



«APPROVED»

by Decision of the Narxoz University
Academic Council

Minutes No.14 «21» January 2022

REGULATIONS
FOR MONITORING THE QUALITY OF TEACHING

Contents

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS.....	3
2. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND PRINCIPLES OF MONITORING THE QUALITY OF TEACHING.....	3
3. ORGANIZATION OF QUALITY MONITORING OF TEACHING.....	4
4. FUNCTIONS OF THE SCHOOLS QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEES DURING MONITORING QUALITY OF TEACHING.....	4
5. REQUIREMENTS FOR MONITORING.....	5
6. FINAL PROVISIONS.....	6
ANNEX 1. SYLLABI ASSESSMENT FORM.....	7
ANNEX 2. FORM FOR ASSESSING THE QUALITY OF COMPLETION OF DISCIPLINES ON THE LMS CANVAS NARXOZ PLATFORM.....	13
ANNEX 3. RULES FOR CLASS VISITS.....	15
ANNEX 4. EVALUATION FORM FOR THE STUDY LESSON.....	17
ANNEX 5. EVALUATION FORM FOR THE STUDY LESSON OF THE CENTER FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY EDUCATION, PHYSICAL CULTURE AND SPORT.....	21
ANNEX 6. EVALUATION FORM FOR EXAM MATERIALS.....	23
ANNEX 7. COURSE MANAGEMENT FORM (CMF).....	28

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1.1 These Regulations for monitoring the quality of teaching at Narxoz University (hereinafter - the "Regulations") regulates the process of monitoring the quality of teaching and defines its purpose, objectives, organization and procedure of carrying out in University.

1.2 The Regulations is developed in accordance with the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On Education" from 27.07.2007 № 319-SH; the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On science" from 18.02.2011 № 407-IV; Order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan from 17.06.2015 No. 391 "On approval of the qualification requirements for Educational activities and the list of documents confirming compliance with them (as amended on 14.07.2021); Standards and Guidelines for Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), the Anti-Corruption Standard for Transparency and Openness in Higher Education Transparency in Higher and Post-Graduate Education (adopted by the Order of the Minister of Decree of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated May 4, 2020 No. 174), the Charter of NJSC "Narxoz University", the Academic Policy and other internal regulatory documents of the University.

1.3 The following term is used in the Regulations:

Monitoring the quality of teaching - the process of tracking academic activities of faculty with the purpose of its objective assessment for making effective management decisions to ensure the effectiveness of the educational process.

1.4 Monitoring the quality of teaching is carried out on the basis of this Regulations and is mandatory for the faculty staff (hereinafter referred to as "faculty").

2. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND PRINCIPLES OF MONITORING THE QUALITY OF TEACHING

2.1 The main purpose of monitoring the quality of teaching is to analyze the level of professional training of Faculty members' and the quality of teaching.

2.2 The main objectives of monitoring the quality of teaching are:

- ✓ obtaining objective information on the quality of teaching by monitoring key parameters and class attendance, student surveys and analysis of the factors influencing the quality of teaching;
- ✓ early diagnosis and identification of aspects that need improvement in the teaching of academic courses;
- ✓ conducting corrective measures based on the results of monitoring;
- ✓ predicting the directions of professional development of the faculty staff;

✓ processing the information obtained on the status and dynamics of the quality of teaching in order to make adequate managerial decisions.

2.3 The main principles of monitoring the quality of teaching are: systematicity, objectivity, comparability and comparability, honesty, timeliness and predictability

3. ORGANIZATION OF QUALITY MONITORING OF TEACHING

3.1 General management of the organization and monitoring of teaching quality is carried out by the Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs.

3.2 At the level of the School/Doctoral Studies Department, the School (Doctoral Studies Department) Quality Assurance Committee monitors the quality of teaching on a regular basis.

3.3 Monitoring of the quality of teaching is carried out on the basis of:

✓ analysis and evaluation of syllabuses (according to the Syllabus Evaluation Form);

✓ analysis of teaching materials developed by the teacher and posted on the LMS Canvas platform (in accordance with the Form for assessing the quality of completion of disciplines on the LMS Canvas Narxoz platform);

✓ analysis of the study lessons attended (in accordance with the Evaluation form for the study lesson);

✓ analysis of the results of the survey of students;

✓ analysis of the results of interviews with focus groups of students;

✓ analysis of Faculty reports on the course conducted (in accordance with the Course Management Form).

4. FUNCTIONS OF THE SCHOOLS QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEES DURING MONITORING QUALITY OF TEACHING

4.1 The Peer review based on class visits by the Schools QA Committees according to the approved schedule in accordance with Rules for class visits (Appendix No.3 to the Regulation).

4.2 Filling out the Evaluation form of the study lesson based on the results of the visit.

4.3 Participation in the moderation of syllabuses, teaching and evaluation materials on the profile of training.

4.4 Participation in the audit for provision of the discipline with educational-methodical and scientific literature, electronic information resources.

4.5 Discussion of the results of the survey of students and faculty staff; in case of receiving negative feedback, work to identify the causes and provide recommendations for their solution.

4.6 Making proposals to the Director of the School / Head of the EP on

- (1) encouraging and promoting the faculty (with positive monitoring results),
- (2) developing recommendations for the development and improvement of the faculty member's work, correcting the content of educational and methodological work, using new approaches to teaching (if comments and negative feedback),
- (3) taking measures for administrative impact (for example, when gross violations of the principles of academic integrity and ethical standards of behavior are detected).

4.7 If the facts of improper fulfillment by the Faculty member of obligations for the timely and high-quality conduct of classes are revealed, the Director of the relevant School / Head of the "Doctoral Studies" is notified.

4.8 Consideration of the compliance of the Faculty with grading criteria (in accordance with the Regulation on grading the positions of the faculty staff of University.

4.9 Monitoring the completion of assessment forms: "Evaluation form for the study lesson (The peer review/ evaluation form based on class visits)" (Appendix No. 4 to the Regulation) and "Course management form" (Appendix No. 8);

4.10 Development of recommendations for improving the quality of teaching.

4.11 Familiarization of Directors of Schools / Heads of EP / Centers with the results of attending classes and recommendations (if necessary) on measures to correct teaching methods and improve the quality of teaching, advanced training in subject area, etc.

5. REQUIREMENTS FOR MONITORING

5.1 The subjects responsible for monitoring the quality of teaching are responsible for:

- proper performance of assigned tasks;
- non-disclosure of information regarding the processing of personal data of the teacher;
- compliance with the monitoring procedure in accordance with the format of the procedure;
- safety of documentation;
- compliance with principles such as objectivity, reliability, legality;
- polite and tactful treatment of evaluated colleagues.

5.2 In case of significant disagreements and discrepancies in the evaluation results the Directors of Schools / Heads of the EPs have the right to attend faculty' classes independently, organize additional surveys of focus groups of students, and involve independent experts (if necessary).

5.3 The members of the Schools' Quality Assurance Commission are clearly aware that the work being carried out on the monitoring of faculty staff has the sole purpose of improving the quality of teaching. Faculty members are informed in advance that the monitoring work is not intended to be fact-finding in order to restrict or penalize faculty members and is solely aimed at supporting them in their professional development.

5.4 The faculty is responsible for:

- quality development of syllabuses, educational and methodological materials, evaluation materials;
- timely placement of syllabuses, educational and methodological materials, assessment materials in LMS Canvas;
- conducting lessons according to the approved timetable;
- transparency of evaluation of students' knowledge, lecturer's use of clear criteria in evaluation (students' awareness of these criteria);
- the pedagogical approach and democratic attitude of the faculty towards the students
- completion of the Course Management Form.

6. FINAL PROVISIONS

6.1 These Regulations shall be approved by a decision of the Academic Council of the University and come into force from the moment of its approval by the Academic Council.

6.2 The term of validity of the Regulations shall not be limited.

6.3 Amendments and additions to these Regulations shall be approved by the Academic Council of the University.

6.4 Responsible for the audit of the document is the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

SYLLABI ASSESSMENT FORM

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1IJN3D5DgkV0wC2M5vVe8y8QowK_EAzuzr9QyYxND8nc/edit?usp=sharing

*** Mandatory****1. Educational Program***

Check only one oval.

- EP Finance
- EP Accounting and auditing
- EP The Economy
- EP Management
- EP Marketing
- EP Digital Engineering and Data Analytics
- EP International Relations and Governance
- EP Law
- EP Tourism
- EP Social Sciences
- Center for Interdisciplinary Development
- Foundation
- Center for Applied Finance
- Other

2. Level of Education *

Check only one oval.

- Undergraduate
- Postgraduate

Discipline information

Discipline name *

Language of instruction *

Check only one oval.

- English
- Russian
- Kazakh

4. NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER ***Main section****5. Do the name and code of the discipline correspond to the curriculum? ***

Check only one oval.

- Name and code fully correspond to the curriculum
- Only title corresponds
- Only the code matches
- Neither name nor code corresponds

6. Form of training *

Check only one oval.

- Traditional format
- Distance format
- Not indicated

7. Does the period of study (semester, year) correspond to the curriculum? *

Check only one oval.

- Yes
- No
- Partially

8. Does the number of credits match the curriculum? *

Check only one oval.

- Yes
- No
- Not specified

9. Information on prerequisites in the curriculum and in the syllabus: *

Check only one oval.

- Curriculum - indicated, syllabus - indicated
- Curriculum - indicated, syllabus - indicated but not correct
- It is in the curriculum, not in the syllabus
- Curriculum- not specified, syllabus - not specified.

10. Is the information about the instructor (name, email) specified? *

Check only one oval.

- Yes
- No
- Partial

11. Are the office hours indicated? *

Check only one oval.

- Yes
- No

12. Indicate how clearly the learning outcomes reflect the content of the discipline. *

Check only one oval.

Check only one oval.

- Yes
 No

21. Does the content of the discipline ensure that the intended learning outcomes are achieved? *

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
 No
 Partial

22. Is a brief description of the assessed tasks indicated? *

Check only one oval.

- Yes
 No

23. Are all learning outcomes tested through assignments? *

Check only one oval.

- All
 Not all

24. Are all assignments aimed at checking the learning outcomes you have set? *

Check only one oval.

- All
 Not all

25. Is the grading structure consistent with the values stated in the academic policy (60% - Internal semester control ISC, 40% - final exam)? *

Check only one oval.

- Yes
 No

26. How clearly is the assessment structure presented? *

Check only one oval.

0 1 2 3 4 5

Not understandable Understandable

27. Is the format of the exam indicated? *

Check only one oval.

Yes No

28. Is the form of the exam appropriate for the learning outcomes? *

Check only one oval.

 Yes No

29. The number of indicated literature in the main literature section *

30. Year of publication of the textbooks indicated in the main literature section? *

Check all the appropriate options.

 before 2017 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021

31. Evaluate the relevance of the literature listed in the main literature section. *

Check only one oval.

0

1

2

3

4

5

Not relevant

Relevant

32. The amount of literature listed in the additional literature section *

33. Year of publication of the textbooks indicated in the additional literature section? *

Check all the appropriate options.

 before 2017 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021

34. Evaluate the relevance of the literature listed in the additional literature. *

Check only one oval.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Not relevant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Relevant

35. Does the academic conduct policy reflect? *

Check only one oval.

Yes

No

36. Is the attendance policy reflected? *

Check only one oval.

Yes

No

37. Select those languages where the descriptions of the discipline are identical*

Check all the boxes that apply.

Kazakh

Russian

English

38. Select those languages where the learning outcomes of the discipline are identical*.

Check all the boxes that apply.

Kazakh

Russian

English

39. Select those languages where the content of the discipline is identical *

Check all the boxes that apply.

Kazakh

Russian

English

40. Choose those languages where the grading structure of the discipline is identical *.

Check all the boxes that apply.

Kazakh

Russian

English

**FORM FOR ASSESSING THE QUALITY OF COMPLETION OF DISCIPLINES
ON THE LMS CANVAS NARXOZ PLATFORM**

School _____

Educational Program _____

Name of discipline _____

Course _____

Language of instruction _____

Instructor's Name _____

	Criteria	Score (point)	Fully compliant	Partial conformity	Doesn't match.	Notes (if any)
	Timely uploading of training materials in the system (total of 5 points)	5				
1	Links to online classes					
2	Availability of a loaded Syllabus					
3	Brief description of the discipline, purpose and learning outcomes					
4	Instructor's personal information					
5	Availability of sources and materials used in the discipline, etc.					
6	Distribution of weights of ISC-1, ISC-2 and final exam grades according to the grading coefficient of the Syllabus and AP					
	ISC 1 (5 points total)	5				
1	Availability of downloaded learning materials by weeks according to the Syllabus					
2	Quality of training materials					
3	Quality of assignments assigned according to the Syllabus					
	ISC 2 (5 points total)	5				
1	Availability of downloaded learning materials by weeks according to the Syllabus					

2	Quality of training materials					
3	Quality of assignments assigned according to the Syllabus					
	Final exam (total of 5 points)	5				
1	Quality of assignments assigned according to the Syllabus					
	The final load score is up to 20 points, in accordance with the Regulation on the grading of faculty positions.	20				
General conclusion on pre-moderation:						
<i>Note - The reviewer/member of the Committee has the right to decide, in case of detection of gross non-compliance with the criteria of the current regulatory requirements in the pre-moderation or on the contrary high grade, to bring to the general discussion of the School QA Committee.</i>						

RULES FOR CLASS VISITS

These Rules class visits determine the algorithm of actions of the officials and teaching staff involved in the procedure of evaluating the quality of teaching at Narxoz University. The rules of class visits are designed to regulate attendance at classes, avoid conflict situations, violations of pedagogical ethics, and subjective evaluations of teachers' work.

1. Employees with the right to visit classes:

- ✓ members of the School/Doctoral Program Department's Quality Assurance Committee (if necessary, other faculty members may be involved as determined by the Committee);
- ✓ members of the University QA Committee;
- ✓ Head of the EP, Director of the School/Doctoral Program Department, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Provost.

- 1.1. It is forbidden for people who are not related to the educational process to attend classes;
- 1.2. Admission to attend classes of persons who are not members of the School/Doctoral Program Department's QA Committee (representatives of accreditation and rating agencies, independent experts, university partners) shall be made on the basis of the relevant order of the Director of the School or the Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs or the Chair of the University QA Committee.

2. The order of attendance at training sessions:

- 2.1. Attendance at classes shall be in accordance with the schedule approved by the Chairperson of the Academic Process Monitoring Group/Chairperson of the School QA Committee;
- 2.2. Teachers are informed in advance about the planned period of attendance in the monitoring.
- 2.3. Two (no more than two) persons authorized to analyze and evaluate the quality of teaching are allowed to attend the class;
- 2.4. Classes of one instructor may be attended at least twice per semester regardless of the format (online or offline).
- 2.5. The person attending the class must be present during the entire class;
- 2.6. School QA Committee member must complete an evaluation form for the study lesson within 2 days of attending the session;
- 2.7. School QA Committee members are required to comply with ethical standards for both students and faculty while attending classes.

3. Restrictions in the process of attending classes:

- 3.1. the person attending the class is required to turn off the cell phone or put it on silent mode;
- 3.2. the visitor has no right to interfere in the course of the class and written tests (independent) and /or laboratory work, comment, ask questions;
- 3.3. during the class, the attendee has no right to talk to students;
- 3.4. the attendant does not have the right to detain students after the end of the class.

4. Analysis of the attended training session

- 4.1. School QA Committee members who have attended the class are required to give an evaluation according to the established criteria spelled out in the class evaluation form;
- 4.2. the visitor writes his or her own comments, remarks and suggestions for improving the quality of the training session (if necessary);
- 4.3. analysis and evaluation of the class is conducted from a position of maximum objectivity and impartiality;
- 4.4. the information obtained in the course of attending classes has the status of internal and confidential information and is not subject to dissemination;

4.5. the loss, dissemination and/or transmission of information, assessment results or other internal documents is a violation of monitoring rules and is subject to disciplinary action in accordance with university policy.

**EVALUATION FORM FOR THE STUDY LESSON
(THE PEER REVIEW / EVALUATION FORM BASED ON CLASS VISITS)**

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1_Ma3YJH5sb0wXUP9qQpc-FYdgSForCpp1bzaob5Rk8A/edit?usp=sharing

Degree of agreement and its corresponding score:

- Strongly agree - 5 points;*
Agree - 4 points;
Difficult to answer - 3 points;
Disagree - 2 points;
Strongly disagree - 1 point.

*** Mandatory**

1. Email *

2. Name and surname of the person who attended the class *

3. Date of visit *

4. Time of visit *

5. Name and surname of the instructor leading the class*

6. Educational Program / Center*

Mark only one oval.

- EP Finance
- EP Accounting and audit
- EP Economics
- EP Management
- EP Marketing
- EP HR & Business Planning
- EP Digital Engineering and Data Analytics
- EP International Relations and Governance
- EP Law
- EP Tourism
- EP Social Sciences
- Center for Interdisciplinary Development

- Center for Applied Finance
 Other _____

7. Number of students in the classroom *

8. Name of discipline *

9. Type of class *

Mark only one oval.

- lecture
 practice
 laboratory not specified

10. Topic of the class *

11. Conformity of the topic and content of the lesson to the syllabus *

Mark only one oval.

- corresponds to
 is inconsistent

12. Relevance of educational material, it's connection with practice (used the results of research, projects, case-studies from the practice of firms, companies, banks, etc.) *

Mark only one oval.

- 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 it is impossible to determine

13. Systematicity and logical consistency in the content of the material studied *

Mark only one oval.

- 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 it is impossible to determine

14. Correspondence of the content of the material to the level of preparedness of the students *

Mark only one oval.

- 1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- it is impossible to determine

15. The instructor's use of the connection of the studied material with other topics and disciplines *

Mark only one oval.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- it is impossible to determine

16. The instructor's knowledge of the subject and general erudition. Free and accessible presentation of material *

Mark only one oval.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- it is impossible to determine

17. Ability of the instructor to maintain the interest and attention of students, their active participation in the discussion of the issues of the training session (to what extent the interest of students to the issues discussed, to further independent study of the material, etc.) *

Mark only one oval.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- it is impossible to determine

18. The instructor knows the interactive methods of organization of work in the classroom, the methods used are correlated with the objectives of training *

Mark only one oval.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

it is impossible to determine

19. Showing pedagogical tact and being democratic in your interactions with students *

Mark only one oval.

1

2

3

4

5

it is impossible to determine

20. Culture of speech, its imagery, emotionality *

Mark only one oval.

1

2

3

4

5

it is impossible to determine

21. What I liked about the class *

22. What needs to be improved *

23. Comments, suggestions, remarks *

**EVALUATION FORM FOR THE STUDY LESSON OF THE CENTER FOR
INTERDISCIPLINARY EDUCATION, PHYSICAL CULTURE AND SPORT
(THE PEER REVIEW / EVALUATION FORM BASED ON CLASS VISITS)**

Full Name of the person who visits the class _____

Date of visit _____

Class start and end times _____

Location of the class _____

Full name of the instructor leading the class _____

Number of students in the classroom (up to 10, 11-16, more than 16) _____

Name of the group (specify the name of the national team, section or direction: Therapeutic physical training): _____

Degree of agreement and its corresponding score:

- *Totally agree - 5 points;*
- *I agree - 4 points;*
- *Difficult to answer - 3 points;*
- *I disagree - 2 points;*
- *Strongly disagree - 1 point.*

Categories and names of indicators	Degree of agreement and the corresponding score				
	1	2	3	4	5
Contents					
1. At the beginning of the class a theoretical part: free-form theoretical information, according to the topic of the syllabus, goals and objectives of the class, Safety review. Questioning the students' well-being, roll call, etc.					
Organization	1	2	3	4	5
2. You can see that the instructor is prepared for the class.					
3. The lesson has a clear structure and sequence: introductory, main and final parts.					
4. Clear, effective transitions are used, with brief outlines from one assignment to the next.					
Interaction with the audience					
5. The instructor gives methodical instructions to students throughout the class in order to control the correctness of the exercise (task).					
6. The instructor treats students respectfully, answers questions, is open to dialogue, attentive and correct.					
7. The instructor knows how to establish interaction with students.					
Effective communications	1	2	3	4	5
8. The instructor is confident and enthusiastic.					
9. Adequate eye contact with students.					
10. The instructor has clear articulation and pronunciation. The level, speed, and tone of voice are easy to understand.					
Teaching methods	1	2	3	4	5

11. The instructor clearly formulates tasks (different methods can be used: demonstration, verbal, game, competitive, strictly regulated exercise, etc.)					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Student Involvement	Most students actively reject assignments	Students complete assignments, but are not particularly engaged in the class	Most students are involved
	1	3	5
12. Degree of student involvement			

1. What I liked about the class?
2. What needs to be improved?
3. Comments, suggestions, remarks

Note:

1. Students who are 15 minutes or more late to class will not be allowed to attend for safety reasons.

2. When evaluating the class and the instructor, it is important to pay attention to the adequacy of the tasks used to solve the pedagogical tasks and the involvement of the students.

3. The discipline "Physical Education" has three academic departments: basic, special and sports:

- classes in the main department (section) are aimed at the general strengthening of the body, taking into account the interest of students: aerobics, strength training, general physical training, table tennis, sports games, fitness aerobics, health boxing.
- in the sports department, classes are training: volleyball, freestyle wrestling, basketball, boxing, big tennis, futsal, martial arts (kazakhsha kures, sambo, judo), cheerleading, swimming, chess (classes in the "Chess" team due to its specificity, different from other training sessions, conducted in online format).
- in the special education department, classes have a health-preventive and corrective orientation: therapeutic physical education.

EVALUATION FORM FOR EXAM MATERIALS

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1kJu74ijSpRbk0gL1WT7QRL4lhy_1rPNKIP9eyOnKHJc/edit?usp=sharing

This form is designed to evaluate exam questions

*** Mandatory**

General Information

1. Full Name of the inspector *

2. Name of the course being evaluated *

3. Name of the instructor leading the course *

4. Level of education

Mark only one oval

Undergraduate

Postgraduate

5. Educational Program / Center*

Mark only one oval

EP Finance

EP Accounting and audit

EP Economics

EP Management

EP Marketing

EP HR & Business Planning

EP Digital Engineering and Data Analytics

EP International Relations and Governance

EP Law

EP Tourism

EP Social Sciences

Center for Interdisciplinary Development

Foundation

Center for Applied Finance

Other

6. Other Exam Form *

Mark only one oval

Written by ticket

Skip to question 7

- Written Combination *Skip to question 7*
- Test *Skip to question 13*
- Project defense *Skip to question 10*
- Case *Skip to question 10*
- Other: _____

Written exam

7. For written exams (tickets) *
Mark only one oval

	Yes	No	Partly
Are the learning outcomes stated in the syllabus verified?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are there criteria against which the student's work will be evaluated ((rubrics))?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are the questions formulated correctly?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do the questions reflect the appropriate level on Bloom's taxonomy?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do the questions cover all the topics in the syllabus?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Level of difficulty of the questions *
Mark only one oval

	1	2	3	4	5	
easy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	complicated

9. Comments

Project and case study

10. On examinations in the form of a project and a case study *

Mark only one oval

	Yes	No	Partly
Are the learning outcomes stated in the syllabus verified?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are there criteria against which the student's work will be evaluated ((rubrics))?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are the questions and/or requirements for the project/case formulated correctly?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do the questions reflect the appropriate level on Bloom's taxonomy?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do the questions cover all the topics in the syllabus?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. Level of difficulty of the questions *

Mark only one oval

	1	2	3	4	5	
easy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	complicated

12. Comments

Exam - test

13. For exams in the test form *

Mark only one oval

	Yes	No	Partly
Are the learning outcomes stated in the syllabus verified?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are the learning outcomes stated in the syllabus verified?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do the questions reflect the appropriate level on Bloom's taxonomy?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Is the test question clear?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Is the question duplicated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are the answer choices duplicated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Does the correct answer clearly stand out?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are the key words contained in the question and answer?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are the questions formed correctly?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. Level of difficulty of the questions *

Mark only one oval

	1	2	3	4	5	
easy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	complicated

15. Comments

COURSE MANAGEMENT FORM

Academic year 20__-20__

School _____

Educational Program _____

Instructor's Name _____

Instructor's Rank _____

Course code _____ Course Title _____

Semester _____ No. of students enrolled _____

1. General Course Description from Syllabus:

2. Course goals:

Course Learning Objectives:

3. Relationship of course objectives with program outcomes:

4. Teaching Resources followed:

Text book(s), cases, video materials, etc.
Reference books used
Other materials used (Cases, video, web sites, articles, guest speakers, etc.)

5. Instructor's opinion about the textbook:

6. Assessment scheme followed:

(% allocated to quizzes, tests, participation, final exams, etc.)

Assessment task	% of the student's final grade
Participation (activity in class)	
Case studies	
Solve problems	
Quizzes	

7. Percentage of the intended content instructor was able to cover:

8. Reason for not covering the entire syllabus (if any):

9. Grade Distribution:

Grade	%
A	
A -	
B +	
B	
B -	
C +	
C	
C -	
D +	
D	
FX	
F	

10. Learning Outcomes and Evaluation Devices:

List the learning outcomes that appear on the course syllabus in the “Outcomes” column and the methods used to measure student achievement of these outcomes in the “Measurement Device” column. Please include all measurement devices that were used to assess each outcome---i.e. if there was more than one device used to evaluate a certain outcome please list them all in the right hand column.

Course Objectives	Course topic	Measurement Device

11. Instructor’s opinion about the course description, suggested content stated and course prerequisite(s) as stated in the current Catalog:

12. Instructor’s assessment of student’s quality

Please comment on how well the students were prepared for the course at the beginning of the course. Use this space to identify any problems with prerequisite courses or requirements and any general student weakness that you observed at the outset of the course.

Please use the scale from 1 – lowest, to 5 – highest.

1. students’ background preparation ____
2. students’ commitment ____
3. students’ attitude ____
4. challenges incurred ____

13. Do you think that ECTS has been allocated effectively in terms of achieved

learning outcomes?

14. Do you think that you have provided an adequate time to complete the projects?

15. Do you always give sufficient time to studying and preparing tasks?

16. Any other comments:

Filled in by the Head of the relevant Educational Program

Assessment and comments by the Head of the Educational Program about the course and the instructor:

Please note

This form must be accompanied by a journal of the teacher's grades for the course according to the syllabus.