
Institutional Assessment and Quality Assurance (IAQA) Policy

I. BACKGROUND.....	2
II. PRINCIPLES.....	2
III. ORGANIZATION.....	2
IV. PROCESSES	3
A. INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	3
B. ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS AND SCHOOLS.....	3
1. <i>Strategic reviews</i>	3
2. <i>Extraordinary reviews</i>	4
C. TEACHING PROGRAMS	5
D. RESEARCH CENTERS	5
E. ACADEMIC SUPPORT UNITS.....	5
F. NON-ACADEMIC UNITS.....	5
ANNEX 1. MANDATE OF THE SENATE CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE (SECUR).....	7
ANNEX 2. PROCEDURE FOR STRATEGIC REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC UNITS AT CEU	8
ANNEX 3. ANNUAL REVIEWS: GUIDELINES AND CHECKLIST	12

I. Background

CEU Mission and Strategic Plan commit the University to excellence and highest quality in its research, education and outreach activities. The CEU Institutional Assessment and Quality Assurance (IAQA) system ensures achieving such quality and supports the implementation of the Strategic Plan. It facilitates the alignment of CEU mission, goals and activities; strengthens the culture of long-term planning, strategic thinking, critical reflection and commitment to excellence.

This Policy defines the main principles, organization and mechanisms of Institutional Assessment and Quality Assurance at CEU. It is informed by the standards defined by the CEU's accrediting agency in the US - the Middle States Commission for Higher Education, standards of the CEU Private University's accrediting agency in Austria – the Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation Austria (AQ Austria), as well as the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area.

II. Principles

Institutional Assessment and Quality Assurance at CEU is based on the following principles:

Centrality of the University's mission and strategic goals as defined in its Strategic Plan and other strategic documents.

Involvement and ownership by faculty and staff. IAQA processes are designed and implemented with direct involvement of CEU faculty and staff in such a way that they support and benefit their regular activities.

Link to planning and continuous improvement. IAQA processes are part of the overall planning cycle and both support and are guided by the CEU Strategic Plan and other plans. Each planning and assessment cycle should result in improvement of existing processes, practices, and outcomes.

Differentiated, multi-level and systematic approach. Distinct IAQA processes take place in individual units, programs and at the institutional level. At the same time, the whole IAQA system at CEU is organized and managed in a coherent and systematic way so that processes at different units and levels inform and support each other.

III. Organization

The Institutional Assessment and Quality Assurance at CEU is led by **the President and Rector** and forms an integral part of the Strategic Planning process.

The Pro-Rectors oversee quality assurance and assessment of activities in their respective areas. They are advised and supported by the Senate Curriculum and Academic Quality Assurance Committee. The COO oversees quality assurance and assessment in non-academic units.

Senate Curriculum and Academic Quality Assurance Committee. The Senate Curriculum and Academic Quality Assurance Committee (SeCur) is elected by the Senate with the responsibility to assure quality of curriculum by providing a meta-level review and guidance to departmental curriculum committees, assure academic quality of departments, programs, and research centers, introduce technical and propose substantive changes to this Policy, and provide advice to the Rector on other matters of quality assurance of academic activities. See Annex 1 for the detailed description of the committee's mandate. The Pro-Rector for Teaching and Learning is the ex-officio chair, and the Rector, the Pro-Rector for Faculty and Research, and the Academic Secretary are ex-officio members of the committee. At least four additional CEU faculty members are elected to the committee. If there is need, an external member may be elected to the committee. A student representative to the committee is elected by the Student Union Assembly.

The **Academic Secretary** - who is also the Academic Liaison Officer for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education - coordinates IAQA processes at CEU. S/he is responsible for supporting the work of the SeCur committee and safe-keeping the IAQA documentation and data, particularly for the purposes of institutional accreditation.

Heads of Departments and Schools are responsible for assessment and quality assurance within their units as well as for providing required information for institutional-level assessment. They set up curriculum committees at the level of the unit or at the level of teaching programs within the unit. In the case of joint programs (degrees awarded in cooperation with other universities), curriculum committees and other quality assurance processes can be set up at the level of the consortium.

Heads of teaching programs are responsible for quality assurance and assessment of these programs. They may designate quality assurance coordinators within the programs to coordinate program-level QA procedures and to liaise with the Academic Secretary.

Central Administration Units and Services (Students Services, Academic Cooperation and Research Support Office, External Relations Office, Human Resources Office, Budget and Finance Office, Information Technology Department, etc.) collect and provide information to the Institutional Assessment processes such as the preparation of the Annual Report and the Strategic Plan. Heads of these Units and Services are also responsible for IAQA processes within their units.

Directors of Research Centers are responsible for quality assurance and assessment of activities within these centers, as well as for providing required information for institutional-level assessment.

Institutional Research Office (IRO) supports the IAQA processes at the institution with collecting, processing, analyzing and reporting on institution-wide data (exit surveys, course and supervision evaluations, admissions and enrollment data, etc.)

IV. Processes

IAQA processes at CEU are included in the planning, assessment and review cycle. These cycles are specific for different levels and areas of CEU operation. This Policy provides an overview of the IAQA processes.

A. Institutional level

IAQA processes at the institutional level are designed to support the preparation, implementation, monitoring and periodic revision of the CEU Strategic Plan, budget plans as well as other CEU-wide plans.

B. Academic Departments and Schools

The Assessment and Quality Assurance Processes at the level of Academic Departments and Schools include collection of key information related to the teaching, research and outreach activities at the Unit, strategic and other reviews of the Unit's activities.

1. *Strategic reviews*

The quality of academic activities of Departments and Schools (further Units) is reviewed every five years or at shorter intervals if the Unit decides it is necessary. The timeline of such strategic reviews is defined by the President and Rector on the advice of the SeCur. In case of extraordinary reviews, the timeline of regular strategic reviews should be adjusted.

The purpose of a strategic review is to evaluate the performance of the Unit in relation to its mission and to identify strategic directions for the Unit. A strategic review should start with discussing the Unit's performance in the framework of the mission and the Strategic Plan of the University. A strategic review should evaluate the curriculum, the quality of teaching, the recruitment and the placement of graduates of the educational programs delivered by the Unit. This review is more general and strategic than annual reviews of individual teaching programs. The strategic review should also cover research and outreach activities of the Unit as well as the quality of its administration.

In preparing for a strategic review, Units should set up an ad hoc Strategic Review Committee consisting of the Head of the Unit as Chair of the Committee, the Head of the Doctoral Program (if applicable), one representative of the junior academic staff members, and any other faculty member the Head of the Unit would like to invite. Faculty members from other Units may be invited to participate in the strategic review committee, especially in case the Unit is involved in inter-departmental academic programs. At least two but no more than three external reviewers from outside CEU should be invited to participate in the evaluation process and conduct a site visit. Where applicable and when useful to the Unit, a practitioner of the discipline being taught may be appointed as a reviewer. The external reviewers are appointed by the Pro-Rector for Faculty and Research based on a shortlist submitted by the Strategic Review Committee.

The strategic review committee should have a meeting with all faculty members and administrative staff of the unit as well as with the Unit's advisory board, and discuss issues pertaining to the subject of the review. The strategic review committee should also meet the student representatives, and receive their written comments. Finally, the strategic review committee should analyze relevant information collected within the Unit and institutionally including the records of annual reviews of the teaching programs and the reports of the previous strategic or extraordinary reviews.

The strategic review committee should prepare a report based on the outcomes of the meetings and analysis of information. A report by the external reviewers, where applicable, is to be incorporated in the Strategic Review Report in a distinct section. The Review Committee may wish to reflect on the external reviewers' report in the main body of the Strategic Review Report. The report should contain the evaluation of the Unit's academic activities and outline strategic directions for the development of the Unit. It may suggest changes to degree programs and other activities deemed necessary for the fulfillment of the stated mission of the Unit. The Head of Unit should send the report to the Pro-Rector for Faculty and Research, who will bring it to the Senate Curriculum and Academic Quality Assurance Committee and to the Rector. The reports should be available for the faculty and staff of the Unit.

The Senate Curriculum and Academic Quality Assurance Committee should report annually to the Senate on the results of strategic reviews and make recommendations concerning the development of academic programs at the University for Senate discussion. The SeCur also provides written feedback to the respective academic units.

Further details and guidance on the procedure for strategic reviews of Departments and Schools are available in Annex 2.

2. *Extraordinary reviews*

The President and Rector may require extraordinary reviews in cases when a significant change concerning the Unit is contemplated as well as during the preparation for accreditation, initiation of joint programs with other institutions, as a result of other issues identified by the Rector and brought to the attention of the Senate, or upon request of the Board of Trustees. Extraordinary reviews may be internal or external. In case of internal extraordinary reviews, the regular strategic review procedure should be followed.

The Rector may require an external extraordinary review of the Unit. As a rule, the Unit is reviewed by three outside evaluators, two of whom should preferably be from an institution other than CEU, appointed by the Rector in consultation with the SeCur and the Unit.

External extraordinary reviews may evaluate teaching, research, administration and outreach activities of the Unit, the performance of the Unit Head and its academic staff members, and the progress and quality of its students (or researchers). The Terms of Reference for the Review Team are developed by the Rector in consultation with the Pro-Rector for Faculty and Research, the SeCur and the Unit. Evaluators may require any documentation they deem necessary in order to meet their Terms of Reference. They may hold interviews with individual academic staff members and students. The external review report should be communicated to the Unit, which should prepare a written response.

Both the review report and the Unit's response should be communicated to the Senate, where decisions on possible changes in procedure and activity may be passed.

C. Teaching programs

Each CEU teaching program (degree and non-degree) should incorporate appropriate planning, assessment and review elements compatible with this Policy, other CEU policies and the requirements of accrediting bodies.

Each degree-granting CEU program should have:

- Program Specifications prepared in accordance with CEU requirements (see CEU Policy on Degree Programs) defining the goals, the learning outcomes and other key aspects of the program as well as syllabi of individual courses (information required by program specifications can be incorporated into program handbooks);
- a process for continuous assessment of the quality of the program, especially in terms of achieving the Program's learning outcomes, overseen by the unit's or program's curriculum committee;
- an annual review process; the review should reflect on the quality and outcomes of the program and may lead to adjusting the Program Specifications, the planned number of students or other aspects of the Program.

The Program Specifications and the documented process and outcomes of program review should be filed with the Office of the Academic Secretary.

In order to support excellence in teaching, CEU encourages external reviews of degree-granting teaching programs. External reviewers (from both within and outside of CEU) can be invited to participate in annual program reviews at the discretion of Heads of Programs and Departments. External reviews of teaching programs can also be initiated by the Pro-Rector for Teaching and Learning or the Rector-President.

Annex 3 provides information on the annual review process and the annual review checklist.

D. Research centers

Each Research Center should have an annual plan of action and provide annual reports of their research and other activities (preferably in an electronic form available on the Center's Website). The activities of Research Centers are reviewed based on these reports and personal meetings with the Directors of the Centers by the SeCur in line with the schedule defined by the committee (see also Policy on Research Centers at CEU). The results of these reviews are used in the budget and other planning processes.

E. Academic support units

Academic support units (Center for Teaching and Learning, Academic Writing Center, etc.) are reviewed annually by the Pro-Rector for Teaching and Learning.

F. Non-academic units

Non-academic units prepare their Work Plans and annual reports and submit these to the Chief Operating Officer (COO) for review and approval. The COO shares those materials that are relevant to CEU-wide IAQA processes with the Academic Secretary.

Signed by *CEU President and Rector Shalini Randeria*.

The original document is filed at the Office of the Academic Secretary.

Annex 1. Mandate of the Senate Curriculum and Academic Quality Assurance Committee (SeCur)

The Senate Curriculum and Academic Quality Assurance Committee advises the Rector and the Senate on university-wide curriculum and other academic quality matters. The committee undertakes to:

- Assure quality of curriculum by providing a meta-level review and guidance to departmental curriculum committees, specifically:
 - (a) developing university-wide criteria for syllabi evaluation;
 - (b) reviewing curriculum maps of degree programs;
 - (c) reviewing proposals for university-wide courses and selecting courses for next academic year based on pre-agreed selection criteria;
 - (d) from time to time undertaking a targeted review of syllabi, in either thematic (e.g. methods courses), chronological (e.g. new courses for a specific term) or other types of clusters.
- Assure academic quality of departments, programs, and research centers by:
 - (a) reviewing and providing feedback to strategic reports of departments;
 - (b) reviewing and providing feedback to annual reports of teaching programs;
 - (c) considering proposals for new degrees programs and formulating a recommendation to the Senate;
 - (d) reviewing departments' evaluation criteria for re-appointment and promotion;
 - (e) reviewing reports on activities of research centers;
 - (f) reviewing and proposing modifications to CEU's Institutional Assessment and Quality Assurance Policy, CEU's Policy on Degree Programs, and the Academic Staff Handbook;
 - (g) taking on other academic quality projects as requested by the Rector, the Senate, or a committee member.

Annex 2. Procedure for strategic reviews of academic units at CEU

1. Goals

- To evaluate the performance of the Unit in relation to its mission and to identify strategic directions for the Unit.
- To review development of the Unit since the last strategic review, assess implementation of the action plan.
- To take stock of research activities of the Unit and develop a research agenda for the next five years.
- To evaluate the Unit's curriculum and assess if any changes to degree programs may be needed.
- To assess collaboration with other units and identify potential avenues for further synergies.
- To allow a chance for members of the Unit to collectively rethink their scholarly and educational paths and devise new strategies for the future.

2. Procedure

- The strategic review process should proceed strictly in line with the calendar for strategic review, to allow timely sharing with the Senate Curriculum and Quality Assurance Committee, the Senate, and the Academic Committee of the Board of Trustees.
- Unit Heads set up an ad hoc Strategic Review Committee, consisting of five or six members, including:
 - The Unit Head (who acts as the Chair of the Committee);
 - Head of the doctoral program;
 - Head of the Unit's Curriculum Committee (if other than Unit Head);
 - One representative of junior faculty members;
 - One or two other members who could be faculty, students, or administrative staff from the Unit as deemed necessary by the Unit Head;
 - Faculty members from other units may be invited to participate in the strategic review committee, especially in case the Unit is involved in inter-departmental degree programs or Advanced Certificate programs;
 - In case of joint unit reviews, Unit Heads work together to set up a joint strategic review committee. In this case, the committee is co-chaired by Heads of all participating units. In case of joint unit reviews, the final composition of the committee is subject to approval by the Pro-Rector for Research and Faculty.
- The Strategic Review Committee makes nominations for external reviewers to the Pro-Rector for Research and Faculty. The Pro-Rector may also propose other candidates for external reviewers and will consult with the Unit Head(s) prior to appointment. The Pro-Rector will appoint at least two but no more than three external reviewers from outside CEU. Where applicable and when useful to the Unit, a practitioner of the discipline being taught may be appointed as a reviewer.
- The Pro-Rector for Research and Faculty extends an invitation to external reviewers, invites them for a site visit, shares the review template, and puts them in touch with the Unit Head(s) for further collaboration.

- The Strategic Review Committee:
 - reviews previous strategic reports and annual reports of teaching programs;
 - meets with all faculty members and administrative staff;
 - meets with (consults with) the Unit's advisory board (if such exists);
 - meets student representatives, and receives their written comments; and/or has discussions with students during regular bi-annual Unit student town-halls;
 - analyzes any other relevant information within the Unit and CEU, including data available at the Institutional Research Office (exit survey reports, results of course and supervision evaluations, admissions and enrollment reports, publications and other data). Data is available at [the IRO's SharePoint site](#). The Committee may request additional data or special reports from the Institutional Research Office. Contact person: Agnes Benedek.

- Strategic review committee prepares a report based on all the above. The total length of the report (excluding appendices) should not exceed 30 pages. The report will have the following structure (*headings highlighted in bold are required, sub-headings can be modified*):

- (1) **Table of contents**
- (2) **Executive summary** (1 page)
- (3) **Background**, including the mission and intellectual profile of the Unit and the external academic environment (1-2 pages)
- (4) **Report on the implementation of the action plan from the previous strategic review** (1-2 pages)
- (5) **Main body of the report** (15-20 pages)

A. **Teaching and Learning**, *including but not limited to:*

- relevance of degree programs to the University's overall strategic goals;
- relevance of degree programs to the job market, societal needs, etc.;
- an assessment of cumulative change of the curriculum since the (re)registration with the New York State Education Department;
- student feedback on teaching and supervision;
- overall reflection on success and possible failures or inadequacies of the programs, as evidenced for example by students' achievement of program learning outcomes;
- overall reflection on the adequacy of resources, student and faculty numbers, and the quality of teaching;
- proposal for the future of the programs (including 'no change' proposal, addition or removal or tracks or specializations, change of names, introduction of new programs, consolidation of existing programs, etc.).

B. **Applicants, Students, Graduates**, *including but not limited to:*

- recruitment and enrollment trends;
- profile of the student body;
- graduation rates;
- placement of graduates;
- proposal relating to recruitment strategies and career services.

C. **Research**, *including but not limited to*:

- summary of key research directions and their alignment with the University's strategic priorities;
- Unit's research output, including a brief summary of faculty's publications data (with links);
- summary of external research grants and awards;
- proposal for strengthening research; future research agenda.

D. **Collaboration and Outreach**, *including but not limited to*:

- summary of Unit's outreach and civic engagement activities and their relation to the University's strategic goals;
- account of collaboration with other CEU units;
- academic partnerships;
- service to the CEU community;
- proposal for future collaboration and outreach activities.

E. **Administration**, *including but not limited to*:

- any challenges and proposals related to the administrative structure and management of the Unit(s).

F. **Overall reflections**, including reflections on the Unit as a whole, the interaction between teaching and research, highlighting potential synergies or tensions, and areas of concern.

(6) **Action plan** for the next five years (*2 pages*), including a **research agenda**, **faculty hiring strategy**, and a **curriculum revision plan**. The action plan should come with an **implementation timeline**.

(7) **Annexes** (only if referenced in the main report and deemed essential by the Strategic Review Committee. Include web links whenever possible rather than file attachments.)

- Unit Head(s) make the report available to faculty, students, and staff of the Unit(s) for discussion and comments, and incorporate any such feedback into the report prior to sharing it with external reviewers.
- Unit Head(s) share the report with the external reviewers in line with the calendar, and **at least two weeks prior to the site visit**.
- The external reviewers prepare a joint evaluation report following the site visit, based on the reviewers' template they received from the Pro-Rector for Research and Faculty.
- Once the external reviewers' report becomes available, the Strategic Review Committee prepares a written response. Both the external review and the committee's response are appended to the strategic report as Annexes. The strategic report can also be revised based on the evaluators' comments.
- Unit Head(s) submit the report to the Pro-Rector for Research and Faculty with a copy to Academic Secretary.

- The Academic Secretary shares the report with the Senior Leadership Team, the Senate Curriculum and Quality Assurance Committee, the Senate, and the Academic Committee of the Board of Trustees, and transmits all their feedback and comments back to the units. The action plan is subject to approval by the Senate Curriculum and Quality Assurance Committee.

3. Sample Calendar

October 7, 2022	Unit Heads receive a formal request to conduct a strategic review, including the guidelines on procedure and this calendar. Meeting with the Pro-Rector for Research and Faculty upon request.
By October 17, 2022	Units set up ad-hoc Strategic Review Committees and propose candidates for external reviewers to the Pro-Rector for Faculty and Research. The Rector and the Pro-Rectors may also suggest candidates for reviewers.
By October 31, 2022	At least two but no more than three external reviewers are appointed by the Pro-Rector for Faculty & Research. Reviewers are invited for a site visit. <i>Initial contact with reviewers: Pro-Rector for Faculty and Research.</i> Logistics is handled by the unit coordinator, expenses and honoraria are covered by the Pro-Rector's Office. <i>Contact person for payments and reimbursements: Boroka Beni.</i>
November-December 2022	Strategic review committee analyses data, meets faculty, staff and student representatives, and puts together a package for external reviewers. <i>Note: Departmental data can be accessed on the IRO SharePoint site. IRO can also generate additional data upon request. Contact person: Agnes Benedek.</i>
January-February 2023	Site visit, external reviewers discuss observations and findings.
By March 14, 2023	External reviewers finalize a joint external review report.
By March 28, 2023	Strategic review committee finalizes the report, incorporating and responding to the comments of external reviewers.
By April 25, 2023	Senate Curriculum and Quality Assurance Committee (SeCur) meets to discuss the reports. Unit heads are invited to attend the meeting. The committee prepares a written feedback report, which is shared with the unit.
By May 2, 2023	Reports and the committee's feedback are shared with the CEU Senior Leadership Team and the CEU Senate (for the June 2 Senate meeting).
June 9, 2023	Outcomes of the strategic reviews, including committee's and Senate feedback, are shared with the Academic Committee of the Board of Trustees (for the June 24-25 Board meeting).

Annex 3. Annual Reviews: Guidelines and Checklist

3.1. Annual reviews of degree programs

In line with the CEU Institutional Assessment and Quality Assurance Policy, each degree-granting CEU program should have an annual review process. Academic units are asked to submit a combined annual report on all degree programs offered by the unit. The recommended length of the report is five pages. Supporting documentation can be provided in appendices.

Reports from annual reviews should be submitted to the Academic Secretary at asrd@ceu.edu. The deadline for annual reports is October 10. Reports will be reviewed by the Senate Curriculum and Academic Quality Assurance Committee (SeCur), and written feedback will be returned to units. Findings from the annual reports will factor in the budget planning process.

Please note: Annual reports will be made publicly available to the members of CEU community on the site of the Office of the Academic Secretary at <https://ceuedu.sharepoint.com/sites/OAS-intranet>.

Units which have undergone a strategic review in the previous year are exempt from the annual review for this academic year.

Unit heads are advised to have a departmental/school meeting to discuss the annual report for the previous academic year and the action plan for the current academic year. Unit heads should make sure to involve student representatives in the process.

The focus of the report should be on the analysis of findings, not the description of processes (unless any new processes have been introduced this year). Evidence should be used to support assertions. Evidence should be derived not only from indirect sources (e.g. exit surveys, course evaluations, etc.), but also from direct sources (student work, with an emphasis on capstone assignments such as theses). Annual reports should include reflection on how evidence of student learning will be used for program improvement.

Annual reports should **address degree programs separately** where relevant. Please note:

- In case of joint degrees, the cooperating units are asked to coordinate reporting. Either both or only one unit can report on the joint program, for as long as inputs by both units are incorporated.
- In case of the doctoral degree in Political Science, the unit which is chairing the program in a given year is asked to report on the doctoral program.
- In case of Advanced Certificates, the program director/executive committee chair is asked to submit a report. There is a separate checklist for Advanced Certificate Programs.

Part I. Program's profile

Over the past academic year, have there been any changes in the unit's mission and/or programs' profile, and/or any significant changes of the curriculum? If yes, please describe the rationale and substance of the changes.¹

Part II. Annual assessment of programs

1. Report on implementation of the Action Plan from the previous year and the comments on the previous Annual Report from the SeCur. Report on the actions that followed from the Action Plan. For units that underwent the strategic review in the previous year, report on the actions that followed from the strategic review.
2. Report on the progress of implementing recommendations received during an accreditation procedure. If the program has not received any recommendations, all recommendations have already been implemented, or the recommendations received pertain to institutional-level, rather than departmental or program-level matters, this section may be omitted.
3. Trends in recruitment, admission, progression and graduation of students (by program). Data will be supplied by the Institutional Research Office and posted under O:/IRO/Public Folder/*Your academic unit's name* by September 10. (contact person: Agnes Benedek, benedeka@ceu.edu).
4. Achievement of program-level learning outcomes as evidenced by students' theses or other evidence. Use of evidence of student learning for program improvement: How did a particular cohort perform (with reference to the program learning outcomes)? What factors are responsible for the deficit of learning? What steps have been taken towards improvement where learning deficits have been identified? Note: use of thesis-grading sheets built on the basis of program learning outcomes can facilitate this assessment. At least one dedicated faculty meeting per year to discuss the findings on student learning is suggested. Supporting materials are posted on the CTL website <https://ctl.ceu.edu/Resources> - see the section on "Using Evidence from Student Work for Program Improvement".
5. Student feedback (through student evaluations, student representatives and in other forms). How is student feedback used for course and program improvement? Exit survey results will be supplied by the Institutional Research Office and posted under O:/IRO/Public Folder/*Your academic unit's name* by September 10 (contact person: Agnes Benedek, benedeka@ceu.edu). In addition to exit surveys, units should employ other modes of evaluation and feedback, including regular meetings with students, either in the form of townhalls or meetings of the unit head and program director with student representatives. There should be at least two such meetings per academic year, one in the fall to collect student feedback, and one in the spring to collect any additional feedback and report back to the students on the use of their feedback for program and course improvement. Results of these meetings should be reported in this section.
6. Action Plan for the next academic year addressing any issues identified.
7. Other comments.

Required attachment:

Curriculum map (if not previously submitted or if modified over the past year)²

¹ Note that certain curricular changes are subject to approval by the CEU Senate and CEU's accrediting agencies. Before implementing curricular changes, consult the CEU Degree Programs Policy to determine whether pre-approval is required. In case of uncertainty, consult the Office of the Academic Secretary.

² A curriculum map is a table or a diagram of a program's curriculum that shows how different courses are aligned to meet and assess the program learning outcomes, and is used to identify and help address academic gaps, redundancies, and misalignments for purposes of improving the overall coherence of a program of study. CEU curriculum maps can be accessed here: <https://oas.ceu.edu/>

3.1. Annual reviews of Advanced Certificate programs

All CEU Advanced Certificate programs that are registered with the New York State Education Department (NYSED) are asked to submit an annual report on the performance of the certificate program, using the below checklist as a guide.

The length of the report should not exceed five pages. Supporting documentation can be provided in appendices.

Reports from annual reviews should be submitted to the Academic Secretary at asrd@ceu.edu. The deadline for the previous year's annual reports is October 10. Reports will be reviewed by the Senate Curriculum and Academic Quality Assurance Committee (SeCur), and written feedback will be returned to programs.

Please note: Annual reports will be made publicly available to the members of CEU community on the website at <https://oas.ceu.edu/>

Part I. Certificate program's profile

Have there been any changes in the program (number of credits, curriculum, requirements, participating departments, governance structure, etc.) as compared to the program application submitted to NYSED? If yes, please describe³.

Part II. Annual assessment of the certificate program

1. Report on implementation of the Action Plan from the previous year and the comments on the previous Annual Report from the SeCur.
2. Students' profile (trends in enrollment, progression, completion, numbers by departments).
3. Achievement of program learning outcomes as evidenced by students' theses or other student work⁴.
4. Student feedback (through course evaluations, townhall meetings and in other forms)⁵. How is student feedback used for program improvement?
5. Action Plan for the next academic year addressing any issues identified.
6. Other comments.

Required attachments:

- List of courses (if not previously submitted or if modified over the past year).

³ Please note that certain kinds of changes may require a program change application to be submitted to NYSED. Before implementing and program changes, consult the CEU Degree Programs Policy to determine if pre-approval is required. In case of uncertainty, consult the Office of the Academic Secretary.

⁴ Supporting materials are posted on the CTL website <https://ctl.ceu.edu/Resources> - see the section on "[Using Evidence from Student Work for Program Improvement](#)".

⁵ The Institutional Research Office (IRO) can help administer an anonymous student evaluation survey upon request. Contact person: Anna Galacz (galacza@ceu.edu)

Document information

Type	Policy
Number	P-1103-3 v 2210
Title	Institutional Assessment and Quality Assurance Policy
Distribution	Internal
Filename	P-1103-3 v 2210 IAQA Policy
Notes	
Related documents	Strategic Plan; Policy on Degree Programs; Policy on Research Centers, Academic Staff Handbook.
For final documents	
Approved by:	Senate, technical modifications approved by SeCur
Date of approval	March 4, 2011, amended October 21, 2011 and November 23, 2012, modified by SAQAC on November 25, 2013 further amendments by the Senate December 1, 2017, June 8, 2018, November 23, 2018, January 28, 2022, and June 2022 (technical modifications by SeCur).
Enters force	April 6, 2011
Lead Unit	Academic Secretary