

QUALITY ASSURANCE AND IMPROVEMENT FRAMEWORK FOR UCA ACADEMIC PROGRAMMES

Reference Number: CTLT-002

Functional Area: Teaching and Learning

Approved Date:	02 April 2026
Approved by:	Academic Council
Effective Date:	20 May 2026
Applies to:	All UCA bachelor's and master's programmes
Responsible Office:	CTLT
Last Reviewed/Updated:	03 April 2026
Scheduled Review Date:	03 April 2029

RATIONALE: The Quality Assurance and Improvement Framework (QAI Framework) articulates the University of Central Asia's (UCA) shared commitment to academic standards, educational excellence, and continuous enhancement of the student learning experience. It provides a coherent institutional framework through which academic quality is owned by programme teams and academic staff and supported by University structures in line with UCA's mission, values, and regulatory obligations.

The QAI Framework is a *principle-led* policy document. Its main body sets out the purpose, guiding principles, governance arrangements, and core quality mechanisms that shape how academic quality is assured and enhanced across the University. Detailed procedures, tools, and templates are set out separately in annexes and supporting documents, allowing practice to evolve while maintaining clarity and consistency.

The Framework forms part of UCA's broader Teaching and Learning policy architecture and should be read alongside related policies, including the Course Administration Policy, Assessment Regulations, and Digital Learning Policy. Together, these documents provide an integrated basis for safeguarding academic integrity, supporting educational innovation, and ensuring that UCA programmes remain relevant, credible, and responsive to diverse stakeholders including students, society, and industry.

Table of Contents

1. POLICY STATEMENT	3
2. PURPOSE	3
3. SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY	4
4. DEFINITIONS.....	4
5. POLICY GUIDING PRINCIPLES	5
6. PRINCIPLES IN ACTION	6
7. QUALITY ASSURANCE CYCLE	7
8. MONITORING, REVIEW, AND REPORTING	8
9. GOVERNANCE AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR QUALITY	11
10. FRAMEWORK REVIEW	14
11. CONTACT INFORMATION	14
12. REVIEW HISTORY.....	14
Annex 1. Programme Development and Approval Guide.....	16
Annex 2. Annual Programme Reflection and Curriculum Review	19
Annex 3. Student Course Feedback.....	22
Annex 4. Programme Advisory Committees	27
Annex 7. UCA School of Arts and Sciences Award for Excellence in Teaching	29
Annex 8. Data for Quality Assurance and Improvement	33
Annex 9. Guidelines for Online Course Delivery	35
Annex 10. UCA faculty Professional Development framework	39
Annex 11. Documents for National Programme Accreditations	43

1. POLICY STATEMENT

1.1. The **Quality Assurance and Improvement (QAI) Framework** sets out the University's shared approach to assuring academic standards and supporting enhancement. It defines:

- the principles that underpin academic quality at UCA,
- the responsibilities of faculty, Schools, and central units in maintaining and improving quality,
- the core mechanisms through which programmes are monitored, reviewed, and enhanced.

1.2. The Framework is designed to balance accountability with development. It ensures that UCA meets national regulatory requirements and international expectations (e.g. *European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG, 2015)*¹), while also supporting reflective practice, pedagogical innovation, and evidence-informed improvement in teaching and learning.

1.3. Quality assurance at UCA is not conceived as a one-off compliance exercise, but as an ongoing, collaborative process embedded in and guiding the key aspects of academic work. Through this Framework, UCA seeks to foster a shared culture of academic responsibility, continuous improvement, and learning-centred education across all campuses.

2. PURPOSE

2.1. The QAI Framework sets out how the University of Central Asia maintains academic standards while continuously improving the quality of its programmes and the student learning experience. The Framework is intended to support good academic practice rather than prescribe uniform solutions, recognising disciplinary diversity and professional judgement.

2.2. Its primary purpose is to support academic staff, Schools, and academic leaders in designing, delivering, reviewing, and enhancing programmes that are intellectually rigorous, relevant to societal needs, and aligned with UCA's mission as a university serving mountain societies.

2.3. Specifically, the QAI Framework aims to:

- support high-quality teaching, learning, assessment, and programme design through systematic, evidence-informed reflection and enhancement,
- ensure that academic practices are aligned with UCA's institutional priorities, values, and academic mission, while meeting national regulatory requirements,
- promote scholarly, research-informed educational practices that strengthen curriculum quality and academic credibility,
- support student achievement, graduate employability, and meaningful societal contribution,
- safeguard the academic integrity, coherence, and long-term credibility of UCA awards,
- encourage appropriate benchmarking against international standards and good practice,

¹ *European Standards and Guidelines (ESG, 2015)* https://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG_2015.pdf

- and foster shared accountability for academic quality through constructive engagement with students, staff, alumni, employers, and external partners.
- 2.4. The QAI Framework is grounded in the principle of continuous improvement and shared responsibility for academic quality. It provides a structured foundation for regular review, data-informed decision-making, and collaborative enhancement, ensuring that UCA's programmes remain relevant, robust, and responsive in a changing educational and societal context. At its core, the Framework exists to protect and enhance UCA student experience its educational outcomes.

3. SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY

- 3.1. The QAI Framework applies to all academic degree programmes of the University of Central Asia, across all campuses and modes of delivery.
- 3.2. It guides the work of:
- academic staff involved in programme design, teaching, assessment, and review,
 - professional and administrative staff who support academic delivery and quality processes,
 - institutional academic governance bodies, including School Academic Committees, the Academic Council, the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology (CTLT), and the Registrar's Office.
- 3.3. Students, alumni, employers, and external experts contribute to academic quality through structured feedback, evaluation, and advisory processes. Their perspectives form an essential part of evidence-based programme review and continuous improvement.

4. DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this Framework, the following definitions apply:

- **Academic Staff** – Faculty members, instructors, and researchers involved in the design, delivery, assessment, and review of academic programmes.
- **CTLT** – Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology.
- **GSD** – Graduate School of Development.
- **MoE(s)** – Ministry or Ministries of Education of UCA's founding states.
- **MPD(s)** – Master's Programme Director(s), responsible for academic leadership of Master's programmes.
- **PAD(s)** – Programme Academic Director(s), responsible for academic leadership of undergraduate and preparatory programmes.
- **Programme(s)** – Academic programmes offered by UCA, including the Preparatory Year, Cooperative Education (Co-op), undergraduate (Bachelor's), and graduate (Master's) programmes.
- **QA (Quality Assurance)** – The policies, structures, and processes through which the University ensures that academic standards are met, regulatory requirements are satisfied, and awards remain credible and secure.

- **QI (Quality Improvement)** – The continuous, evidence-informed process of enhancing teaching, learning, assessment, and programme design, drawing on data, reflection, and feedback from students, staff, alumni, and external partners.
- **RO** – Registrar’s Office.
- **SAS** – School of Arts and Sciences.
- **TLC** – Teaching and Learning Committee.
- **UCA (the University)** – The University of Central Asia.

Within this Framework, Quality Assurance and Quality Improvement are understood as complementary and mutually reinforcing processes. Academic Directors from across Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programmes work collaboratively with academic support teams and units to uphold and enhance academic quality.

5. POLICY GUIDING PRINCIPLES

5.1. The QAI Framework is grounded in the higher education legislation and quality assurance requirements of UCA’s Founding States and is informed by recognised international standards for higher education quality assurance, including the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG, 2015).

5.2. Within this regulatory context, the Framework sets out the principles through which UCA assures and enhances academic quality across all programmes, campuses, and modes of delivery. These principles reflect the University’s mission as a regional institution committed to academic excellence, integrity, innovation, community engagement, continuous learning, and the social and economic development of the societies it serves:

- **Academic Excellence and Integrity:** UCA is committed to maintaining high and consistent academic standards across all programmes and campuses and to ensuring the fairness, validity, and integrity of teaching, assessment, certification, and awards. Academic excellence is reflected in the rigour, quality, and credibility of academic provision, in high-quality teaching, and in meaningful student learning. It is supported by ethical conduct, honesty in scholarship, and institutional practices that protect academic integrity and public confidence in the University’s awards.
- **Scholarly, Research-Informed and Technology-Enhanced Education:** Education at UCA is expected to be current, scholarly, and informed by disciplinary knowledge, research, international good practice, and the purposeful use of technology and educational innovation in support of teaching and learning.
- **Innovation and Developmental Impact:** Academic quality at UCA is understood in relation to the University’s commitment to serving the communities in which it operates. Quality education is therefore defined not only by academic standards, but also by the relevance and responsiveness of programmes to local needs and opportunities, and by their contribution to social and economic development and the

cultivation of innovation and entrepreneurial capacity across the University community.

- **Continuous Improvement, Accountability and Shared Responsibility:** Academic quality is sustained through continuous improvement, clear accountability, and shared responsibility across the University community. Quality assurance and enhancement therefore rely on regular review, critical reflection, evidence-informed action, and transparent processes, and are strengthened through collaboration and partnership with students, staff, alumni, employers, communities, and external partners, while remaining informed by relevant national, regional, and international reference points.

6. PRINCIPLES IN ACTION

- 6.1. The principles set out in this QAI Framework are operationalised through a coherent set of procedures, policies, and institutional structures that together support the assurance and continuous enhancement of academic quality at UCA.
- 6.2. Quality assurance and improvement are embedded within UCA's normal academic and governance processes rather than treated as separate or standalone activities. Procedures clarify roles, responsibilities, and decision points for key quality processes, while complementary institutional policies, terms of reference, and committees provide the structures through which these processes are implemented and overseen.
- 6.3. Many procedures and policies contribute to more than one principle of the Framework. This reflects the integrated nature of UCA's approach to academic quality, in which activities such as programme review, assessment design, staff development, student feedback, and external engagement simultaneously support academic standards, enhancement, and innovation.
- 6.4. Taken together, these procedures and structures are intended to provide clarity, consistency, and proportionality, enabling academic staff and academic leaders to focus on improving teaching, learning, and student outcomes while meeting institutional and regulatory requirements.

The Framework is designed to support academic judgement and professional practice, not to replace them, and to encourage reflective improvement rather than compliance-driven reporting.

Table 1: How QAI principles are implemented at UCA

This table illustrates how each guiding principle of the QAI Framework is enacted through specific procedures and supported by institutional policies and governance structures.

<i>Principle</i>	<i>Procedures</i>	<i>Connected Policies and Structures</i>
<i>Academic Excellence and Integrity</i>	Programme Development and Approval Guide (Annex 1); Exam Proctoring Protocol for Undergraduate Programmes (link); SAS Teaching Awards (Annex 7);	UCA Academic Policies, including Academic Integrity Policy; Assessment Regulations (TBD)

<i>Scholarly, Research-Informed and Technology-Enhanced Education</i>	Guidelines for Online Course Delivery (<i>Annex 9</i>); Peer Observation of Teaching (<i>link</i>).	Course Administration Policy; Digital Learning Policy (TBA)
<i>Innovation and Developmental Impact</i>	Programme Development and Approval Guide (<i>Annex 1</i>); Curriculum Review (<i>Annex 2</i>); Programme Advisory Committees (<i>Annex 4</i>) Final-Year Theses and State Exam Committee Reports.	UCA Innovation Hub documents; UCA Partnership regulations and records;
<i>Continuous Improvement, Accountability and Shared Responsibility</i>	Student course feedback (<i>Annex 3</i>); Data for QAI (<i>Annex 8</i>) Curriculum Review (<i>Annex 2</i>); Peer observation of teaching (<i>link</i>); SAS Teaching Awards (<i>Annex 7</i>). Regular analyses and review of admission criteria; Student performance analytics; Graduate employability and Placement Reports; Final-Year Theses and State Exam Committee Reports;	Professional Development Framework (<i>Annex 10</i>) UCA Undergraduate Admission Policy

No single procedure or policy operates in isolation; quality assurance and enhancement at UCA relies on the cumulative and interconnected application of these mechanisms across the academic lifecycle.

7. QUALITY ASSURANCE CYCLE

7.1.UCA's approach to academic quality is organised around a continuous **Plan–Do–Check–Act (PDCA)** cycle that is embedded in the full lifecycle of programme design, delivery, and review. Rather than a standalone compliance process, the cycle reflects how academic teams plan, deliver, reflect on, and enhance their programmes in practice. It ensures that quality assurance and quality improvement are systematic, evidence-informed, and integral to everyday academic work.

- **Plan:** Programme teams articulate programme purpose, learning outcomes, admission criteria and graduate attributes (or core literacies), ensuring alignment with UCA's

mission, regional context, and national regulatory requirements. Programme and course design, approval, and modification follow the procedures set out in the *Programme Development and Approval Guide* (Annex 1) and are supported by the *Course Administration Policy*.

- **Do:** Academic staff deliver teaching, learning, and assessment in line with approved curricula, with attention to coherence, fairness, and consistency across courses and cohorts. Teaching practice is supported through peer observation, professional development, and guidance provided by UCA Academic Policies, the Course Administration Policy, and Assessment Regulations. Academic integrity is upheld in accordance with the *Academic Integrity Policy*.
- **Check:** Programme quality and effectiveness are reviewed using a combination of quantitative and qualitative evidence, including student performance data, analyses of admissions to graduate and undergraduate programmes, student and alumni feedback (Annex 3), quality assurance datasets (Annex 8), advisory input, and external review processes (Programme Advisory Committees – Annex 4). This evidence is used to identify strengths, emerging risks, and opportunities for improvement.
- **Act:** Insights from review and evaluation are translated into targeted enhancement actions. These may include curriculum revisions, adjustments to teaching and assessment practices, staff development priorities, or updates to supporting policies and guidance. Key mechanisms include curriculum review processes (Annex 2), action planning and follow-up, and the sharing of effective practice through initiatives such as the SAS Award for Excellence in Teaching (Annex 7).

7.2. Through this cyclical approach, reflection and improvement are embedded within UCA's academic culture. The **PDCA cycle** directly informs the monitoring, review, and reporting arrangements described in Section 8 and supports coherent decision-making at programme, school, and institutional levels.

8. MONITORING, REVIEW, AND REPORTING

8.1. Monitoring, review, and reporting enable the University to assure and enhance the quality, relevance, and integrity of its academic programmes. Together, these processes support reflective practice, informed decision-making, and continuous improvement, while ensuring appropriate accountability to internal and external stakeholders. UCA's approach emphasises proportionate, evidence-informed review, embedded in academic practice rather than treated as a separate compliance activity.

8.2. UCA applies three complementary forms of monitoring and review that together create a continuous feedback loop for academic quality and institutional learning:

- **Ongoing monitoring**, embedded in educational delivery and supporting timely enhancement,
- **Periodic review**, providing in-depth evaluation of programme quality, relevance, and sustainability,

- **Self-assessment and accreditation review**, conducted to meet national and international regulatory requirements.

8.3. Ongoing monitoring

- 8.3.1. Ongoing monitoring is embedded in teaching and learning activities and focuses on identifying strengths, emerging issues, and opportunities for improvement. Evidence used for ongoing monitoring typically includes:
- Student course feedback
 - Student performance, progression, retention and completion data
 - Moderation and cross-verification of assessments to ensure fairness and consistency
 - Observation of teaching, including required observation for newly appointed faculty and continuing peer observation
 - Faculty feedback on the quality of education of admitted students
- 8.3.2. Findings from ongoing monitoring form *Annual Programme Reflection* and *Curriculum Review* processes (*Annex 2*) along with professional development priorities, resource planning, and policy refinement.
- 8.3.3. Key reflections, decisions, and agreed actions arising from ongoing monitoring are recorded through programme-level meetings and relevant academic committees, ensuring continuity and institutional memory.
- 8.3.4. Programme Directors report material findings and enhancement actions arising from ongoing monitoring to School Academic Committees and Deans as part of routine academic governance.

8.4. Periodic review

- 8.4.1. Periodic review provides a structured, holistic evaluation of programme quality, relevance, and sustainability, confirming alignment with UCA's mission, regional priorities, and academic standards. Core components include:
- Review of programme aims, structure, and learning outcomes,
 - Analysis of student achievement, graduate pathways, employability outcomes, and stakeholder feedback,
 - Analyses of the admissions results,
 - External input from subject experts, employers, and alumni, as appropriate,
 - Evaluation of teaching, learning, assessment practices, and resource adequacy.
- 8.4.2. Periodic reviews (*Curriculum review – Annex 2*) are normally conducted every three years or earlier where risk, performance, or regulatory requirements indicate the need.

8.5. Self-assessment Review and National Accreditation

- 8.5.1. Self-assessment is a structured, reflective process through which UCA evaluates the quality, relevance, integrity, and effectiveness of its academic provision against: national regulatory requirements in the Founding States, institutional standards and policies, and international good practice.

8.5.2. Its primary purpose is not compliance alone, but **institutional learning, improvement, and assurance of academic credibility**.

8.5.3. UCA's self-assessment processes typically address the following core components:

- Academic standards and curriculum coherence, including programme design, learning outcomes, and assessment integrity,
- Quality of teaching and learning, including pedagogy, staff capability, and learning resources,
- Student experience and outcomes, including progression, completion, employability, and graduate pathways,
- Governance and quality management, including internal oversight, data use, and enhancement processes,
- Resources and sustainability, including staffing, infrastructure, and institutional capacity to deliver programmes effectively.

8.5.4. Self-assessment draws on multiple sources of evidence and review mechanisms (*see List of documents for National Accreditation in Annex 11*), including:

- Programme and course-level data (student performance, progression, completion),
- Student, alumni, and stakeholder feedback,
- Outcomes of periodic curriculum review and Annual Programme Reflection,
- External examiner, advisory board, and peer review input,
- National standards and accreditation criteria.
- Feedback of the admission committee members
- Feedback of applicants (if possible, even the feedback of those applicants who were not admitted to the university)
- Annual review the effectiveness and gaps of the promotion

Together, these mechanisms ensure that self-assessment is **evidence-informed, triangulated, and developmental**.

8.5.5. UCA conducts institutional and programme-level self-assessment reviews in line with national accreditation cycles and regulatory requirements in the Founding States.

8.5.6. Findings and recommendations arising from self-assessment and accreditation processes inform:

- institutional policy development,
- strategic and academic planning,
- resource allocation,
- enhancement actions at programme and institutional level.

8.5.7. Progress against required actions is monitored through established governance channels, and outcomes are synthesised institutionally to ensure coherence between external quality standards and UCA's internal quality assurance and enhancement cycle.

8.6. Quality Calendar

8.6.1. UCA maintains an institutional Quality Calendar that sequences Annual Programme Reflection (APR), Curriculum Review (CR), and Self-assessment activities. The Quality

Calendar ensures that internal quality assurance and enhancement cycles are aligned with national accreditation timelines, while allowing sufficient time for evidence gathering, analysis, reflection, and implementation of improvement actions.

Table 1. Indicative Cycle (2025–2030)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Institutional QA Focus</i>	<i>Main Activity</i>
2025	Consolidation	Curriculum Review (CR) across all programmes and Self-assessment reports
2026	National Accreditation	Institutional and Programme accreditation
2027	Enhancement	APR
2028	Consolidation	CR
2029	Monitoring	APR
2030	Consolidation	APR, Preparation for the next institutional Self-assessment

8.7. Risks to programme quality, academic standards, or regulatory compliance identified through ongoing monitoring, periodic review, or self-assessment are escalated through School Academic Committees to the Academic Council and, where appropriate, to Senior Management and the Rector.

8.8. The purpose of escalation is to ensure timely awareness, proportionate response, and institutional learning, rather than to assign fault.

8.9. Identified quality-related risks are incorporated into School-level risk registers and, where material, reflected in the University’s institutional risk framework.

8.10. Such risks are monitored through established governance and assurance mechanisms, including reporting to the University’s Audit and Risk Committee, where relevant.

8.11. Where material non-compliance with approved quality processes or academic standards is identified, the Dean will commission a corrective action plan with clearly defined actions, responsibilities, timelines, and monitoring arrangements.

8.12. Progress against corrective actions is reported through School Academic Committees to the Academic Council.

8.13. Persistent or systemic non-compliance, or risks that cannot be mitigated at School level, may trigger a targeted review commissioned by the Rector.

9. GOVERNANCE AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR QUALITY

9.1. UCA recognises that academic quality and standards are a shared institutional responsibility, grounded first and foremost in academic practice. Primary ownership rests with academic staff and programme teams, who are responsible for designing, delivering, evaluating, and continuously improving programmes to ensure alignment with intended learning outcomes, academic standards, and a high-quality student learning experience.

9.2. Quality oversight is exercised through University- and School-level academic governance structures. These structures provide coherence, assurance, and accountability, ensuring that

academic provision aligns with UCA’s mission, strategic priorities, and applicable national and international requirements, while respecting academic autonomy and professional judgement.

9.3.Responsibility for academic quality is therefore distributed across multiple levels of the University, with clearly defined roles that support effective collaboration between programme teams, Schools, and central academic units. These roles are outlined below.

9.4.The allocation of responsibilities below reflects the principle that academic quality is owned by academic communities and assured through proportionate governance.

<i>Entity / Level</i>	<i>Responsibilities</i>
<i>Academic Staff and Programme Teams</i>	Design, deliver, and continuously enhance academic programmes; ensure the validity, fairness, and integrity of assessment; engage in ongoing review and improvement informed by evidence, student and peer feedback, and scholarly practice.
<i>PADs/MPDs</i>	Provide academic leadership and oversight of programme quality and coherence; analyse student performance and other relevant data for quality monitoring; lead annual and periodic programme reviews; work with RO on annual and periodic admission reviews; report to Associate Deans and School Deans on programme performance, risks, and enhancement outcomes. Responsibilities are governed by their respective Terms of Reference.
<i>School Deans, Associate Deans and Academic Operations</i>	Ensure effective implementation of quality assurance and improvement processes within the School; monitor programme delivery and performance; support faculty in enhancement activities; and ensure compliance with institutional policies and external requirements.
<i>School Academic Committees</i>	Oversee academic quality at School level; review evidence from programme monitoring and review processes; evaluate enhancement actions; and submit recommendations to the Academic Council. The SAS Committee oversees undergraduate programmes, and the GSD Committee oversees Master’s programmes. Responsibilities are defined in their Terms of Reference.
<i>Academic Council</i>	Serve as the University’s highest academic authority; approve new programmes and major programme changes; and ensure institutional compliance with the QAI Framework, academic policies, and external quality standards. The full scope of responsibilities is defined in its Terms of Reference. The Academic Council approves amendments to the QAI Framework.

<i>Office of the Registrar</i>	Ensure compliance with academic regulations, licensing, and documentation standards; coordinate institutional accreditation processes; provide authoritative academic data for quality monitoring; and report relevant quality and compliance matters to the Rector and academic governance bodies.
<i>Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology</i>	Support and coordinate quality assurance and improvement processes; analyse and synthesise academic quality data; produce institutional quality reports; and facilitate professional development in teaching, learning, assessment, and educational innovation.
<i>Rector and Senior Management</i>	Provide strategic oversight of academic quality; ensure that adequate resources, systems, and governance structures are in place to support effective implementation of the QAI Framework; and address systemic risks to academic standards or quality.
<i>Students</i>	Act as partners in quality assurance and enhancement through structured feedback mechanisms, representation on academic committees, and participation in programme review processes, ensuring that the student perspective informs decision-making and supports relevant, engaging, and high-quality learning experiences.

9.5.UCA's quality assurance and improvement processes operate through clearly defined lines of reporting, oversight, and decision-making:

- **Board of Trustees** – Receives reports on institutional academic performance, quality, and risk from the Rector (principally through the Academic and Student Affairs Committee).
- **Rector and Senior Management** – Provide strategic oversight of academic quality and ensure alignment of resources, structures, and priorities.
- **Academic Council** – Holds final authority over academic standards, programme approval, and major academic changes.
- **School Academic Committees** – Review evidence on programme quality and performance and monitor enhancement actions at School level.
- **School Deans, Associate Deans** – Ensure the effective implementation of quality assurance and improvement processes within their Schools and compliance with institutional policies and external requirements.
- **Programme Directors and Programme Teams** – Hold primary responsibility for managing programme quality, conducting monitoring and review activities, and implementing enhancement actions.
- **Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology (CTLT) and Office of the Registrar** – Provide institutional coordination, analytical support, professional guidance, and compliance oversight for quality assurance and improvement processes.

10. FRAMEWORK REVIEW

10.1. The QAI Framework is reviewed every three years, or earlier if required by changes in national regulations, institutional strategy, or accreditation standards. The review is led by CTLT in consultation with Schools, the Academic Council, and external experts.

11. CONTACT INFORMATION

11.1. Centre of Teaching, Learning and Technology, ctlte@ucentralasia.org

12. REVIEW HISTORY

Revision №	Date	Approved by	Revision description	Process Owner
	02.04.2026	Academic Council	New Policy	CTLT

Annex list:

1. Programme Development and Approval Procedure
2. Curriculum Review
3. Student Course Feedback
4. Programme Advisory Committees
5. Exam Proctoring Guide (a separate document, [link](#))
6. Peer Observation Guide (a separate document, [link](#))
7. UCA SAS Award for Excellence in Teaching
8. Data for Quality Assurance and Improvement
9. Guidelines for Online Course Delivery
10. UCA Faculty Professional Development Framework
11. Documents for National Programme Accreditations

Annex 1. Programme Development and Approval Guide

- 1.1. This guide outlines the University of Central Asia's (UCA) process for the initiation, development, approval, and implementation of new academic programmes across undergraduate and graduate levels. The guide ensures that all new programmes align with UCA's mission, strategic priorities, quality standards, and regulatory requirements, and that they are relevant, feasible, and sustainable.
- 1.2. New academic programmes may be initiated by Programme Academic Directors (PADs), Deans of Schools, Associate Deans, faculty members, the Rector's Office, or upon recommendation from external stakeholders (e.g., Ministries of Education, employers, or advisory boards). The rationale for proposing a new programme must be clearly articulated and aligned with UCA's mission and strategic academic development priorities.
- 1.3. The programme development starts with a Concept Note. A Concept Note must be developed at the initial stage. It must include:
 - Justification and strategic alignment;
 - Target audience and societal need;
 - Preliminary graduate profile and programme learning outcomes;
 - Proposed degree type, length, structure, and mode of delivery;
 - Anticipated resources and faculty requirements;
 - Consideration of licensing, accreditation, and compliance with MoE regulations.
- 1.4. The Concept Note must be endorsed by the Dean of the respective School and submitted to the Academic Council for review and recommendation.
- 1.5. Following approval of the Concept Note, the proposing unit must conduct a feasibility analysis in consultation with:
 - CTLT;
 - Registrar's Office;
 - Associate Deans;
 - Finance and Human Resources Departments;
 - Relevant external partners or peer institutions.

The purpose of the consultation is to assess institutional capacity, resource readiness, sustainability, and alignment with national and international academic standards and regulatory requirements.

- 1.6. Upon successful completion of the feasibility analysis, a full Programme Proposal must be submitted. The Proposal must contain:
 - Full curriculum with course structure and credit allocation aligned with the relevant state educational standard;
 - Programme learning outcomes and graduate profile;
 - Teaching, learning, and assessment strategies;
 - Faculty qualifications and staffing plan;
 - Student support, infrastructure, and digital learning provisions;

- Programme governance, review mechanisms, and budget estimates.

The Proposal must follow UCA's Credit Framework Policy, part of UCA Academic Policies, and be submitted using the approved template.

1.7. The Programme Proposal must undergo the following internal review process:

- Peer review by CTLT and internal academic reviewers;
- Consultation with the Programme Advisory Committee (if applicable);
- Review and endorsement by the Dean and School-level Academic Committee;
- Review and recommendation by the Academic Council;
- Final approval by the UCA Board of Trustees.

1.8. Where required, proposals must be submitted to the relevant Ministry of Education for licensing and accreditation by the Office of the Registrar. External expert feedback may also be solicited as part of quality assurance and benchmarking against comparable programmes.

1.9. Upon internal and external approval, the programme is implemented according to an approved launch plan. The plan includes:

- Faculty recruitment and onboarding;
- Development of course syllabi and materials;
- Programme marketing and admissions preparation;
- Infrastructure and logistical readiness.

1.10. CTLT provides instructional design and pedagogical support throughout the implementation phase.

1.11. All programmes undergoing their first full cycle of delivery following institutional approval are subject to enhanced monitoring during their first cycle of delivery. Enhanced monitoring of newly approved programmes includes:

- systematic collection and analysis of student and faculty midterm and end-of-the course feedback;
- analyses of the admission quality and process
- ongoing programme reflection and documentation of adjustments made during the first cycle;
- implementation of early alert measures to identify and address concerns related to student performance, workload balance, or resource adequacy;
- regular progress reporting to the School Academic Committee and CTLT for oversight and guidance; and
- submission of a *First-Cohort Completion Report*, including analysis of graduate outcomes, stakeholder feedback, and recommendations for programme improvement.

1.12. The outcomes of enhanced monitoring inform the subsequent full programme review and future curriculum adjustments. Newly introduced programmes shall undergo annual review throughout the period of the first cohort's progression and until the completion of the first cohort. Thereafter, they shall be reviewed every three years.

- 1.13. The responsibility for developing and submitting new programme proposals lies with the PAD/MPD or designated faculty lead, under the supervision of the Dean and Associate Deans. Full governance responsibilities are set out in Section 9 of the QAI Framework.
- 1.14. Course development and approval are described in the Course Administration Policy.
- 1.15. This guide will be read in conjunction with the UCA Quality Assurance and Improvement (QAI) Framework, which outlines the principles, governance, and monitoring processes that underpin programme approval and ongoing review.
- 1.16. Change log:

Revision No	Date	Approved by	Revision description	Process Owner

Annex 2. Annual Programme Reflection and Curriculum Review

1. Annual Programme Reflection

- 1.1. Annual Programme Reflection (APR) is a light-touch, faculty-led annual process through which each programme reflects on the academic year, identifies emerging needs and issues, and considers actions to support programme improvement.
- 1.2. APR is led by the Academic Directors (PAD) of Undergraduate and Postgraduate programs and undertaken collectively by faculty teaching in the programme. Other relevant academic staff may be invited to participate, where appropriate.
- 1.3. APR normally takes place at the end of the academic year and draws on relevant evidence, including student performance, student feedback, faculty reflections, and issues arising in programme delivery. The format, duration, and guiding questions are determined by the faculty teaching in the programme.
- 1.4. APR is developmental in purpose and is intended to support programme-level reflection, priority-setting, and planning for the following academic year.
- 1.5. The outcomes of APR are documented in meeting minutes. The PAD/MPD reports the main outcomes to the SAS Academic Committee and records any agreed follow-up actions for programme use.

2. Curriculum review

- 2.1. Curriculum Review (CR) is a key mechanism for periodic programme assessment and improvement.
- 2.2. Conducted every three years, between formal Programme Self-assessment, typically in June, it ensures that all academic programmes remain high quality, relevant, and aligned with UCA's mission, values, and external standards. The process is faculty-led, evidence-informed, and supported by the Centre for Teaching, Learning, and Technology (CTLT).
- 2.3. Findings from the APR and CR constitute institutional monitoring processes described in the QAI Framework (Sections 6–8), ensuring full alignment across all quality assurance activities.
- 2.4. CR is led by the PAD/MPD in collaboration with the Dean, Associate Deans of the respective School. All faculty members teaching in the programme are engaged in the process. External experts, employers, partners, alumni, and student representatives may be invited to provide feedback and ensure objectivity. Their perspectives help shape targeted recommendations to improve programme quality, relevance, and impact.
- 2.5. The CR may be informed by the findings and recommendations of the Programme Advisory Committee as described in Annex 4. Programme Advisory Committees.
- 2.6. Each curriculum review follows a structured process outlined in the Curriculum Review Guide. The main stages include:

a. Preparation and Framing

- The PAD/MPD identifies programme- or area-specific guiding questions that focus the review. These may address:
 - Strategic alignment with institutional priorities;

- Curriculum structure, coherence, and progression;
- Quality of teaching, learning, and available resources;
- Alignment between programme learning outcomes (PLOs), course learning outcomes (CLOs), and assessment practices;
- Integration of interdisciplinary and regionally relevant elements, including responsible use of generative AI in teaching and assessment;
- Student support, academic advising, and faculty development.
- CTLT may recommend additional focal areas based on cross-programme observations or recurring institutional themes.
- CTLT compiles and provides relevant evidence and data, including student performance trends, course evaluation summaries, alumni feedback, and outcomes of external reviews.
- CTLT prepares the School Curriculum Review Guide, outlining the guiding questions, review timeline, and procedural steps for the cycle.

b. Discussion

- The Programme team and other relevant participants meet to discuss each guiding question, analyse evidence and agree on priority actions
- Each team summarises key discussion points and proposals for improvement.

c. Synthesis and Action Planning

- Programme teams summarise and prioritise key findings, draft proposed actions, and identify data or support required for implementation. Draft action plans are validated by the Dean and shared with CTLT for integration into the School's quality enhancement plan.

d. Reporting and Follow-Up

- The PAD/MPD prepares the *Curriculum Review Minutes* within two weeks of completing the review, summarising key findings, decisions, and proposed actions.
- The Associate Deans and Dean reviews minutes and provides comments.
- The PAD/MPD reports major discussion points and proposed actions to the School's Academic Committee for endorsement and follow up.
- The Dean communicates the summary of the programme reports to the UCA Academic Council.

2.7. Each programme submits Curriculum Review Meeting Minutes following the structure below:

Programme/Area:

- Review Dates:
- Participants:
- Guiding Questions
- Summary of Discussions
- Proposed Revisions and Follow-Up Actions

- Resource and Support Needs
- Attachments
- Programme plans for the next academic cycle

2.8. CTLT maintains an archive of all Curriculum Review Minutes and synthesises recurring themes across programmes to inform institutional enhancement priorities. CTLT ensures that Curriculum Review Minutes are accessible to succeeding PADs/MPDs to support continuity of practice and institutional learning.

2.9. A focused curriculum review may be initiated between full review cycles to address specific issues or opportunities. This abbreviated process is initiated by the PAD/MPD in consultation with the Dean and CTLT, following a modified scope and reporting format.

2.10. The primary outcomes of curriculum and reflection processes include:

- Updated programme learning outcomes and structure;
- Improved vertical and horizontal scaffolding of courses;
- Enhanced assessment and teaching strategies;
- Clear implementation plans integrated into programme operations.\

2.11. The outcomes of internal programme reviews are integrated into UCA's continuous improvement cycle and reported through the annual quality report to the Academic Council and Senior Management.

2.12. Change log:

Revision No	Date	Approved by	Revision description	Process Owner

Annex 3. Student Course Feedback

- 1.1. The Student Course Feedback Procedure ensures that students' experiences of their courses are collected and reviewed in a systematic, efficient, and transparent manner. The feedback process is a core component of UCA's Quality Assurance and Improvement (QAI) Framework, supporting the continuous enhancement of teaching, learning, and course design.
- 1.2. The primary goal of this procedure is to enable students to provide constructive feedback on their learning experience, contributing to teaching excellence and student success. Findings from student course feedback inform Annual Programme Reflections (APR), Curriculum Reviews (CR), and institutional quality reports, ensuring that student perspectives directly inform UCA's continuous improvement cycle.
- 1.3. All courses and components of UCA academic programmes are subject to student course feedback. Courses delivered through external digital learning providers follow a separate feedback form adapted to the nature and delivery format of those courses.
- 1.4. Findings from course feedback serve as one of several evidence sources used to evaluate and enhance the quality, relevance, and effectiveness of UCA's academic provision. Non-credit courses are excluded from this procedure.
- 1.5. The principles of the Student course feedback procedure are:
 - *Continuous Improvement*: Student course feedback is conducted to enhance teaching and learning and forms part of instructors' ongoing commitment to improving student experience.
 - *Anonymity*: All feedback is anonymous. Instructors do not have access to completed forms and must not be present during the feedback session or attempt to influence student responses.
 - *Confidentiality*: Individual course feedback data will not be publicly disclosed. Reports are shared only with relevant academic staff and administrators.
 - *Practicality*: Feedback collection is designed to minimise disruption to teaching while ensuring meaningful participation.
- 1.6. Each School Teaching and Learning Committee determines the feedback format, questions, and administration procedures. The approved course feedback form is provided to CTLT to administer to students. It is reviewed periodically to ensure relevance and clarity.
- 1.7. The student course feedback process is administered by CTLT:
 - Feedback is collected at the end of each course, normally during the final two weeks of instruction and before the examination period, as a summative review of the learning experience.
 - Instructors are informed of the course feedback in advance.
 - Individual course feedback reports include the number of respondents and the response rate for each quantifiable question. They are issued and shared with faculty within 4 weeks after the completion of the feedback process, accounting for data entry and analysis, after final course grades are submitted to the Registrar's Office.

- All course feedback results are also shared with the PAD/MPD and Faculty Deputies, or designated faculty lead, Associate Deans, and the Dean.
- General results of student feedback are shared in an annual Course Feedback Report, including:
 - Overall student response and completion rates;
 - Aggregate satisfaction levels;
 - Semester comparison if possible;
 - Recurring themes or issues and suggested actions;
 - Changes in feedback procedures made in response to stakeholder input;
 - Discussion of findings.
- CTLT also analyses longitudinal trends across years and campuses to identify systemic issues and examples of effective teaching practice.
- The report is discussed during programme and School-level academic meetings to ensure that appropriate follow-up actions are identified and implemented. PAD/MPD and Faculty Deputies communicate key changes and improvements to the Dean and to students to close the feedback loop.

1.8. Individual course feedback results constitute one source of evidence in the annual academic staff assessment for SAS and GSD faculty. They are not used in isolation and are considered alongside peer observations, self-reflections, and other indicators of teaching quality.

1.9. Where response rates are low, the findings shall be discussed with the faculty member concerned, interpreted with caution, and considered alongside other available evidence, including qualitative comments, student performance, faculty reflections, and relevant programme context.

1.10. The PAD/MPD working with Associate Dean are responsible for ensuring that low-response course feedback is used appropriately in programme reflection and faculty discussions, and not interpreted in isolation.

1.11. Faculty are encouraged to collect in-progress course student feedback (Annex 1. In-progress course feedback guide).

1.12. The PAD/MPD is responsible for ensuring that course feedback is interpreted fairly and in context. The use of student feedback in faculty assessment is governed by the *Policy on Annual Performance Evaluation of SAS Faculty*.

1.13. The CTLT will provide guidance for students on constructive feedback.

1.14. Change log:

Revision No	Date	Approved by	Revision description	Process Owner

Annex 1. In-progress course feedback guide

Why collect in-progress course feedback?

In-progress (sometimes called mid-course) course feedback gives faculty an opportunity to check in with students while the course is still underway. It helps identify what is working well, address challenges early, and make adjustments where possible. It also demonstrates that student perspectives are valued.

When is the right time?

- *Full-semester courses:* Weeks 6–7 (before midterm exam week)
- *Half-semester courses:* Around week 3

By this point, students have enough experience to offer useful feedback, and you still have time to act on it.

How to collect feedback

- Use an online tool (such as MS Forms or Poll Everywhere) to keep responses anonymous. Reassure them that responses are anonymous and encourage constructive feedback.
- Keep it short and focused on aspects of the course you can realistically adjust.
- Explain why you are asking. Let students know you value their input and intend to use it to improve the course.
- Set aside 10 minutes at the start/end of a class.

Sample questions the faculty might use

Open-ended questions

- What in this course is helping you learn most effectively?
- What makes learning more difficult?
- What could be improved to make the remaining weeks more productive?

Choice question

- How would you describe the pace of this course? Too fast / Too slow / About right

Choice + follow-up question

- When you read or hear instructions in this course, do you usually understand what is expected of you? o Yes / No
- If you answered “No,” please give an example of an instruction that was unclear.

Making sense of feedback

Start by summarising longer responses into short notes. Group comments into broad themes (for example: pacing, assignments, clarity of expectations, learning activities), and look for patterns rather than focusing on individual or isolated comments.

It can be helpful to organise feedback into three simple categories:

- What is working well?
- Changes that can realistically be undertaken
- Issues that cannot be resolved within the running semester

Remember that in-progress course feedback is intended to support learning and course improvement. It is not meant to invite public discussion of the instructor as a person.

Closing the loop with students

- Respond to feedback as soon as possible. Where feasible, set aside 10–15 minutes of class time to share what you learned from the feedback.
- Explain your decisions: what you plan to change and why. If some suggestions cannot be acted on, briefly explain the reasons. Even small, visible changes signal that feedback has been heard.
- Use this conversation to clarify course goals, address misunderstandings, and emphasise that learning is a shared responsibility between instructors and students.
- Finally, consider a brief follow-up later in the semester (through a short discussion or quick survey) to check whether the changes have had the intended effect.

Just-in-time feedback: small check-ins during class

In addition to in-progress feedback, you can gather quick, informal feedback during class using simple Classroom Assessment Techniques (Angelo & Cross, 1993). These low-stakes activities help you quickly gauge understanding and adjust your teaching in the moment.

Some examples:

• *Start, Stop, Continue*

- What should we start doing?
- What should we stop doing?
- What should we continue doing?

• ***One Minute Paper:*** At the end of class, ask students to write for one minute: o What was the most important thing you learned today?

- What question do you still have?

• ***Muddiest Point:*** Ask students what was least clear in the lesson and address it in the next class or through a short follow-up resource.

These small check-ins can help you stay responsive and keep the course moving at a steady, manageable pace.

Need support?

If you'd like help designing questions, making sense of feedback, or thinking through next steps, the CTLT team is happy to help. Please contact mariia.guzikova@ucentralasia.org.

Annex 4. Programme Advisory Committees

- 1.1. This procedure defines how UCA engages external experts and stakeholders to ensure the quality, relevance, and continuous improvement of its academic programmes. External engagement complements internal quality processes and supports institutional accountability to national regulators and regional partners.
- 1.2. UCA values external perspectives as a vital component of programme quality assurance and enhancement. Engagement with external experts ensures that academic programmes remain current, relevant, and aligned with societal priorities, labour market needs, and UCA's mission.
- 1.3. *Programme Advisory Committees (PACs)*
 - 1.3.1. PACs serve as a formal mechanism for external consultation and play a key role in maintaining and enhancing programme quality. Each academic programme establishes a PAC to advise on curriculum relevance, graduate attributes, and evolving disciplinary and industry trends.
 - 1.3.2. For a newly established programme, a PAC is expected to be established by the end of the first year of programme delivery. Its first meeting shall normally take place following the completion of the first year of study.
 - 1.3.3. For an existing programme, a PAC is expected to be established no later than the commencement of the periodic review process.
 - 1.3.4. PACs provide informed advice to academic programme teams on:
 - Ensuring the quality, relevance, and currency of the curriculum;
 - Identifying emerging trends, required skills, and labour market shifts affecting the relevance and currency of graduate attributes;
 - Advising on methods, technologies, and pedagogical approaches;
 - Supporting programme evaluation, curriculum review, and accreditation processes;
 - Providing insights into potential partnerships with industry, community organisations, and professional associations;
 - 1.3.5. PACs have an advisory, non-policy-making and non-executive function. Their recommendations inform programme development and quality improvement decisions, and outcomes informed by their advice shall be communicated back to the committee to ensure transparency and accountability.
 - 1.3.6. PACs are composed of external members familiar with the regional and disciplinary context of UCA's programmes. Membership is balanced across relevant stakeholder groups, including:
 - Employers from business and industry sectors;
 - Representatives of governmental and non-governmental agencies;
 - Academic representatives from higher education partners and institutions (ideally including UCA's development partners);
 - Programme alumni working in the field.
 - 1.3.7. Committees are expected to reflect diversity in professional background, gender, and other relevant characteristics.

- 1.3.8. Programme teams propose members for PACs, and appointments are approved by the Dean of the respective School. PAC composition and terms of reference are reviewed by the School Academic Committee to ensure consistency with institutional quality governance.
- Appointments shall normally be for two years.
 - The PAD/MPD serves as *ex officio* member and acts as the primary liaison between the PAC and the School.
- 1.3.9. The Chair of the PAC is elected by members for a two-year term and may be re-elected once.
- 1.3.10. The Chair, together with PAD/MPD, prepares the annual PAC work plan, meeting agendas, and follow-up actions.
- 1.3.11. The Committee meets at least once per academic year. Agendas are distributed two weeks in advance, and minutes shared with all members, the Dean, and PAD/MPD within one week after meetings.
- 1.3.12. PACs participate in programme evaluation and development activities, including:
- *Curriculum Review and Accreditation*: Providing input for internal reviews and external accreditation cycles;
 - *Labour Market Alignment*: Advising on skill demands, employability, and partnership opportunities;
 - *Graduate Employability*: Recommending strategies to enhance graduate outcomes and professional pathways;
- 1.3.13. PAC members are provided with relevant programme materials (curriculum structure, graduate placement data, course catalogue, capstone topics) before meetings to enable informed feedback.
- 1.3.14. Feedback and recommendations from Programme Advisory Committees are reviewed by the PAD/MPD and the School Dean or Associate Dean(s). Agreed follow-up actions are documented in the Curriculum Review Meeting minutes and incorporated into faculty discussion agendas and programme action plans, as appropriate. The PAC advises on adjustments considered necessary for the effective development of the programme, and its recommendations must be discussed with the broader programme faculty to ensure shared understanding and informed decision-making. This ensures that PAC input directly contributes to evidence-based decision-making and continuous improvement across all programmes.
- 1.3.15. Change log:

Revision №	Date	Approved by	Revision description	Process Owner

Annex 7. UCA School of Arts and Sciences Award for Excellence in Teaching

1. Aim of the Award

- 1.1. The University of Central Asia (UCA) School of Arts and Sciences (SAS) Award for Excellence in Teaching (hereinafter referred to as the Award) aims to acknowledge outstanding faculty for their exceptional contribution to student success, as well as for their teaching and learning enhancement and innovation initiatives. The Award will be presented during the Bell Ringing ceremony at the beginning of the academic year.
- 1.2. By emphasizing the importance of inspirational teachers and teaching skills, UCA encourages the pursuit of teaching excellence within its teaching community. Nominating faculty for the Award, UCA students and alumni recognize and support faculty members who have played a significant role in inspiring them and contributing to their success.
- 1.3. Two Awards will be presented each year, one for each campus.
- 1.4. This Award forms part of UCA's Quality Assurance and Improvement (QAI) Framework by recognizing teaching practices that exemplify institutional values of excellence, innovation, and learning-focused practice.

2. Eligibility

- 2.1. All faculty who have taught at SAS for at least two consecutive academic years are eligible for the Award.
- 2.2. Recipients of the Awards in previous years are eligible for nomination in subsequent academic years.

3. Nomination for the Award and criteria

- 3.1. The nomination process will be conducted electronically.
- 3.2. Faculty eligible for the Award may be nominated by SAS faculty members, students, and SAS alumni. Self-nominations are not permitted.
- 3.3. The list of faculty members eligible for nominations will be included in the electronic nomination form.
- 3.4. Each nomination (indicating one nominee) must be made by an individual: group nominations will not be considered. Nominations submitted on behalf of another person will be excluded from consideration.
- 3.5. One nominee may be nominated for one or several criteria indicated in 3.7.
- 3.6. The nomination form must include a Nomination Statement, which is the most important part of the nomination. This statement should provide clear, specific evidence (examples) of the nominee's outstanding teaching abilities, directly addressing at least one of the areas listed in section 3.7., for which they are being nominated. The statement should describe concrete activities, examples, and impacts that demonstrate how the nominee meets the selected criteria. Only nominations providing clear and verifiable evidence will be considered by the selection committee. Nominees are expected to demonstrate excellence in at least one of the following areas:

- *Inspiring passion for the subject:* The faculty member brings their subject to life in the classroom, sparking curiosity and excitement. They inspire students to go beyond required learning and explore the subject independently.
- *Providing exceptional support and guidance:* The faculty member goes beyond the classroom to offer thoughtful advice and help, supporting students with academic challenges and career decisions with care and commitment.
- *Continuously improving their teaching:* The faculty member actively seeks and uses feedback from students and peers, consistently refining their teaching each semester, and pursues professional development to improve teaching.
- *Connecting learning to careers:* The faculty member designs learning activities, projects, or assignments that help students see how their studies relate to future jobs and opportunities.
- *Innovating assessment and feedback:* The faculty member encourages improvement by using creative forms of assessment and providing timely, constructive feedback that helps students grow.
- *Creating an inclusive and supportive environment:* The faculty member fosters a classroom environment that values and supports students from diverse backgrounds and learning styles.
- *Contributing to university-wide learning initiatives and education:* The faculty member plays an active role in major initiatives like curriculum development, academic mobility, or projects that benefit students across the institution.
- *Contributing to teaching excellence in the region:* The faculty member develops new teaching practices or resources that help educators in Central Asia overcome challenges and improve their teaching.

3.7.The deadline for submitting nominations will be last Sunday of May each year.

3.8.The nominations are administered by the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology (CTLT), with support for disseminating information provided by the UCA Student Association (UCASA), Student Life Team (SLT) and Graduate Placement Advisor.

4. Selection Committee and Procedure

4.1.The Selection Committee will be chaired by the Dean of SAS. The Committee will include six members:

- The Associate Deans of both campuses
- The UCASA Presidents from both campuses
- One faculty member from each campus, appointed annually by the Dean from among the members of the Teaching and Learning Committee, ensuring fairness and diversity of perspectives through annual rotation.

4.2.Members of the Selection Committee cannot nominate candidates or be nominated themselves.

4.3.After the nomination deadline, CTLT will:

- Collect and tally all nominations;

- Prepare a shortlist of the top five candidates for each campus based on the highest number of nominations;
 - Compile nominee document packages, including nomination statements, and circulate them to the Selection Committee.
- 4.4. The Selection Committee members will review the materials, then convene to discuss, deliberate, and work toward a consensus on Award recipients. For the meeting to be valid, at least two-thirds of the members must be present. In case of a tie, the Dean of SAS will have the deciding vote.
- 4.5. All nomination materials, committee discussions, and decisions related to the Award are confidential. Members of the Selection Committee will treat all documents and deliberations with discretion. Information regarding nominations, deliberations, and the outcome of the selection process may not be shared with anyone outside the Committee until the official announcement is made. Details of deliberations should not be shared outside the Committee, even after the official announcement of the outcomes.
- 4.6. The Dean of SAS will submit the Selection Committee's decision, along with all supporting documentation, to the Rector for final approval. The Rector's decision is final and cannot be appealed.
- 4.7. Once the Rector has approved the decision, the Dean of SAS will formally notify the finalists with an official letter from the Selection Committee, inviting them to attend the Award ceremony and offering them the opportunity to accept or decline the Award.
- 4.8. The Selection Committee may recommend the Dean of SAS to issue a Letter of Appreciation to shortlisted nominees whose submissions reflect exceptional achievements and strong support from both students and colleagues. While not selected as Award recipients, these faculty members have demonstrated significant impact on teaching and learning. The issuance of the Letter of Appreciation will follow separate Terms of Reference.
- 4.9. If a Nominee declines, the Selection Committee will reconvene to select an alternate finalist.
- 4.10. The Award will be presented by one member of the Selection Committee and the UCASA President of the respective campus, highlighting the collaborative partnership between the University academic leadership and the student body in celebrating teaching excellence.
- 4.11. Follow-up for the Award Process:
- Announcement of the Award and opening of nominations
 - Nomination submission deadline
 - CTLT compiles and prepares nominee packages for review
 - Appointment of Selection Committee members (by the Dean)
 - Distribution of nomination packages to Selection Committee
 - Selection Committee review period
 - Selection Committee meeting and final decision
 - Submission of committee decision to the Rector for approval
 - Rector's approval (by Rector's memo)
 - Notification of finalists by the Dean

- Award presentation

4.12. CTLT maintains a secure archive of all nomination materials, Selection Committee decisions, and Rector's approvals for institutional record-keeping and reporting purposes.

5. Benefits for Award recipients

5.1. The Award recipients will be celebrated during the annual UCA Bell Ringing ceremony. The Award winners will be announced to UCA and the educational community on the UCA website and UCA social media channels.

5.2. The Award may be referenced during the annual evaluation process and can strengthen promotion portfolios and/or merit performance evaluations.

5.3. Findings and reflections from the Award process, including evidence of innovative teaching practices, are shared with CTLT and the School Academic Committee to inform professional development initiatives and strengthen the culture of teaching excellence across UCA.

6. Guidelines revision

6.1. The Guidelines are subject to triennial review based on feedback from all relevant stakeholders. The Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology (CTLT) shall collect feedback and propose revisions to the Selection Committee. All changes require the Rector's approval. Substantive amendments affecting the Award's purpose or philosophy shall be submitted for approval to the Academic Council and the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the UCA Board of Trustees.

6.2. Change log:

Revision №	Date	Approved by	Revision description	Process Owner

Annex 8. Data for Quality Assurance and Improvement

- 1.1.UCA's commitment to continuous quality improvement is underpinned by evidence-based, data-informed decision-making. Systematic collection and analysis of applicants, student, alumni, and employer feedback, along with academic performance data, ensure that programmes remain relevant, effective, and aligned with institutional goals and external standards.
- 1.2.The following indicators provide a structured framework for monitoring programme quality and effectiveness. Data are compiled from institutional systems, survey instruments, and external sources, and reported as part of UCA's internal Quality Assurance and Improvement (QAI) cycle.
- 1.3.Data used for quality assurance are collected, processed, and retained in accordance with applicable data protection laws and institutional privacy policies. Access is role-based and limited to legitimate educational interests.

Indicator	Data Source and Reporting	Data Owner
Accreditation and Licensing	Licenses issued by the Ministries of Education of the Founding states. Accreditation reports and recommendations of accreditation and attestation regulatory bodies.	UCA Registrar
Faculty Qualifications	Faculty diploma, CVs, PD documents.	HR
Faculty performance	Faculty activity plans and reports.	SAS Associate Deans, GSD Dean, HR (if electronically)
Teaching Awards	Teaching awards results	CTLT
Faculty Peer observations	Peer observations reports	CTLT
Faculty Research Activity outputs	Publication and grant records, research initiatives reports.	Dean of Research, PADs/MPDs
Incoming Student Performance	Entry test results (reported in the <i>Student Performance Report</i>).	Raw data - UCA Registrar, Report – CTLT
Student Performance, Retention and Progression	CGPA, course grades, capstone, and state exam, students and graduates with distinction, retention rates and cohort data in the <i>Student Performance Report</i> .	Raw data - UCA Registrar, Report – CTLT

Graduate Employment and Further Study	<i>Graduate Employment and Placement Report.</i>	Department of Cooperative Education
Employer Satisfaction	Findings from the <i>Co-op Employer Feedback Report.</i>	CTLT
Student and Graduate Satisfaction	<i>Student Course Feedback Survey; Alumni Satisfaction Survey.</i>	CTLT
Programme Enhancement	<i>Curriculum review reports; First cohort completion report (for new programmes)</i>	PADs/MPDs, CTLT
External and Advisory Feedback	External experts evaluations and <i>Programme Advisory Committee Reports.</i>	PADs/MPDs, CTLT
International Recognition	International partnerships, student/faculty mobility data	International Office

1.4.All data are reviewed by PAD/MPD, Deans, CTLT, School's Academic Committee and Academic Council to identify trends, priorities, and actions for improvement. Summaries and analysis inform institutional planning, programme reviews, and decision-making at both School and University levels. Data insights are also used to benchmark performance against national and international standards, supporting UCA's culture of continuous enhancement.

1.5.Data is collected and analyzed annually, with summary reports presented to the Academic Council as part of the institutional quality reporting cycle.

1.6.Quality-assurance datasets are retained for five years unless a longer period is required by national regulation or accreditation conditions. Retention requirements may vary across the three Founding States; the Registrar's Office should be consulted where national regulatory requirements differ from this default.

1.7.Change log:

Revision No	Date	Approved by	Revision description	Process Owner

Annex 9. Guidelines for Online Course Delivery

1. Principles and quality expectations

- 1.1. University of Central Asia (UCA) is committed to delivering high-quality education across all modalities, including online synchronous (remote) learning. These guidelines set out the expectations and requirements for online course delivery at UCA and are intended to ensure that online provision is accessible, engaging, effective, and aligned with institutional academic standards.
- 1.2. These guidelines apply to all faculty, including full-time and visiting instructors, who teach remotely.
- 1.3. Online course delivery shall meet the same academic standards as offline courses in relation to course design, teaching quality, student engagement, assessment, feedback, academic support, and achievement of course and programme learning outcomes.
- 1.4. Online course delivery shall be designed and implemented in ways that are appropriate to the approved course learning outcomes, the nature of the subject, the needs of students, and the requirements of the programme.
- 1.5. The choice of online delivery type shall support effective student engagement, appropriate interaction, timely feedback, and valid assessment of learning.
- 1.6. The quality of online course delivery shall be reviewed through relevant quality assurance processes, including student course feedback, classroom observation, review of course design and Moodle use, and evidence of student achievement of course learning outcomes.
- 1.7. Student feedback on online courses shall be reviewed by the instructor and the PAD/MPD/FD in conjunction with other available evidence, including qualitative comments, student performance, classroom observation, and relevant course context.
- 1.8. Where online course delivery gives rise to concerns, including persistently weak student feedback, low student participation, poor engagement, or misalignment between delivery format and learning needs, the PAD/MPD/FD may, in consultation with the instructor and with support from CTLT where appropriate, recommend corrective action.
- 1.9. Corrective action may include additional guidance to the instructor, targeted pedagogical support, peer or CTLT observation, revision of course instruction, adjustment of engagement strategies, or change of delivery type.
- 1.10. Achievement of course learning outcomes in online settings shall be verified through approved assessment methods aligned with course learning outcomes, together with review of student work, grading patterns, student progression, and other relevant evidence of learning.
- 1.11. Any alternative assessment or teaching arrangements adopted for online delivery shall demonstrate achievement of equivalent academic standards and learning outcomes.
- 1.12. Online delivery types are intended to support different pedagogical approaches and patterns of student engagement. The choice of delivery type shall be guided by the learning outcomes, nature of the course, expected level of interaction, and practical requirements of delivery.

- **Type 1: Individual online (on-laptop) delivery** is designed for courses or class sessions in which discussion, collaboration, and real-time interaction are essential to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.
- **Type 2: In-class online delivery** is designed for courses or class sessions in which lecture-based delivery is appropriate, provided that student participation is actively supported through structured interaction, such as chat, polls, questioning, or other engagement strategies.
- **Combination of Type 1 and Type 2** may be used where different learning activities within the course require different forms of online engagement.

2. Delivery arrangements

- 2.1. All online classes will be delivered via UCA Microsoft Teams (MS Teams). Zoom sessions are only possible if the instructor does not have the access to UCA MS Office.
- 2.2. The instructors shall maintain the Moodle course page in accordance with Moodle Page Population Requirements, including uploading the syllabus, recording attendance, sharing course materials, conducting assignments, and posting grades in the Grader.
- 2.3. All online sessions, regardless of the chosen type (see below), will be recorded and stored in the "Files" section of the corresponding Microsoft Teams class.
- 2.4. Instructors shall inform students that course recordings and course materials are the intellectual property of the University and must not be shared with third parties under any circumstances.
- 2.5. The preferred type of online delivery will be specified in the *Course Organization* section of the syllabus and approved by the respective Programme Academic Director (PAD) /Master Programme Director (MPD) or Faculty Deputy (FD).
- 2.6. The PAD/MPD/FD will indicate the preferred course delivery mode in the *Course Memo* to assist the Registrar's Office in preparing the timetable.
- 2.7. Type 1 courses involve significant group work, discussions, and breakout activities. It encourages active participation and real-time collaboration. Instructors and students will keep their cameras on throughout the session. Instructors will inform students that those with cameras off during the session may be marked as "absent" on the course Moodle page. Technical difficulties will be reported at the beginning of the session and will be treated as exceptions. Students who report technical issues but remain unresponsive - both verbally and in the chat - will still be marked as absent.
- 2.8. Type 2 courses are conducted live with all students attending at the same time. While this course type is primarily lecture-based there should be required participation through chat, polls, or Q&A. Instructors will keep their cameras on throughout the session.
- 2.9. The Registrar's Office will allocate classrooms for Type 2 courses and include the assigned classroom numbers in the Class Timetable.
- 2.10. Faculty coordinators on each campus are responsible for scheduling classes in MS Teams in accordance with the Class Timetable shared by the Registrar's Office. Faculty coordinators will communicate directly with instructors to arrange sessions. A Class-type team will be created in Microsoft Teams for each course.
- 2.11. For Type 2 courses, IT team on campuses will facilitate the classroom setup.

2.12. Instructors may combine Type 1 and Type 2 sessions as appropriate to the course content and learning activities. The final schedule must be submitted to the Assistant Registrar via the Course Memo for room allocation.

3. Support, monitoring and follow-up

3.1. CTLT will work with newly appointed PADs and MPDs to provide them with an orientation on online delivery methods to ensure they make informed decisions about online course formats.

3.2. Newly appointed faculty with limited experience in teaching via MS Teams will be required to complete the 'Teaching Online with Microsoft Teams' training provided by CTLT. Ongoing support from CTLT will be available to all instructors throughout the course.

3.3. Newly hired instructors teaching online will be observed by the respective PAD/MPD/FD and CTLT within the first weeks of the course.

3.4. If the observation of an online class indicates that students are disengaging (e.g., persistently low participation, non-responsiveness in discussion/chat, camera-off without approved accommodation, or declining attendance), the PAD/MPD/FD may recommend a change of delivery type to improve learning engagement. Any change will be communicated by the PAD/MPD to the Registrar's Office for room allocation/timetabling and communicated by the course instructor to students at least one week in advance, unless an urgent change is required to protect learning continuity.

4. Roles and responsibilities:

4.1. The Registrar's Office will schedule online classes according to the course type indicated in the Course Memo.

4.2. Associate Deans will ensure that newly hired instructors comply with the rules outlined in the guidelines.

4.3. PAD/MPD/FD will discuss and approve the type of course delivery with the respective instructor; include the course delivery type in the Course Memo; observe classes of newly hired instructors within the first weeks after the beginning of the course to ensure conformity with these guidelines.

4.4. Faculty Coordinators will assist instructors with class setup in MS Teams.

4.5. CTLT will include these guidelines in the package shared with all newly hired instructors as part of the onboarding process; support instructors if they encounter problems using MS Teams; observe online classes within the first three weeks after the beginning of the semester and provide a classroom observation report to the PAD/MPD/FD and the Associate Dean of the respective class.

4.6. IT will support the classroom setup for Type 2 courses on campuses.

5. Change log:

Revision No	Date	Approved by	Revision description	Process Owner
-------------	------	-------------	----------------------	---------------

--	--	--	--	--

Annex 1. Good practice recommendations

Class Rules and Participation

- Collaboratively define class rules during the first session and publish them on the MS Teams channel and in the General part of the course in Moodle. Refer back to these rules as needed.
- Establish clear rules for communication during class and guidelines for post-class interactions.

Session Length

- For longer sessions (e.g., 3-hour classes), include a 10-minute break every 50–60 minutes.

Engagement and Interaction

- Active Learning: Limit lecturing to 20 minutes at a time, followed by interactive activities such as polls, quizzes, case studies, or group discussions.
- Group Work: Use MS Teams breakout rooms and Plc Notebook for collaborative work.
- Feedback Tools: Utilize real-time feedback (e.g., thumbs up/down, emojis) and short surveys to gauge understanding and maintain engagement.
- In-progress Course Feedback: Collect regular student feedback and use it for continuous improvement (refer to the In-Progress Course Feedback Guidelines).
- For longer sessions, consider pre-recording lectures or assigning pre-class readings/videos and using live sessions for active learning activities such as problem-solving, discussions, and Q&A.

Annex 10. UCA faculty Professional Development framework

1. Purpose and principles

- 1.1. This Framework sets out the principles, expectations, and institutional arrangements for faculty Professional Development (PD) at the University of Central Asia (UCA).
- 1.2. Faculty PD is a core component of academic practice at UCA. It supports the continuous development of faculty roles in teaching, research, academic leadership, and service, and contributes to the enhancement of educational quality as part of the UCA Quality Assurance and Improvement Framework (QAI Framework) for academic programmes.
- 1.3. Within this framework, Professional Development refers to structured and self-directed activities undertaken by faculty to maintain, enhance, and extend their knowledge, skills, and professional capacities in teaching, assessment, curriculum design, research, academic leadership, and service.
- 1.4. Faculty Professional Development at UCA shall:
 - be continuous, developmental, and research-informed;
 - respond to institutional priorities, programme review outcomes, faculty roles and responsibilities, and identified development needs;
 - promote reflective practice, peer learning, and collaboration;
 - support effective, inclusive, and context- and culture-sensitive academic practice;
 - be delivered through flexible and complementary formats; and
 - support professional learning, innovation, and informed experimentation.
- 1.5. Institutional priorities for teaching- and learning-related PD are informed by the Advance HE Professional Standards Framework (PSF), which provides an internationally recognised foundation for teaching and supporting learning in higher education. Other areas of PD are informed by institutional priorities, faculty roles, and relevant professional requirements.
- 1.6. Aggregated evidence from Professional Development activities, including participation data, survey feedback, and identified development needs, informs institutional planning, quality enhancement, academic development priorities, and the continuous improvement of PD provision. Where relevant, such evidence may also inform programme review, curriculum enhancement, research development, and academic leadership support.
- 1.7. Individual professional development records may inform developmental discussions within academic supervision processes.

2. Scope

- 2.1. This framework applies to all full-time faculty teaching in UCA academic degree programmes. Visiting faculty are encouraged to engage in relevant PD activities where practicable; specific expectations are agreed with the relevant Programme Academic Director /Master Programme Director at the point of appointment.
- 2.2. Engagement in Professional Development is a mandatory component of academic practice at UCA, recognising that Professional Development needs vary according to role, discipline, experience, and programme context.

2.3.PD activities may address, but are not limited to, the following topics:

- Teaching and learning
- Research and scholarship
- Academic leadership and service
- Other areas aligned with institutional priorities and relevant priorities of UCA Founding States

2.4.All newly appointed faculty, including visiting faculty, teaching in academic degree programmes must participate in faculty onboarding activities. All faculty are expected to participate in PD activities offered as part of programme development and review.

2.5.Newly appointed Programme Directors shall participate in a targeted onboarding process addressing academic leadership responsibilities, including clarification of role expectations, programme management, academic regulations, and available institutional support.

2.6.Engagement in PD activities is recognised as part of faculty workload.

2.7.Programme directors will develop the PDP plans for each academic year.

3. PD forms

3.1.PD comprises structured and self-directed activities.

3.2.Structured PD is offered by UCA academic support units and departments.

3.3.Self-directed PD is individually pursued by faculty members in alignment with their professional development needs and School and programme priorities.

3.4.Recognised forms of PD include:

- individual consultations and targeted professional support;
- peer observation and peer review for reflective practice (see Peer observation guide);
- curriculum and programme development activities;
- workshops, webinars, and short courses;
- self-directed resource-based learning;
- communities of practice and peer learning groups;
- mentoring and coaching, both as mentee/coachee and as mentor/coach;
- research and scholarship development activities, including conference participation, research dissemination, grant-related training, and publication development;
- leadership development for academic and administrative roles;
- service-related development linked to advising, committee work, community engagement, or other institutional responsibilities; and
- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL).

3.5.PD may be undertaken with or without release from regular duties, depending on its format and relevant institutional arrangements.

4. PD planning, documentation and recognition

- 4.1. Faculty PD follows a five-year cycle aligned with national requirements and UCA quality assurance processes.
- 4.2. UCA Schools, supported by UCA academic support units, develop five-year faculty PD plans for School faculty members, which are approved by the respective School Academic Committees.

PD activity title and format	Priority area (Teaching, research, other)	Target group	Provider	Timing	Expected hours	Mandatory / optional	Evidence of participation

- 4.3. In line with the requirements of UCA's Founding States, UCA ensures structured and documented opportunities for faculty Professional Development totalling at least 72 academic hours within a rolling five-year period. This constitutes the minimum required threshold; continued engagement beyond it is expected as part of academic practice.
- 4.4. These hours may be accrued through the recognised forms of PD listed in Section 3.4. Independent self-study may account for up to 50% of the total, provided it is appropriately documented and evidenced.
- 4.5. Participation in Professional Development activities offered by UCA units and departments is recorded by the organising unit for quality assurance and reporting purposes.
- 4.6. Faculty document their PD engagement in Faculty Activity Plans and Reports. Self-directed Professional Development must be supported by appropriate documentation, such as a certificate of completion, confirmation of participation, conference programme, publication, reflective summary, or evidence of completed assessment requirements.
- 4.7. The Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology (CTLT) monitors whether the 72-hour requirement is being met, consolidates the PD data and reports institutionally.

5. Evaluation of institutional PD provision

- 5.1. The effectiveness and relevance of PD provision shall be evaluated through:
- participant feedback, reflections, and follow-up reports;
 - analysis of participation patterns, engagement trends, and emerging development needs;
 - evidence of perceived or demonstrated impact on academic practice, including teaching, research, leadership, and service, as appropriate; and
 - where relevant, evidence of contribution to student learning, programme quality, institutional priorities, or professional effectiveness, including institutional awards.
- 5.2. Evaluation findings shall inform future Professional Development planning and delivery.

6. Roles and responsibilities

- 6.1. UCA governing bodies, including the Rector and the Academic Council, determine institutional priorities for Professional Development in line with the University's strategic objectives and relevant legal and regulatory requirements.

- 6.2.The UCA Academic Council approves this Framework and keeps it under regular review.
- 6.3.UCA Schools identify Professional Development priorities and develop faculty PD plans.
- 6.4.The UCA Schools Academic Committees approve the School’s five-year faculty Professional Development plan.
- 6.5.UCA academic units and departments contribute to the organization and delivery of Professional Development within their respective areas of expertise.
- 6.6.CTLT acts as the institutional coordinator for teaching- and learning-related PD and supports institution-wide monitoring, consolidation of PD data, and institutional reporting.
- 6.7.Faculty academic supervisors, such as Programme Directors and Faculty Deputies, support faculty Professional Development by discussing individual priorities with faculty members, ensuring alignment with programme and institutional priorities, and reviewing and approving Professional Development goals recorded in Faculty Activity Plans.
- 6.8.Faculty members are responsible for engaging in Professional Development in accordance with this Framework, including participation in required activities, reflection on practice, and documentation of Professional Development goals and engagement in Faculty Activity Plans and Reports.

7. Framework Review

- 7.1.This Framework shall be reviewed every five years by CTLT in consultation with the Schools and other relevant stakeholders and submitted to the UCA Academic Council for approval of any revisions. Revisions shall ensure continued alignment with institutional priorities, Quality Assurance requirements, and evolving educational practices. Where this Framework forms part of the Quality Assurance Framework, it will be reviewed for alignment with QAI principles and requirements at each three-year QAI review cycle, even where a full revision is not due.

7.2.Change log:

Revision No	Date	Approved by	Revision description	Process Owner

Annex 11. Documents for National Programme Accreditations

- 1.1. The Rector shall appoint a task force responsible for coordinating preparations for national programme accreditation. The task force shall ensure systematic preparation, organisation, and retention of all accreditation-related documentation in a single designated folder or repository. This repository shall be maintained as a complete and current record of the accreditation process and shall support institutional follow-up, continuity, and quality improvement.
- 1.2. Responsibility for maintaining individual documents shall rest with the relevant documentation holders identified below.

CATEGORY	DOCUMENTS	DOCUMENTATION HOLDER
Documents of previous accreditation and cycles	Self-evaluation report, all appendices, recommendation of accreditation agencies	Accreditation task force lead
Accreditation initiation	Application for accreditation; application letter to the accrediting agency	Accreditation task force / designated accreditation coordinator
Self-study documentation	Self-evaluation/attestation/accreditation report (self-study / самооценка)	Accreditation task force lead
	Appendices / evidence pack supporting the self-evaluation	Accreditation task force, with contributions from relevant units
Legal and institutional documents	University Charter	Legal Office
	Copy of the licences	Registrar
	University structure	Rector's Office
	University strategic plan	Rector's Office
	Policies and ToRs of University Units	UCA Policy and Risk Manager
	Minutes of UCA Academic Council, Academic Council ToR Minutes of AC meetings documenting how academic programmes align with the priority areas and programmes of UCA's Founding States	Registrar
School management documents	School committees' minutes	Academic Operations

Student documents	Transcripts, student status documents	Registrar
Educational programme documentation	Programme description aligned with relevant state educational standards, Programme curricula. Course assessment materials.	Programme Director / School / Academic Affairs
	Course syllabi; Course catalogues.	CTLT
	Course memos; Course schedules.	Registrar
	Programme curriculum review reports	CTLT, PADs/MPDs
	Programme Advisory Committee minutes	PADs/MPDs
	Programme management records	PADs/MPDs
Internal quality assurance documentation	Quality Assurance and Improvement Framework and procedures; results monitoring and reports; student feedback reports.	CTL
Student data and achievement evidence	Admissions data; progression and retention data; completion data; graduates with honors data.	Registrar
	Student assessment evidence; Results of final thesis defense, report of the final theses defense committee	PADs/MPDs
	Graduate outcomes results (employment, graduate school admissions)	Cooperative education department, PADs/MPDs
	Coop employer feedback	Cooperative education department, CTLT
	Student fees and financial aid information	Finance
Staff evidence	Staffing lists; CVs; qualification records; workload data; professional development records.	Human Resources
	Staff research / scholarly activity evidence	Dean of Research
	Faculty Activity Plans and Reports	Programme Directors and Associate Deans
Learning resources and student support	Library resources	Library
	Laboratory resources	Lab assistants
	Digital systems	IT
	LMS Moodle resources	CTLT
	Student support services	Student Life Team

Public information and transparency materials	Website information and public information materials	APA, Communications Office
External review materials	External evaluation report / conclusion; site-visit documentation; committee observations and recommendations	Accreditation task force / designated accreditation coordinator