership appointment procedure, and for fields of study); it tightened these criteria considerably. This discussion will continue. The criteria must be sufficiently transparent. Higher education institutions must be familiarized with them in depth and should incorporate them into their internal evaluation systems and develop them to suit their own conditions.

As to 2: The ACCR management and Secretariat held a meeting with members of work groups on 14 March 2008. A handbook was adopted a form was prepared for the examination of applications for the accreditation of degree programmes.

As to 3: Communication with the public and the academic community, as demonstrated by certain reactions of the representatives of higher education institutions, remains inadequate despite the intensified efforts here. As a result, there are frequent misunderstandings.

There was a certain, although not fully satisfactory, improvement in the quality of the ACCR website. Materials are missing that could provide a deeper insight into the ACCR's activities and its plans in the field of quality assurance in Czech higher education.

As to 4: This problem will be resolved gradually by regularly replacing ACCR members in accordance with the requirements of the law. The first positive changes in this respect emerged in September 2008 (a new ACCR member from the Slovak Republic).

In cooperation with the Student Chamber of the Higher Education Council, there has been steady progress in increasing the representation of students in permanent work groups; the ACCR has sound experience of cooperation with students recommended by the HEC Student Chamber in the activities of special work groups. So far, there has been little headway in increasing the involvement of professionals, who often lack the motivation for such activity. Another obstacle is the lack of funds to adequately compensate them for the work and time they devote to this activity.

As to 5: The ACCR and the Ministry's Department of Higher Education are promoting these requirements. The ACCR's need to be professionalized and require adequate funding, staffing and facilities. These requirements also receive significant backing from the Czech Rectors Conference and the Higher Education Council.

There is still much to do in this field. The first positive step in this respect has been the quality reinforcement of staff at the Secretariat. Nevertheless, this cannot be regarded as sufficient. Its facilities, funding and staffing remain very undersized.

The independence and professionalization of the ACCR would benefit significantly if its budget were set as a percentage of the annual budget for public higher education institutions. The adoption of such a budgeting rule would help shield the ACCR from political pressures and the pressures of various interest groups and create conditions conducive to its professionalization.

The evaluation was in the competence of a three-member evaluation committee, whose remit included the production of a draft evaluation report, the submission thereof at an ACCR meeting for discussion, and the preparation of the *Report on the application of the recommendations formulated in the Report on the internal evaluation of the Accreditation Commission of the Czech Republic approved at the November meeting of the ACCR in 2007* for publication. The members of the internal evaluation committee, based on a vote, were Milan Sojka, Jiří Sobota, and Petr Kyloušek. At the ACCR's September meeting, the evaluation committee submitted the evaluation report for discussion. Members of the Accreditation Committee had until mid-October to send their observations on the draft report.

The *Report on the application of recommendations formulated in the Report on the internal evaluation of the Accreditation Commission approved at the November meeting of the ACCR in 2007* was discussed at ACCR meeting 5/2008 and published on the ACCR website. It is expected that the report will be translated into English and placed at the disposal of external evaluators in accordance with ENQA rules. Besides providing feedback to the ACCR, it will also become an important basis for the external evaluation of the ACCR planned for 2009.

Progress in the planning of a joint project of external ACCR evaluation

As already mentioned in the previous sections, as part of the preparations for a joint external evaluation project a statute was drawn up for a committee for the external evaluation of the ACCR and the Accreditation Commission of the Slovak Republic, which was signed by the ministers of both parties in summer 2008. In autumn 2008, the English version, with minor adjustments incorporated into the statute in the form of Addendum No 1, was approved by the ENQA, with which both parties to the joint project have been communicating in the preparation of the evaluation.

Work is currently under way on the joint nomination of 14 members to the evaluation committee which will be in charge of the external evaluation. The members of the evaluation committee will be appointed by the Czech Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports and the Slovak Ministry of Education. Committee members will come from the ranks of representatives of the National Rectors Conference, the national agencies ENIC/NARIC, student representatives, employer representatives and independent domestic and foreign experts on quality assurance in higher education from both countries.

The committee's principal task will be to assess to what extent the Accreditation Commission applies procedures in accordance with the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European of Higher Education Area*.

The actual evaluation, according to our projections, should take place in spring 2009, so that, by summer 2009, the evaluation committee will have sufficient documentation for the production of its evaluation report. This evaluation report will be then be translated into English and sent to the ENQA for assessment.

In December 2008, project secretaries from both countries were appointed to provide a coordinating role. Tereza Hájková, from the Ministry's Department of Higher Education, was appointed by the Czech Republic. The material and technical needs of the evaluation committee's activities will be covered by the Czech Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports in cooperation with the Slovak Ministry of Education.

The two Ministries are work together on the whole joint project according to plan and they are confident that they will succeed in their common goal so that the two national agencies are eligible to become members of the EQAR (*European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education*).

VI. Annexes

Contents of annexes:

- a) List of members of the Accreditation Commission
- b) List of all personnel changes in the permanent work groups during 2008
- c) Overview of ACCR meetings in 2008
- d) List of special work groups set up for evaluations in 2008
- d) List and brief outcome of evaluations of educational institutions and accredited activities in 2008
- e) Statistics on developments in the number of accredited and non-accredited degree programmes in 2008
- f) Statistics on developments in fields of study for habilitation procedure and professorship procedure in 2008
- g) Summary of unfavourable and favourable opinions on the granting of State approval
- h) Summary of opinions on new faculties and changes in the type of institutions
- j) Summary of opinions on applications for the type-designation of higher education institutions
- k) Summary of opinions issued on the basis of requests from the Minister for Education, Youth and Sports

a) List of members of the Accreditation Commission

1) List of ACCR members valid until 31 August 2008

prof. PhDr. Vladimíra Dvořáková, CSc.; Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics, Prague, Chairwoman

prof. Ing. Milan Sojka, CSc.; Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, Prague, Deputy Chairman

prof. JUDr. Milan Bakeš, DrSc.; Faculty of Law, Charles University, Prague

prof. Dr. Tilman Berger; Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen (Germany)

prof. PhDr. Jana Geršlová, CSc.; Faculty of Economics, VŠB – Technical University of Ostrava

prof. RNDr. Petr Hájek, DrSc.; Institute of Informatics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

prof. RNDr. Pavel Höschl, DrSc.; Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Prague

doc. Mgr. Ing. Karel Chadt, CSc.; ŠKODA AUTO, a.s., Ml. Boleslav

prof. PhDr. Petr Kyloušek, CSc.; Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University

prof. PhDr. Jiří Mareš, CSc.; Hradec Králové Faculty of Medicine, Charles University, Prague

prof. Ing. Jaromír Příhoda, CSc.; Institute of Thermomechanics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

prof. PhDr. Svatava Raková, CSc.; Institute of History, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague

prof. Ing. Jan Roda, CSc.; Faculty of Chemical Technology, Institute of Chemical Technology, Prague

prof. RNDr. František Sehnal, CSc.; Biology Centre, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

prof. Dr.phil. Peter Schmidt; University of Zittau/Görlitz (Germany)

prof. Dr. Ing. Jiří Sobota; Fachhochschule Wiesbaden (Germany)

prof. MUDr. Pravoslav Stránský, CSc.; Hradec Králové Faculty of Medicine, Charles University, Prague

prof. Ing. Antonín Stratil, DrSc.; Institute of Animal Physiology and Genetics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

prof. RNDr. PhDr. Jan Štěpán, CSc.; Faculty of Arts, Palacký University, Olomouc

prof. Vladimír Tichý, CSc.; Faculty of Music, Academy of Performing Arts, Prague

prof. Ing. Jan Uhlíř, CSc.; Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Czech Technical University, Prague

2) List of ACCR members valid as of 1 September 2008

prof. PhDr. Vladimíra Dvořáková, CSc.; Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics, Prague, Chairwoman

prof. Ing. Milan Sojka, CSc.; Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, Prague, Deputy Chairman

prof. MUDr. Michal Anděl, CSc.; Third Faculty of Medicine, Charles University, Prague

prof. JUDr. Milan Bakeš, DrSc.; Faculty of Law, Charles University, Prague

prof. PhDr. Jana Geršlová, CSc.; Faculty of Economics, VŠB – Technical University of Ostrava

prof. RNDr. Pavel Höschl, DrSc.; Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Prague

doc. Mgr. Ing. Karel Chadt, CSc.; ŠKODA AUTO, a.s., Ml. Boleslav

prof. PhDr. Petr Kyloušek, CSc.; Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University

prof. Ing. Jaromír Příhoda, CSc.; Institute of Thermomechanics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

prof. PhDr. Svatava Raková, CSc.; Institute of History, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

prof. Ing. Jan Roda, CSc.; Faculty of Chemical Technology, Institute of Chemical Technology, Prague

prof. RNDr. František Sehnal, CSc.; Biology Centre, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

prof. Dr.phil. Peter Schmidt; University of Zittau/Görlitz (Germany)

prof. Dr. Ing. Jiří Sobota; Fachhochschule Wiesbaden (Germany)

prof. Ing. Zdeněk Strakoš, DrSc.; Institute of Informatics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

prof. Ing. Antonín Stratil, DrSc.; Institute of Animal Physiology and Genetics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

doc. PaedDr. Iva Stuchlíková, CSc.; Teacher Training Faculty, University of South Bohemia, Č. Budějovice

prof. RNDr. PhDr. Jan Štěpán, CSc.; Faculty of Arts, Palacký University, Olomouc

prof. Vladimír Tichý, CSc.; Faculty of Music, Academy of Performing Arts, Prague

prof. Ing. Jan Uhlíř, CSc.; Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Czech Technical University, Prague

prof. Ing. Pavol Vincúr, CSc.; Faculty of National Economy, University of Economics, Bratislava (Slovakia)

b) List of all personnel changes among members of work groups in 2008

Working Group on Economics

The following were appointed new members of the work group:

Hana Mikovcová (Faculty of Business Administration, University of Economics, Prague),

Petr Houška (Ministry of Regional Development).

Working Group on Paramedical Fields of Study

Daniel Jirkovský (Královské Vinohrady Teaching Hospital) left the work group

Jana Nováková (Motol Teaching Hospital) was appointed a new member of the work group.

Working Group on History

Ivan Šedivý (Masaryk Institute, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic) was appointed a new member of the work group.

Working Group on Mathematics and Informatics

The work group now works under the leadership of the chairman *Zdeněk Strakoš* (Institute of Informatics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic) and has the following members:

Pavel Drábek (Faculty of Applied Sciences, University of West Bohemia, Plzeň)

Jan Flusser (Institute of Information Theory and Automation, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic)

Jan Frait (Czech National Bank, Prague)

Petr Hájek (Institute of Informatics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic)

Dag Hrubý (Grammar School, A. K. Vítáka 452 Jevíčko)

Miroslav Hušek (Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Prague)

Josef Málek (Mathematical Institute, Charles University, Prague)

Jiří Rosický (Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Masaryk University, Brno)

Jiří Sgall (Institute of Mathematics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic)

Olga Štěpánková (Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Czech Technical University, Prague)

Peter Vojtáš (Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Prague)

Pavel Zezula (Faculty of Informatics, Masaryk University, Brno)

Martin Lanzendörfer (Institute of Informatics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic)

Working Group on Medicine

The work group now works under the leadership of the chairman *Michal Anděl* (Third Faculty of Medicine, Charles University, Prague) and has the following members:

Pravoslav Stránský (Hradec Králové Faculty of Medicine, Charles University, Prague)
Bohuslav Ošřádal (Institute of Physiology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic)
Jan Herget (Second Faculty of Medicine, Charles University, Prague)
Vlastimil Ščudla (Faculty of Medicine, Palacký University, Olomouc)
Josef Fusek (Faculty of Military Health Sciences, University of Defence, Brno)
Jana Mačáková (Faculty of Medicine, Palacký University, Olomouc)
Vladislav Třeška (Plzeň Faculty of Medicine, Charles University, Prague)

Working Group on Pedagogy, Psychology and Kinanthropology

The work group now works under the leadership of the chairwoman *Iva Stuchlíková* (Teacher Training Faculty, University of South Bohemia, České Budějovice) and has the following members:

Jiří Mareš (Hradec Králové Faculty of Medicine, Charles University, Prague)
Růžena Váňová (Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague)
Karel Frömel (Faculty of Physical Culture, Palacký University, Olomouc)
Milan Pol (Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno)
Antonín Rychtecký (Faculty of Physical Education and Sport, Charles University, Prague)
Marie Vítková (Teacher Training Faculty, Masaryk University, Brno)
Isabela Pavelková (Teacher Training Faculty, Charles University, Prague)
Tomáš Urbánek (Institute of Psychology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic)
Alena Plháková (Faculty of Arts, Palacký University, Olomouc)
Alena Nelešovská (Teacher Training Faculty, Palacký University, Olomouc)
Veronika Polišenská (Institute of Psychology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic)
František Tomášek (Palach Primary School, Brandýs nad Labem)
Vladimíra Spilková (Teacher Training Faculty, Charles University, Prague)
Jiří Němec (Teacher Training Faculty, Masaryk University)

c) Overview of ACCR meetings in 2008

ACCR meeting	venue	number of ACCR members present
Meeting 1 (28–30 Jan)	Litomyšl	17
Meeting 2 (31 Mar –2 Apr)	Vílanac u Jihlavy	19
Meeting 3 (16–18 June)	Žďár nad Sázavou	20
Meeting 4 (16–17 Sep)	Medlov	19
Meeting 5 (24–26 Nov)	Litomyšl	21

d) List of special work groups operating in 2008

- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of fields of study for habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor at faculties of art, i.e. the Faculty of Art of Charles University, Prague, the Faculty of Art of Masaryk University, the Faculty of Art of the University of Ostrava, the Faculty of Art of the University of South Bohemia, České Budějovice: *Jiří Mareš* – *chairman*, *Svatava Raková*, *Vlastimil Fiala*, *Bohuslav Mánek*, *Eva Semotanová*.

- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of pedagogical fields of study at higher education art institutions – fine arts (Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design, Prague): *Jiří Mareš – chairman, Vladimír Tichý, Petr Kratochvíl, Radek Horáček.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of the Faculty of Business and Management, Brno University of Technology: *Jana Geršlová – chairwoman, Karel Chadt, Jan Uhlíř, Věra Mulačová, Milan Sojka.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of the Faculty of Mining and geology, VŠB – Technical University of Ostrava: *Miroslav Liška – chairman, Jan Uhlíř, Martin Braniš, Josef Zeman.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of the Faculty of Law, University of West Bohemia, Plzeň: *Vladimíra Dvořáková – chairwoman, Milan Bakeš, Josef Fiala, Alena Wintrová, Radim Boháč.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of Vysoká škola podnikání, a.s., Ostrava (Business School Ostrava): *Ladislav Blažek – chairman, Jan Uhlíř, Jan Roda, Věra Mulačová.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of Akademie STING, o.p.s., Brno: *Leo Vodáček – chairman, Jana Geršlová, Bohumil Král, Petr Richter.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of Vysoká škola v Plzni, o.p.s. (Plzeň College): *Valérie Tóthová – chairwoman, Jaroslav Opavský, Staša Bartůňková, Pavel Höschl.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of Jan Evangelista Purkyně University, Ústí nad Labem: *Vladimíra Dvořáková – chairwoman, Jiří Mareš, Iva Stuchlíková, Svatava Raková, Petr Kyloušek, Milan Hlavačka, Pavel Höschl, Ivan Pelant, , Oldřich Pytela, František Sehnal, Martin Braniš, Antonín Stratil, Vladimír Tichý, Petr Kratochvíl, Jiří T. Kotalík, Jan Uhlíř, Miroslav Liška, Jaromír Příhoda, Valérie Tóthová, Staša Bartůňková, Oldřich Matoušek, Libor Musil, Jana Geršlová, Milan Sojka, Jan Štěpán, Zdeněk Strakoš, Jan Roda, Miroslav Jašurek, Michal Anděl, Jaromír Příhoda.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of doctoral degree programmes at higher education art institutions, i.e. the Academy of Performing Arts, Prague, Janáček Academy of Music and Performing Arts, Brno, Academy of Fine Arts, Prague, and Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design, Prague: *Vladimír Tichý – chairman, Petr Kratochvíl, Ivan Poledňák, Miloš Horanský, Zoja Mikotová, Lubomír Slavíček, Jaromír Blažejovský, Jiří T. Kotalík, Stanislav Zippe.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of Anglo-americká vysoká škola, o.p.s. (Anglo-American University): *Vladimíra Dvořáková – chairwoman, Blanka Říchová, Zdenka Mansfeldová, Milan Sojka, Svatava Raková, Petr Vymětal.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of Moravská vysoká škola Olomouc, o.p.s. (Moravian College Olomouc): *Milan Sojka – chairman, Bohumil Král, Ladislav Ivánek.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of the University of New York in Prague, s.r.o.: *Vladimíra Dvořáková – chairwoman, Blanka Říchová, Zdenka Mansfeldová, Milan Sojka, Svatava Raková, Petr Vymětal.*

- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of Vysoká škola regionálního rozvoje, s.r.o. (College of Regional Development): *Jana Geršlová – chairwoman, Jiří Patočka, Lumír Kulhánek, Petr Richter, Milan Sojka.*
- Composition of the special work group on the evaluation of the consultation centres and field offices of Bankovní institut Vysoká škola, a.s., Prague (Banking Institute/College of Banking): *Jana Geršlová – chairwoman, Bohumil Král, Lumír Kulhánek, Pavol Vincúr, Karel Chadt, Jan Roda, Pavel Höschl, Milan Sojka, Petr Kyloušek, Jan Uhlíř, Vladimíra Dvořáková, Jiří Mareš, Věra Mulačová, Jan Pour, Iva Mikovcová.*

Members nominated by the Student Chamber of the Higher Education Council were also active in the work groups.

e) Summary of educational institutions evaluated and activities accredited:

Meeting 2008/1

Evaluation of fields of study for habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor at faculties of art – Charles University, Prague, Masaryk University, University of Ostrava, University of South Bohemia, České Budějovice

Conclusions and recommendations:

General conclusions and recommendations

1. The ACCR notes that the faculties of art that were visited devote due attention to the quality of the habilitation and appointment procedure. In the five-year period monitored, there has been an evident tendency to increase the demands placed on candidates for academic titles, define the criteria more precisely, responsibly set up commissions, carefully select external examiners and conduct the proceedings so that they are not a formality.
2. The ACCR recommends that the faculties place the same high standards on external examiners. The evaluation showed that a significant portion of reviews are rather descriptive in nature, with less space devoted to expert analytical and evaluating passages.

Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague (FF UK)

The ACCR applauds:

1. efforts by the faculty's management to address staffing and qualifications at the faculty in a systemic manner, including a new model for the funding of departments and institutes,
2. the staffing situation in historical fields of study,
3. the stringent rules for setting up commissions and selecting external examiners,
4. the increasing demands on the quality of habilitation and appointment procedures,
5. the increasing demands on the quality of doctoral studies.

The ACCR recommends:

1. improving the situation regarding qualifications in some linguistic and social fields, particularly in German studies, Romance languages and literatures, information science, political science, pedagogy, psychology,
2. in relation to "borderline theses": do not accept, for a viva voce, theses which are on the border between scientific and popular scientific literature; where interdisciplinary theses touch on historical fields of study, insist that the methodological approaches standard for historical sciences are respected,

3. that the management of FF UK and the management of Charles University, Prague, draw up a concept to deal with the complex personnel situation at the Institute of Phonetics; phonetics is a science with an eighty-year tradition at FF UK and authorization to conduct habilitation procedure disappeared at FF UK in 2007; no other faculty in the Czech Republic or in neighbouring countries has the right to conduct habilitation procedure; two younger members of staff at the institute have prepared a thesis for their habilitation; there are two ways of addressing this: a) apply for the re-accreditation of habilitation procedure in the field of phonetics, b) allow the two candidates to earn habilitations in a related field and then apply for the accreditation of habilitation procedure in the field of phonetics; the ACCR believes that the first option would be more appropriate,
4. improving the method for archiving materials on habilitation and appointment procedure,
5. in relation to doctoral studies, establishing minimum output requirements for PhD students necessary for the successful completion of the programme,
6. in relation to doctoral studies, monitoring the workload of individual supervisors and setting a maximum number of PhD students that can be guided by a single supervisor.

Conclusion

The overall state of habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor at FF UK is very good. The ACCR agrees with the trend by the faculty management to increase demands on habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor.

Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University (FF MU)

The ACCR applauds:

1. the increasing demands on the quality of habilitation and appointment procedures,
2. the increasing demands on the quality of doctoral studies,
3. the system for checking the originality of doctoral theses,
4. the system for publishing doctoral theses,
5. the excellence in archiving materials on habilitation and appointment procedure.

The ACCR recommends:

1. improving the situation regarding qualifications in some social science fields, particularly in ethnology and psychology,
2. continuing to monitor the situation regarding qualifications in German studies,
3. in relation to “borderline theses”: do not accept, for a viva voce, theses which are on the border between scientific and popular scientific literature,
4. in relation to doctoral studies, monitoring the workload of individual supervisors and setting a maximum number of PhD students that can be guided by a single supervisor.

Conclusion

The overall state of habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor at FF MU is very good. The ACCR agrees with the trend by the faculty management to increase demands on habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor.

Faculty of Arts, University of Ostrava (FF OU)

The ACCR applauds:

1. the systematic attention paid by the faculty management to improving the qualifications of department staff,
2. the increasing demands on the quality of habilitation and appointment procedures,
3. the systematic involvement of foreign experts in the work of commissions,
4. the increasing demands on the quality of doctoral studies,

5. the excellent standards in place for the archiving materials on habilitation and appointment procedure.

The ACCR recommends:

1. in relation to habilitation procedure, applying a principle that the composition of the habilitation commission and the set of external examiners may have only one overlapping expert,
2. in relation to the appointment procedure, requiring an opinion from a renowned centre or renowned experts concerning the qualities of the candidate (especially in cases of non-university candidates),
3. improving the situation regarding qualifications at the Department of Slavonic Studies and the Department of Psychology and Social Work,
4. establishing a more expeditious system for checking the quality of doctoral studies and acting more promptly to eliminate those students who, in the longer term, do not fulfil their obligations,
5. in relation to doctoral studies, establishing minimum output requirements for PhD students necessary for the successful completion of the programme.

Conclusion

FF OU was formed 16 years ago. Its staffing situation is relatively good, with a favourable outlook for the future. The overall state of habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor at FF OU is very good. The ACCR appreciates the trend by the faculty management to increase demands on habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor.

Faculty of Arts, University of South Bohemia, České Budějovice (FF JU)

The ACCR applauds:

1. the systematic attention paid by the faculty management to improving the qualifications of department staff,
2. the high demands on the quality of habilitation and appointment procedures,
3. the explicit identification of domestic periodicals which are recognized as scientific periodicals with demanding review procedure for the purposes of habilitation and appointment procedures,
4. the increasing demands on the quality of doctoral studies,
5. the excellent standards in place for the archiving materials on habilitation and appointment procedure.

The ACCR recommends:

1. improving the situation regarding qualifications at institutes which are at the outset of their development: the Institute of Aesthetics and Art History, the Archaeological Institute, the Institute of Archiving and Auxiliary Sciences of History,
2. in the future, when the number of authorizations for appointment procedure is extended to other fields, requiring an opinion from a renowned centre or renowned experts concerning the qualities of the candidate (especially in cases of non-university candidates),
3. in relation to doctoral studies, monitoring the workload of individual supervisors and setting a maximum number of PhD students that can be guided by a single supervisor.

Conclusion

FF JU is a young faculty established on 1 January 2006. The faculty as a whole is still forming; its institutes are at various stages of development. The staffing situation bodes well

for the future. The state of habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor at FF JU is very good. The ACCR appreciates the trend by the faculty management to increase demands on habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor.

Evaluation of pedagogical fields of study at higher education art institutions 2 – fine arts (Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design, Prague)

Conclusions and recommendations:

1. Capitalize on the upcoming universal restructuring of studies at the Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design, Prague (VSUP), to prepare a new concept of teacher training. Students who study the teaching module in accordance with the current rules will complete their studies under the conditions announced at the start of their studies.
2. Submit a new concept of teacher training for VSUP students as part of the new materials for accreditation.
3. Clearly define the graduate profile and explicitly specify what the graduates of the programme are qualified to do with their certificate. The special work group recommends that graduates be authorized to teach at secondary schools, secondary schools of art and primary schools of art, but not at primary schools (i.e. institutions attended by pupils aged approximately 6–15 years).
4. The scope of teacher training at VSUP should correspond to the scope of teacher training at similar art institutions in the Czech Republic. It will therefore have to be extended.
5. In the preparation of the accreditation materials, the special work group recommends reconsidering the names of certain subjects. Necessary requirements also include a detailed synopsis of the subject, requirements for completion of the subject and a list of the latest reference literature.
6. Students must have at least 4 weeks' teaching practice. This experience also includes sitting in on classes at schools.
7. The studies must be rounded off with a comprehensive examination and defence of a thesis. This need not take the form solely of a curriculum for schools.

In the future, VSUP could consider the possibility of offering teacher training for active artists in the form of a lifelong learning programme.

Meeting 2008/2

Evaluation of the Faculty of Mining and geology, VŠB – Technical University of Ostrava

Conclusions and recommendations:

The ACCR appreciates the quality that went into the preparation of the documentation for the evaluation, in terms of both openness and content. In addition to specific recommendations stemming from a meeting with students (contained in the evaluation report), the following conclusions also require attention:

1. Strengths

- The content of some degree programmes focused on the traditional mining disciplines. The prospects for these programmes are boosted by the growing need for mining experts. Studies in this field have a nationwide scope.
- Very good material facilities.
- The skills and creative ability to prepare study texts to support the teaching of basic subjects within the relevant fields of study.

2. Weaknesses

- The generally low numbers of teachers with academic titles still involved in research and the related quality of teaching in some fields.
- The low level of publishing by academics in impact factor journals and the associated low number of quality publications by PhD students.
- The large number of students per supervisor in most doctoral degree programmes (address this by means of a dean's directive or, better, throughout the institutions by means of a rector's directive).
- The diversity of fields of study, particularly in the bachelor's degree programmes, for which the faculty is short of staff. This applies in particular to teaching at the field offices in Most.
- Foreign-language teaching.
- Optional subjects.
- Little co-operation in the fields of science and education with foreign institutions.
- The faculty management stresses the excellence and uniqueness of the degree programmes. However, this is not reflected in excellence of output at either international or national level. Nor is there excellence in the organization of certain, admittedly unique, programmes.
- The faculty enjoys extensive collaboration with industry bodies. However, these are actually just ancillary activities as they do not stimulate any inspiring ideas for scientific output.

3. Opportunities

- Capitalize on the promise offered by degree programmes to increase interest in studying them. Do not seek to increase the number of students by expanding the number of fields whose appeal lies in their name rather than content.

4. Problems threatening the prospects for some accredited activities

- The lack of professors and readers still active in research; in the next few years this will have a major effect on the accreditation of habilitation procedure and procedure for appointment as a professor, as well also on the accreditation of doctoral degree programmes.

Recommendations for ACCR action in response to the faculty's applications for accreditation or the expansion of its activities:

1. Do not renew the accreditation of procedure for the appointment of professors in the following fields:
 - Mine surveying and geodesy,
 - Machine and process management.
2. If the faculty fails to demonstrate qualitative developments (staffing, publishing) in 2010 in the field of
 - Mine surveying and geodesy,do not renew the accreditation of habilitation procedure after the current accreditation expires in 2011.
3. After 2011, do not renew the accreditation of habilitation procedure in the field of
 - Machine and process management.

4. Retain the restrictions applied to the accreditation of the field of study “*Economics, management and informatics in public administration*”, the teaching of which may be provided by other workplaces at VŠB – Technical University of Ostrava.

Meeting 2008/3

Evaluation of the Faculty of Law, University of West Bohemia, Plzeň.

Conclusions and recommendations:

- 1) Expand the range of optional subjects focusing on foreign-language training. Consider whether the numerical thresholds for optional subjects complicate student profiling. Increase student awareness of the possibility of rating the standard of teaching. Consider the possibility of informing students of the results of evaluations and the related measures that have been taken – the creation of feedback in relation to the evaluator. Consider an alternative method of evaluation outside the STAG system which would clearly ensure the anonymity of the evaluator. Improve electronic communications between the study department and students. Extend the office hours of the study department or offer combined-study students an alternative communication channel.
- 2) Modify the conditions of the admissions process for those holding bachelor’s degrees in a legal specialization who are seeking a place in the *Law and Jurisprudence* master’s programme, so that parts of the internal regulations issued by the Faculty of Law of the University of West Bohemia are publicly available and apply to all graduates of a particular subject from all institutions in the Czech Republic.
- 3) In opinions on nostrification, monitor whether there are attempts to circumvent the conditions of accreditation in the Czech Republic, i.e. whether the quality meets the requirements, especially as regards institutions operating directly in the Czech Republic, and in cases of nostrification not for individuals but for whole classes of graduates. Prevent the potential misuse of the university’s name in various statements etc. used for the “advertising” and “marketing” purposes of other institutions.
- 4) Assess the progress made in lifelong learning, particularly in terms of the organization of direct teaching (efficiency and one-off stress), the proportions of direct and indirect teaching, the quality of teaching, given that a significant proportion of graduates then transfer to a bachelor form of study. Submit the internal evaluation of the progress in lifelong learning and the measures proposed to the Accreditation Commission by May 2009.
- 5) Pay attention to staffing. Present proposals for action – the prospects of improving the qualifications of key faculty staff (defence of doctoral theses, habilitation and appointment procedure), with an indication of the anticipated dates of the procedure (within a three-year timeframe), create conditions for ordinary workers whose activities at other workplaces will only be marginal (i.e. not more than half their workload) and who will significantly contribute to scientific and research work, thus forming the pedagogical and research kernel of the faculty.
- 6) Significantly increase the faculty’s scientific and research activities. Establish research priorities that could help attract high-quality grants in the future.
- 7) In the defence of dissertations, make certain of the quality of the external examiners and their reviews. Commissions must be composed of experts in the field.

Recommendations for the accreditation of degree programmes

- 1) The *Legal Specialization* bachelor's degree programme has accreditation valid until 1 June 2012. Therefore there is currently no need to renew this accreditation.
- 2) In relation to the master's degree programme *Law and Jurisprudence* the ACCR recommends extending the accreditation by 4 years. However, the ACCR also draws attention to a number of significant shortcomings, in particular as regards staffing, and calls on the Faculty of Law of the University of West Bohemia, within the meaning of Section 85(1) of the Higher Education Act, to remedy this situation and submit an inspection report by the end of April 2009. If these shortcomings are not fixed, the ACCR, in accordance with Section 85(2)(a) of the Higher Education Act, will make a proposal to the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports to limit the accreditation by preventing the enrolment of new candidates.
- 3) In relation to the doctoral degree programme *Theoretical Jurisprudence*, the ACCR found serious shortcomings, in particular the inadequate human resources and insufficient relevant scientific and research activities at the faculty. Against this background, the ACCR proposes an extension to the accreditation by 4 years only for current students to complete the course, and, within the meaning of Section 85(2)(a) of the Higher Education Act, proposes that the MoEYS limit the accreditation by preventing the enrolment of new candidates. The ACCR recommends that the Faculty of Law of the University of West Bohemia weigh up its options and decide which fields of doctoral studies (with regard to the above staffing analysis, the measures taken and an analysis of scientific activities and basic prospects for the further development of scientific research at the faculty and at the Institute of State and Law of the ASCR) it will try to defend in the future.

Evaluation of the Faculty of Business and Management, Brno University of Technology (FP VUT)

Conclusions and recommendations:

After considering all the evaluation documentation and the results of the work group's time at FP VUT, studying the requested materials, consulting the faculty management, and arranging a meeting between a representative of the Student Chamber of the Higher Education Council and students from the faculty, we are in a position to note that FP VUT is on an even keel. There is keen interest among candidates in studying here; the faculty offers students placements at foreign higher education institutions, invites professional experts, and provides teaching in foreign languages for a number of fields of study. It is involved in international cooperation, and there is significant industry interest in contributing to teaching and research.

In the overall assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of FP VUT's activities, of which the faculty is aware in many cases, the ACCR made the following recommendations to the FP VUT management:

- 1) In the conception of subjects for bachelor's and master's programmes, pay attention to their content and content continuity while bearing in mind their harmonization with the graduate profile for individual fields of study. Increase the optional component of teaching in line with students' specializations and in view of the focus of their final theses.
- 2) The systematic innovation of subjects is necessary in light of industry requirements and in order to increase their attractiveness – but not at the expense of quality.

- 3) Resolve the problems with the teaching of foreign languages – mainly in view of efforts to increase student mobility within the EU.
- 4) Gear staffing policy towards the acquisition of a sufficient number of good-quality internal teachers, especially at the rank of reader and professor, and motivate them to be more focused on their work at FP VUT and on scientific research.
- 5) In relation to habilitation and professorial procedure, it is necessary to change the practice where criteria are assessed only formally in quantitative terms, to improve the work of the habilitation and appointment commissions with an emphasis on examining the quality of publishing and research activities, and to discuss the quality criteria at the academic council. The ACCR considers the mentioned deficiencies to be serious and requires the submission, in June 2009, of an inspection report on the measures taken.
- 6) Improve the impact of PhD students in educational activities at FP VUT. Consider introducing a more effective incentive programme so that there is greater interest in internal doctoral studies.
- 7) Expand learning facilities for students at the faculty to reflect the increase in the number of students and new fields.
- 8) Improve the internal information system and IS/ICT, ensure the better deployment of study support for e-learning.

Evaluation of Akademie STING, o.p.s., Brno

Conclusions and recommendations:

The evaluation resulted in the general conclusion that ASting is a satisfactorily functioning private college. Personnel and organizational changes in 2007 and early 2008 were warranted and have proved effective. Further, the measures taken by ASting to improve its work, as detailed in the Evaluation Report, as well as in the Long-term Plan for the Years 2006/2010 and the 2007 Update, illustrate determined efforts at the quality operation and further development of the college.

Following up on ASting's existing plans, the ACCR makes the following recommendations:

- 1) In keeping with the global development trend of integrating fields of study and blurring the differences between the modern management of small, medium-sized and large organizational units, gradually innovate the content of the teaching material in the current bachelor's degree programmes "Economic Policy and Administration" (the fields "Taxation" and "Financial Control") and "Economics and Management" (the field "Organization and Management of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises"). Ensure that the graduate profile corresponds to changing needs in order for graduates to be successful in the modern workplace.
- 2) Strengthen the conceptual management of staff policy to hire further quality and promising internal experts in a basic employment relationship with ASting.
- 3) Focus on developing the research activities of ASting staff, particularly as regards external grant activities and publishing in prestigious sources of information. Expand these activities to the majority of the existing internal teaching staff.
- 4) Pay systematic attention to the further professional growth and qualifications of promising internal staff, especially by capitalizing on collaborations with leading domestic and foreign higher education institutions.
- 5) Increase existing or create new useful contacts with appropriate international partners with a view to participating in international programmes and cooperation.
- 6) Prepare the gradual introduction of teaching in English, especially for optional subjects.

- 7) Continue improving the quality and appropriate forms of study support for combined studies.
- 8) In the implementation of the new IS/ICT system for ASting, consider an appropriate level of e-learning, the provision of internet and intranet consultations and arrangements to ensure that students have access to relevant foreign information sources.

Recommendations for the accreditation of degree programmes

In view of the expiry this year of ASting's accreditation for its master's degree programme "Economics and Management", incorporating the field of study "Business Economics and Management", with a standard two-year study period and offered as a full-time or combined course, the ACCR recommends renewing this accreditation for a further 4 years.

Evaluation of Business School Ostrava (VSP)

Conclusions and recommendations:

VSP broadly complies, in its various areas of activity and arrangements for the provision thereof, with the requirements for bachelor's degrees placed on non-university higher education institutions operating as business schools. However, it should be noted that the biggest weakness is the staffing of the college with internal habilitated workers who are employed full time here. This weakness is perhaps tolerable in the bachelor's degree studies, but in relation to master's programmes this situation is undesirable and unsustainable in the long term.

- 1) The ACCR recommends that the VSP management pay maximum attention to staffing and take measures to ensure that staffing with internal habilitated workers is in line with the requirements of master's degrees. If the necessary improvements are not made, it would be appropriate to reassess the accreditation of the master's degree programme.
- 2) The ACCR recommends paying particular attention to the staffing of the degree programme provided off-site (at VSP's field offices). The degree programme in these workplaces should be secured in the same manner as at the seat of the college.

Recommendations for the accreditation of degree programmes

In view of the expiry this year of VSP's accreditation for its master's degree programme "Economics and Management", incorporating the field of study "Entrepreneurship", with a standard two-year study period and offered as a full-time or combined course, the ACCR recommends renewing this accreditation for a further 4 years. The ACCR also points out, within the meaning of Section 85(1) of the Higher Education Act, the above deficiencies and requires the submission of an inspection report, by the end of April 2009, which sets out how these shortcomings are being remedied. The report should include the details about the staffing of degree programmes off-site (at the college's field offices).

Evaluation of Plzeň College (VSPL)

Conclusions and recommendations:

The principal activity of this higher education institution is its teaching process, which is very well secured in terms of both material and human resources. VSPL currently provides teaching only in the bachelor fields of study, but the college is well placed to introduce master's studies. For the further development of the college, it is important that the management continues to pay sufficient attention to the professional and scientific growth of

its academic staff in order to ensure the rejuvenation of the teaching corps of professors and readers. As the school states in its evaluation report, the development of the scientific research and publishing activities of teachers would be desirable.

Meeting 2008/5

Evaluation of the Jan Evangelista Purkyně University (UJEP) in Ústí nad Labem

Conclusions and recommendations:

1. Resources of degree programmes for teacher training and didactics. At all the faculties, it is necessary to continue respecting the study framework (the provision of pedagogy and psychology studies) agreed with the Teacher Training Faculty, the scope of arrangements for teaching practice, the scope of State final examinations, continue the mutual communication of didacticians involved in the various fields of study and for different types of schools (primary, secondary education), and intensify this cooperation further. The doctoral study of didactics should be developed further in accordance with the current formulae. For the faculties in question, it is very important to raise the standard of pedagogical and psychological disciplines at the Teacher Training Faculty and to foster creative and research activity in them. Research activities in didactics for individual fields of study (especially in respect of accredited doctoral studies) should also be developed in cooperation with faculties where teacher training is provided.
2. Human resources. In all parts of the university and all degree programmes and fields where there is an apparent lack of habilitated workers, making departments dependent on “commuting” habilitated staff, create pressure for these “commuters” to educate PhD students for the UJEP at their “home” workplace (naturally, under the conditions of standard admissions procedure for doctoral studies). The situation could also be improved by the creation of a separate plan of qualification growth for each “problem” department. However, these plans must be realistic and checkable.
3. Academic activity. Creative, professional and research work should mainly be developed in the broader context of accredited degree programmes (educational activities), or in connection with the preparation of new accreditations and as a certain response to the needs of the region. It is not appropriate to develop expert activities in cases where they are inconsistent with the degree programmes in place at a department. Try to implement the effective interaction of the various components.
4. Publishing. It is impossible to make improvements here simply by having the institution’s own journals included in the R&D Council’s list and by developing internal publishing. These activities only carry any relevance if they have a narrowly targeted regional theme, but otherwise there must be unconditional attempts to publish in national and international journals. The publishing activities of university staff should be systematically monitored (where appropriate, motivational criteria can be applied).
5. Cooperation between the university’s individual parts. Intensify the cooperation of faculties where fields of study overlap – the creation of joint subjects (compulsory or “mandatorily optional” in certain degree programmes and their disciplines), the merger of departments which can provide teaching for multiple faculties, the submission and implementation of joint research projects. Operate on a “bottom-up” initiative. Explore solutions at the level of individual components and at the management level of the

university to streamline teaching and the use of skilled workers. Clarify the structure of degree programmes and their fields of study at faculties.

6. Combined studies. At faculty level, unify rules for combined studies (if accredited), develop study support for the distance learning element of combined studies (including, for example, e-learning programmes).
7. Credit system. Make the university's credit system compatible with ECTS credits and as such resolve the occasional problems with the recognition of credits when studying abroad. In humanities in particular, reduce contact teaching in favour of self-study – the reading of specialist texts, quality seminar work or projects, etc. .
8. Teaching in foreign languages. As far as possible, gradually create and integrate into Czech degree programmes subjects taught in foreign languages (especially English and German). Engage the younger generation in the teaching of these subjects. As such, gradually prepare for an increase in the number of fields of study provided in English or German. For younger members of staff, there may be significant financial incentives to teach in these fields (which will help stabilize their economic situation).
9. Internal evaluation. Try to increase student participation in student evaluations of teaching (explain the anonymity of the evaluation, use discretion to publish some of the evaluation analyses). Continue the analysis of evaluations by graduates.

Conclusions and recommendations for individual parts of UJEP

Teacher Training Faculty (PedF)

1. Securely stabilize accredited degree programmes and fields. Assess where fields of study overlap. Make their structure more transparent, even if there is a resultant reduction in the number of fields of study; profile students through optional subjects or modules. The accreditation of new programmes and fields is not recommended in the current situation (except to replace fields which no longer attract interest).
2. Stabilize the organizational structure of PedF. Do not split further workplaces (departments) and do not hive them off from the PedF structure.
3. Improve the faculty's human resources. Reduce the number of part-time workers, monitor the age structure of each workplace and create opportunities for professional growth, especially among younger staff. In the individual departments, create feasible, checkable career development plans.
4. The Departments of Pedagogy, Psychology and Primary Education are disproportionately burdened by pedagogical (but not teacher training) disciplines, in which there is keen interest. This situation must be urgently addressed by strengthening the staffing capacity because workers at these departments are now fully occupied by teaching and do not have room for professional growth. The standard of these departments is crucial not only for the Teacher Training Faculty, but also for other components of the university providing teacher training fields of study aimed at secondary schools. The priority is to provide teacher training. Increasing the number of non-teacher-training disciplines (no matter how attractive) would be a major risk for PedF.
5. Significantly fortify the creative and research activities carried out in connection with teaching and the faculty's specialization. Focus publishing on journals of national importance and on international journals (not regional periodicals and proceedings), establish systematic citation records. It is unacceptable that one third of the staff have not published.
6. Strengthen pan-university coordination in the provision of inter-faculty degree programmes and disciplines. The ACCR recommends establishing a framework agreement at university level rather than bilateral agreements between its various

components.

Faculty of Arts (FF)

1. Stabilize the structure of fields of study (this applies in particular to “German studies” and “Philosophy and political science”), create new fields of study only where this is necessary to round off the department profile.
2. Discourage the duplication of language departments for staffing and professional reasons (lack of quality staff, practical teacher training focus at the Teacher Training Faculty). For the time being, do not accredit any further language-range fields (Slavonic studies).
3. In the medium term, do not split the Department of Philosophy and Political Science. Instead, stabilize the number of staff and, in accordance with the newly accredited master’s programme, coherently develop the specialization of political philosophy, including research activities, which will further highlight the unique profile of the department within higher education teaching in the Czech Republic.
4. Revitalize the field of “German studies in Central Europe” (in the discussion it was observed that candidates express little interest in this area of study), develop the field of “Heritage documentation” in conjunction with technical fields of study cultivated at other UJEP faculties, and keep track of how graduates are able to apply their learning in practice. Continue to support the range-based focus in German studies, consider the possible establishment of Intercultural German Studies as a master’s field.

Faculty of Natural Sciences (PrF)

1. In the long term, stabilize the staffing situation at the faculty. Strengthen the qualification structure of academic staff. Involve lecturers in doctoral degree programmes through “commuting” habilitated workers (analyse the current situation – how many “commuting” habilitated workers currently train PrF staff?). Create conditions for and encourage workers to gain their habilitation. Develop a realistic timetable for the development of human resources (qualification structure) and subordinate staff policy to this timetable; review the timetable periodically.
2. Focus staff publishing on national journals, international journals, and IF journals (depending on the nature of the specific fields of study), not on proceedings or regional periodicals.
3. Assess the structure of fields of study. When presenting degree programmes and their fields for accreditation/re-accreditation, take into account not only the resource requirements at PrF, but also the projected market interest in the graduates.
4. Ensure the cohesion of the key lines of research in individual fields with the profiling of fields of study (themes of dissertations), particularly in master’s and doctoral programmes.
5. Place an emphasis on closer cooperation with other parts of the university: with the Teacher Training Faculty in the implementation of teacher training programmes and programmes focused on didactics. Cooperate with the Faculty of the Environment in the implementation of degree programmes in biology and chemistry. In the field of chemistry, consider the possibility of closer links with a similar centre at the Faculty of the Environment.

Faculty of the Environment (FZP)

1. Stabilize the staff situation at the faculty with regard to its field of educational activities and research focus. Promote research and engage more FZP staff in research, increase the incentive system to encourage publishing and research activities. Due to the large number of lecturers over 50 years, where the prospects of achieving further qualifications are

diminished, focus mainly on the younger generation; strengthen the position of key academics at the faculty in terms of the focus of research and teaching. Enable younger workers to take doctoral studies at workplaces where they can learn to publish in international journals. Research and educational activities should be linked to the needs of the region and should be interrelated, i.e. develop research activities in those fields where there is a master's degree or where the possibility of a master's or doctoral programme is becoming apparent.

2. Analyse where the content of different fields of study overlaps (within the faculty and in relation to other faculties at UJEP), and optimize their structure (including with respect to the efficiency of the activities).
3. Pay greater attention to the standard of theses. Theses should be supervised by teachers who have experience from their own publishing activities.
4. Enhance cooperation with other parts of the university, particularly with the Faculty of Natural Sciences, in the implementation of degree programmes and research activities.

Faculty of Social and Economic Studies (FSE)

1. Continue to work intensively on improving the structure of academic staff. Maintain and develop further the strategy for the nurturing of qualified staff, manage professional and academic activities with due regard for the degree programmes and fields of study. Continue the new strategy of training staff, i.e. encourage graduates of doctoral degree programmes to publish intensively and prepare their habilitation theses.
2. Pay individual attention to the field of Social Work. Draw up a realistic plan for the development of human resources (including checkable growth plans for qualifications).
3. Place an emphasis on improving the language skills of FSE academic staff and create conditions to ensure that FSE starts teaching selected subjects in English and German, which in the long run could gradually lead to the accreditation of degree programmes taught in English or German.
4. Increase the number of outgoing and, in particular, incoming students in the framework of exchange programmes with foreign partner institutions. In the organization of the faculty, improve the process for the recognition of courses taken abroad.
5. Seek to improve and more evenly distribute research and publishing activities at the faculty, give more room to staff preparing for habilitation.
6. Increase the share of publications in peer-reviewed journals of national importance, or in IF journals, and monographs published by prestigious publishing houses.
7. Strengthen cooperation with other parts of the university, particularly with the Faculty of Production Technology and Management (economic and management disciplines) and the Teacher Training Faculty (social sciences). Consider whether interlinking departments in the performance of educational and research work could lead to greater efficiency and better quality.
8. Instead of extensive development (the accreditation of new degree programmes), focus on stabilizing the current situation (in relation to social work in particular), including the systematic strengthening of creative and research activities.

Institute of Health Studies (UZS)

1. In the long term, stabilize the staffing situation at the institute. Strengthen the qualification structure of the academic staff, create conditions and encourage staff to study doctoral degree programmes. Do not expand the range of degree programmes and fields of study until the institute is much more settled and has developed.

2. Resolve the staffing situation at the Department of Nursing; studies should be led by a teacher who has practical experience in nursing in this area, continues to publish, and is professionally active.
3. Reinforce the publishing activities of academic staff, monitor whether this work is related to the subjects they teach.
4. Analyse current research or creative activity at UZS. Formulate a longer-term plan of research and creative activities at the institute in relation to the content of accredited fields of study.
5. Ensure that the range of themes for bachelor dissertations is more in line with the graduate profile and is practically oriented.
6. Resolve the problems associated with practical experience for students, interference with the examination period, or spread work experience over a longer period.
7. Enhance the mobility of students and academic staff. Strengthen the promotion of international mobility and the related individual care for students. Try to conclude bilateral agreements on student exchanges with partner higher education institutions (Saxony).
8. Make more use of regional contacts for international cooperation (and the possible post-graduate studies of staff).

Faculty of Art and Design (FUD)

1. Review the classification of fields of study and make it more transparent.
2. By 31 January 2009, present the ACCR with documents on a proper assessment of the *Photography* course reflecting the actual situation (curricula, a synopsis of subjects with all the formalities, the teaching staff at all the studios, with all the standard information on the qualifications and creative activities of teachers, where appropriate their activities at other workplaces, or the place and field of their habilitation procedure, etc.).
3. Continue to promote and encourage the acquisition of further qualifications, in particular among younger academics (the submission of applications for habilitation procedure) and ensure that the age structure of professors and readers at FUD is balanced.
4. Modify the method used to evaluate a studio (do not split an evaluation of a studio into student credits and examinations; evaluate only their examination-related activities).
5. Curatorship Studies, a field recently accredited under the master's degree programme, has not yet had any graduates. As soon as possible, provide the ACCR with samples of the first outputs (theses).
6. Enhance cooperation with other parts of the university, particularly with the Teacher Training Faculty, in the implementation of doctoral degree programmes and the organization of subjects related to theory and art history in bachelor's and master's programmes.

Faculty of Production Technology and Management (FVTM)

1. Conduct an analysis of the current structure of degree programmes and their fields of study. Consider the concept of more broadly based disciplines where students would be profiled through a range of mandatorily optional subjects or modules. Account should be taken not only of the human and material resources available to the faculty, but also of the job prospects of future graduates. New fields of study should be submitted for accreditation only in exceptional cases, i.e. if they would significantly complement the faculty's profile.
2. Consolidate the staffing of fields of study. As a matter of priority, address the situation at the KSM and KAD departments. Draw up a realistic plan for the development of human

resources (including checkable growth plans for qualifications). Increase publishing by ordinary teachers in international journals and specialist journals of national importance.

3. Continue to strengthen the participation of FVTM (as an institution!) in major grant projects. Research handled by some members of staff in the framework of grants awarded to another institution does not resolve the issue of the faculty's own research. The beneficiary or co-grantee of major grants must be FVTM.
4. Strengthen cooperation with other parts of UJEP, particularly with the Faculty of Natural Sciences (mathematics, physics and mechanics) and the Faculty of Social and Economic Studies (economics and management). In cooperation with the Teacher Training Faculty and the Faculty of Natural Sciences, consider the optimal way of implementing the teacher training degree programmes.

Faculty of Art and Design (FUD)

The ACCR sought further documents, in particular to clarify the current situation in the field of photography. The conclusions and recommendations will be formulated at the ACCR's April meeting after the current structure of the fields of study has been clarified.

Monitoring the implementation of conclusions and recommendations

The ACCR has requested the submission, in November 2010, of an inspection report for the university as a whole and for the individual components evaluated separately to show how the ACCR's conclusions and recommendations are being pursued.

Conclusions regarding the accreditation of degree programmes

1. The ACCR agrees with the six-year renewal of the accreditation of all bachelor's and master's degree programmes and their fields of studies currently implemented at UJEP or at units within UJEP, save for cases where accreditation has been limited or renewed only so that current students can complete their courses, and with the exception of the study of the bachelor's and master's Photography programme at FUD.
2. The ACCR requires the submission, in November 2010, of inspection report on the provision of the following degree programmes and fields of study:
 - PedF – for degree programmes incorporating pedagogical and psychological training, present the facilities in place for pedagogy and psychology
 - FF – political science degree programmes
 - PrF – informatics and chemistry degree programmes
 - FZP – all master's degree programmes
 - FSE – social work degree programme
 - UZS – the Nursing degree programme with the fields of study of General Nurse and Midwife
 - FVTM – the bachelor courses Glass and Polymer Processing Technology, Production Facilities, and the doctoral programme Engineering Technology

f) Statistics on developments in the number of accredited and non-accredited degree programmes in 2008

Comparison with the situation in 2007. The data highlighted in bold is for 2008.

applications	fields of study under doctoral degree programmes		fields of study under master's/follow-up master's degree programmes		fields of study under bachelor's degree programmes	
	approval	rejection	approval	rejection	approval	rejection
accreditation	303 373	15 7	8/125 1/152	0/22 19/24	112 148	24 29
accreditation renewal	56 43	0 0	242/47 175/106	0/0 0/0	192 268	0 0
accreditation expansion	17 27	5 2	6/115 1/145	0/15 0/8	145 177	29 40
+ proposal to restrict accreditation	1 0		0/0 0/0		0 0	
post-secondary vocational colleges and higher education institutions under Section 81					12 5	0 0
higher education institutions & institutes of the Academy of Sciences under Section 81	113 211	0 0				

+ for some fields, at the same time as renewing accreditation the ACCR proposed certain restrictions.

g) Statistics on developments in fields of study for habilitation procedure and professorship procedure in 2008

Comparison of data for 2007 and 2008. The figures for 2008 are in bold.

	habilitation procedure	professorship procedure	total
recommended	570 32	527 28	1097 60
not recommended	8 0	13 1	21 1

h) Summary of unfavourable and favourable opinions on the granting of State approval

In 2008, the ACCR assessed 9 applications for State approval, of which it recommended 3 (the relevant ACCR meeting is indicated in brackets):

Vysoká škola ekonomie a managementu, o.p.s. (College of Economics and Management), Ústí nad Labem (02-08)

Akcent College, s.r.o., Prague (03-08)

University of Northern Virginia – Prague, s.r.o., Prague (03-08)

Six applications were unsuccessful in seeking a recommendation from the ACCR:

Evropská akademie státu a práva, a.s. (European Academy of State and Law), Prague (01-08)

Vysoká škola aplikované psychologie, s.r.o. (College of Applied Psychology), Prague (02-08)

Vysoká škola BEAN, s.r.o. (BEAN College), Prague (02-08)

Vysoká škola sociálních studií, s.r.o. (College of Social Studies), Benešov (02-08)

Joštova akademie, o.p.s. (Jošt Academy), Brno (03-08)

Vysoká škola ekonomiky a řízení, a.s. (College of Economics and Management), Prague (05-08)

i) Summary of opinions on applications for the establishment or division of faculties

Application for an opinion on the establishment of the Faculty of Safety and Law, Police Academy of the Czech Republic, Prague

Application for an opinion on the establishment of the Faculty of Safety Management, Police Academy of the Czech Republic, Prague

Application for an opinion on the establishment of the Faculty of Social Policies, University of Ostrava

Application for an opinion on the establishment of the Faculty of Public Policies, Silesian University, Opava

Application for an opinion on the establishment of the Faculty of Health Studies, University of West Bohemia, Plzeň

Application for an opinion on the establishment of the Faculty of Health Studies, Masaryk University

Application for an opinion on the establishment of the Faculty of Regional Development and International Studies, Mendel University of Agriculture and Forestry, Brno

j) Summary of opinions on applications for the type-designation of higher education institutions

In 2008, the ACCR did not assess any applications for the type-designation of higher education institutions.

k) Summary of opinions issued on the basis of requests from the Minister for Education, Youth and Sports

Request from the Minister for Education for a new hearing on the delivery of an opinion on an application from the University of Finance and Administration (*Vysoká škola finanční a správní, o.p.s.*) for the accreditation of the doctoral programme *Economic Policy and Administration* with the field of study *Financial Markets and Institutions*, and for the remedying of deficiencies in the grounds of the opinion (02-08)

Request from the Ministry for Education for cooperation concerning an application from the University of Applied Economic Studies in České Budějovice (*Vysoká škola aplikovaných ekonomických studií v Českých Budějovicích, s.r.o.*) to expand the accreditation of its bachelor's degree programme "Economic Policy and Administration" with the field of study "Applied Economics in the Social Sphere" in order to include combined courses (04-08)