



**Provision
on decision-making of the IQAA Accreditation Council concerning specialized
(programme) accreditation of higher education institutions (HEIs)**

1. The Accreditation Council on its meeting for decision-making concerning specialized accreditation of HEIs considers the following documents: a self-evaluation report, an external review report made by the expert group, a conclusion made by the Agency.

2. The defining factor in decision-making on specialized accreditation is evaluation by standards, made according to the findings of the external review by the IQAA expert group, which includes national and international experts, students and employers.

3. To standardise the decision-making process on accreditation, based on the experience of the European accreditation agencies, the following algorithm is adopted to standardize decision-making on specialized accreditation:

3.1 Evaluative judgment “**Fully complies**” in the external review of an individual standard is accepted in points, which equals to 3 points, evaluative judgment “**Substantially complies**” equals to 2 points, evaluative judgment “**Partially complies**” equals to 1 point and evaluative judgment “**Does not comply**” equals to 0 points (See the table).

3.2 The maximum number of points that a study programme can receive by 7 standards equals to 21 points, respectively, while the minimum is 0 points.

3.3 A study programme is considered as accredited for full time period of 5 years, if it receives **15-21 points (the experts’ marks by 7 standards are grouped by the judgments “Fully complies”, “Substantially complies”, “Partially complies”)**.

3.4 A study programme is considered as accredited with conditions, if it receives **8-14 points (the experts’ marks by seven standards are also grouped by the judgments “Fully complies”, “Substantially complies”, “Partially complies”)**.

3.5 In justified cases, taking into account opinions of the Accreditation Council members, additional information about a study programme, and evaluation of evidence the assessment in points can be changed (para 3.3 and para 3.4).

3.6 A study programme is considered as not accredited, if it has **less than 8 points**, and in case if at least one of its standards received a judgment “Does not comply”.

Standard	Fully complies	Substantially complies	Partially complies	Does not comply
Standard 1 – Aims of study programmes and a policy in the field of quality assurance	3	2	1	0
Standard 2 – Development and approval of study programmes, information management	3	2	1	0
Standard 3 - Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment	3	2	1	0
Standard 4 – Admission of students, progression, recognition and certification	3	2	1	0
Standard 5 – Teaching staff	3	2	1	0
Standard 6 – Learning Resources and Student Support	3	2	1	0
Standard 7 - Public Information	3	2	1	0
Standard 8 – Periodic external quality assurance and follow-up procedures	-	-	-	-

4. If significant violations of the accreditation standards and current legislation are identified, the Accreditation council may make a decision (including conditional accreditation or non-accreditation), which is not based on these quantitative indicators.

5. The Accreditation council may decide to conditionally extend accreditation for half a year (six months), if there are objective grounds for untimely completion of accreditation.

The provision has been amended (para 4, 5), approved at a meeting of the Accreditation council on December 9, 2017.

