National Pedagogical University of Uzbekistan

QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY

NPUU

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 2
    1.1 Purpose 2
    1.2 Principles 2
    1.3 Scope 3
    1.4 Governance 3
    1.5 Responsibilities 5
    1.6 Definition of terms 5
2. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT PROCESSES: PDCA CYCLE 6
3. PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW 6
    3.1 Programme Specifications 7
    3.2 Course Specifications 7
    3.3 Annual Programme Monitoring and Review 8
    3.4 Course portfolio 9
4. STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGEMENT 10
    4.1 Student representation 10
    4.2 Employer Engagement 10
5. TEACHING AND LEARNING 11
    5.1 Key teaching and learning standards 11
    5.2 Assessment and Evaluation 11
    5.3 Assessment Formats 12
6. TEACHING PRACTICE DEVELOPMENT 12
5. DATA-BASED DECISION MAKING 13
    5.1 Student voice and Feedback Systems 13
6. INTERNAL QUALITY REVIEW 15
7. EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE **16**

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

These Quality Assurance Procedures establish the operational basis for the implementation of the internal quality assurance system at the Schools of National Pedagogical University of Uzbekistan ('NPUU'). They define the required processes, responsibilities, and actions to ensure consistent planning, monitoring, review, and enhancement of academic quality across all structural units. The procedures are designed to support the development, maintenance, and continuous improvement of a quality culture in which all internal stakeholders carry defined responsibilities and actively participate in quality assurance activities at their respective levels.

1.2 Principles

This QA Framework is grounded in the University's Strategic Principles and translates these into operational quality commitments, ensuring that excellence, integrity, innovation, and equity are embedded in all quality assurance processes.

The following are the core quality assurance principles:

- **Ownership and responsibility**
  The setting and maintenance of the academic standards of the University's academic provision are shared responsibility, which includes the broad involvement of academic staff, students and other stakeholders, working in partnership through membership of School, and University committees as well as other organisational entities.
- **Consistency rather than standardisation**
  There are agreed quality assurance processes but with some flexibility for schools and other organisational units to determine how they meet the intended outcomes of the process. The Transformation Department within the Office of the Vice-Rector for Transformation provides a co-ordinated approach to quality assurance across Schools and organisational units across the campus to promote consistency.
- **Evidence-based decision making**
  Judgements and decisions in relation to quality must be based on data and systematic review.

- **Continuous improvement**
  When it comes to the quality of education provisions, the University's ultimate goal is continuous improvement — striving to exceed the standards set by regulatory bodies, rather than simply meeting the minimum required.
- **Transparency and accountability**
  University's academic activities are well measured and informed, with transparent decision-making in line with the University's governance systems.
- **Enhancement focus**
  All quality assurance activities must prioritise continuous enhancement, not mere compliance.
- **Stakeholder engagement**
  Students, staff and external stakeholders must be involved in quality processes. Documentation requirements seek to ensure that students and other stakeholders are able to get clear and accurate information about courses of study which lead to a NPUU award, and clarity of the University's awards.
- **Proportionality**
  QA processes must be appropriate to their context and proportionate to desired outcome and to the risk attached to the activity they are assuring.

1.3 Scope

The procedures set in this Framework are binding on all departments, units, and staff within the Schools involved in academic and support activities. They regulate the implementation and operation of quality assurance processes at School level in accordance with University-wide quality assurance requirements.

1.4 Governance

Academic Council

The Academic Council is the highest collegial governing body of the University, responsible for approving key academic regulations and policies. The University Academic Council is composed of the following members:

- Rector, serving as the Chair of the Council,
- All Vice-Rectors, representing their respective strategic and academic areas of responsibility,
- Deans of Schools, providing academic and administrative leadership within their schools,
- Heads of Administrative Departments, contributing operational and institutional expertise.

School Academic Board

The School Academic Board serves as the highest collegial academic body at the school level and is responsible for academic governance, oversight, and decision-making within the School. The School of Academic Board also serves as the Progression and Award Board. The Progression and Award Board is responsible for reviewing students' academic performance, determining progression decisions, and approving awards in accordance with the University regulations. The School Academic Board is composed of the following members:

- Dean of School, serving as Chair of the Board,
- Deputy Deans, Head of Undergraduate Office, or Director of the Transformation Department,
- Department Head or appointed faculty member, designated annually by Department Heads prior to the first Mid-term examination and serving for the duration of that academic year,
- Head of Academic Affairs Department,
- Head of Educational and Methodological Support division,
- Head of Registrar's Office,
- Head of School Student Council,
- Additional individuals may be invited to attend meetings to report on specific matters within their area of expertise, as required.

Teaching Quality Assurance and Accreditation Department (TQAAD)

The Quality Assurance and Accreditation Department is responsible for the implementation of quality assurance policies and regulations, and for monitoring and evaluating quality assurance practices within the University. The Department is also responsible for overseeing the accreditation processes of individual programmes as well as the University as a whole.

Schools

Schools are the primary academic divisions of the University, each bringing together a group of related disciplines and fields of study. Each School is led by a Dean, who holds overall responsibility for academic standards, quality assurance, and the effective delivery of educational provision within the School. Schools are responsible for ensuring that all programmes offered under their remit align with University-wide quality standards and regulatory requirements.

Departments

Departments are the operational academic units within a School, responsible for delivering teaching, conducting research, and managing the day-to-day academic activities within a specific discipline or subject area. Each Department operates under the leadership of a Head of Department, who is accountable for ensuring that departmental activities are carried out in accordance with the School's and University's quality assurance policies and framework.

1.5 Responsibilities

The maintenance and continuous improvement of academic standards and the quality of educational provision within the School is the responsibility of all School bodies, departments, and staff. The **Dean of the School** holds primary responsibility for the implementation of the Quality Assurance Policy and Framework, providing overall leadership and oversight of all quality-related activities. All other bodies, departments, and staff are expected to carry out their respective quality assurance responsibilities in accordance with the roles and actions defined within the Framework. Each unit and individual remains accountable for ensuring that School-level activities align with University-wide quality standards.

1.6 Definition of terms

Term	Definition
Evaluation	The systematic process of assessing the effectiveness and impact of academic programmes and School-level activities. The purpose of evaluation is to determine whether objectives are being achieved, to identify strengths and weaknesses, and to inform decisions for continuous improvement of academic quality within the School.
Monitoring	The ongoing process of collecting, analyzing, and using information about academic programmes and School-level activities to track progress against quality objectives and identify issues early.
Quality	Quality in higher education refers to how well providers support students to consistently achieve positive outcomes in learning, personal development and career advancement, while meeting the reasonable expectations of those students, employers, government and society in general.
Quality Assurance	A set of processes, policies, actions or mechanisms implemented in an institution or programme to ensure that it is fulfilling its own

	purpose, meeting the national and international standards that apply to higher education in general or to specific programmes (Martin & Stella, 2007, p. 34).
Quality culture	"Organizational culture that intends to enhance quality permanently and is characterized by two distinct elements: a cultural/psychological element of shared values, beliefs, expectations and commitment towards quality and a structural/managerial element with defined processes that enhance quality and aim at coordinating individual efforts." (Kottman et al., 2016, p. 7 after EUA, 2006).
Quality enhancement	A development of quality beyond minimum threshold requirement.
University ("NPUU")	The National Pedagogical University of Uzbekistan.

2. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT PROCESSES: PDCA CYCLE

The Schools of NPUU adopt the four-step **Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA)** cycle as the foundational methodology for its quality improvement and assurance processes. This cyclical approach ensures that quality enhancement is systematic, evidence-based, and continuous.

1. Plan: The Schools identify areas requiring improvement and develop a structured strategic plan outlining objectives, responsibilities, timelines, and expected outcomes. This stage involves analysis of existing data, stakeholder input, and alignment with institutional and regulatory standards.

2. Do: The planned actions and interventions are implemented in accordance with the established strategy. Relevant stakeholders carry out their designated responsibilities to progress towards the identified quality objectives.

3. Check: The outcomes of the implemented actions are systematically monitored, evaluated, and reviewed against the predefined objectives. Evidence is gathered to assess the effectiveness of the interventions and to identify any gaps or areas requiring further attention.

4. Act: Based on the findings of the evaluation stage, the Schools take informed decisions. Where improvements have been achieved, successful practices are

documented, institutionalised, and used to inform broader quality enhancement initiatives. Where outcomes are unsatisfactory, the cycle begins again with a revised plan to address the identified shortcomings.

3. PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW

The Schools shall implement programme development and approval procedures to ensure that all programmes meet University requirements and applicable national and international standards. Programme design and revision at School level must comply with University regulations and follow these requirements:

- All programmes and courses offered by the School must align with the University mission, vision, and strategic objectives.
- The Schools must ensure stakeholder engagement (such as employers, graduates, students, and professional bodies where applicable) in programme design and revision.
- Programme curriculum must demonstrate relevance to societal needs and labour market demands.
- Each programme must maintain an approved Programme Specification that is publicly accessible to applicants, students, and other stakeholders.
- Programmes must incorporate current pedagogical approaches, promote student-centred learning, integrate theory with practice, and prepare students for regional and global professional contexts.
- Programme proposals and major revisions must be reviewed at School level and approved through University Academic Council in accordance with University approval procedures.

3.1 Programme Specifications

Programme Specifications are official documents published annually for each award-bearing taught programme at the NPUU. They provide a clear and comprehensive overview of a programme's purpose, structure and outcomes.

Programme specifications at the NPUU has the following mandatory elements:

- Programme title, name of the final award, teaching institution, date specification approved
- Brief overview of the programme (the purpose of the programme in a brief paragraph)
- Educational Aims
- Learning outcomes

- Programme structure (a brief outline of the programme structure and how it supports progress)
- Teaching and learning (which methods of teaching are used, i.e., lectures, seminars, etc.. How is the programme taught and how do students learn?)
- Assessment (assessments and how these meet the learning outcomes previously listed)
- Progression and Career Destinations (the opportunities for the students' personal and professional development, including transferable and employability skills)

3.2 Course Specifications

Course Specifications are official documents published per semester for each credit-bearning taught course (modules) at the NPUU. They provide a clear and comprehensive overview of a course's purpose, structure and outcomes.

Course specifications at the NPUU has the following mandatory elements:

- Course title, course code, credits assigned to the course, total number of hours taught, contact hours per week, pre-requisite(s) if applicable, semester and and academic year
- Full name of the course leader and other instructors, including their office hours, email addresses, and rooms,
- Reading list, including mandatory and optional readings,
- Course description, course learning outcomes, alignment of course learning outcomes to programme learning outcomes,
- Weekly distribution of course topics and assessments, including the weighting of each assessment component,
- Assessment of course learning outcomes,
- Students' workload,
- Date specification approved.

3.3 Annual Programme Monitoring and Review

Annual Programme Monitoring and Review (APMR) is conducted to verify that programmes are delivered in accordance with approved specifications and that intended academic and professional objectives are achieved. The process supports continuous quality improvement and alignment with University educational aims.

Programme leaders are responsible for preparing the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for each programme.

The AMR must include a proposed action plan for the forthcoming academic year and a status report on actions from the previous academic year.
The AMR must be evidence-based and include, at minimum, analysis of:

- Admission data
- Student progression and retention
- Student achievement and outcomes
- Appeals and complaints
- Student feedback results
- Course portfolios.

AMRs are prepared for the previous academic year and submitted by deadlines established by Academic Affairs.

Submitted AMRs are reviewed at School level by the Dean/Deputy Deans and forwarded to the University Quality Assurance Unit for reviewing, providing feedback and approval of the AMRs. Additional meetings with faculty, stakeholders and external experts may be held by the Department of University Quality Assurance Unit to gather feedback and data to further improve the quality of the programmes and to approve the AMRs.

After approval, AMRs may be published in accordance with the University transparency requirements.

3.4 Course portfolio

The Course Portfolio is an official academic record designed to ensure systematic documentation, evaluation, and continuous enhancement of teaching and learning. Its purpose is to:

- provide verifiable evidence of course delivery, assessment practices, and academic standards;
- ensure alignment between intended learning outcomes, teaching activities, and assessment methods;
- support transparency, consistency, and accountability in grading and academic decision-making;
- facilitate data-informed Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI);
- serve as required documentation for Annual Programme Monitoring, internal review, and external quality assurance processes;
- formally confirm completion and academic closure of a course.

As part of the University's quality assurance and enhancement processes, complete Course Portfolio for every course delivered must be submitted. Course Portfolios serve as mandatory evidence for Annual Programme Monitoring and review.

The Course Portfolio must include:

- Approved course syllabus;
- Lecture or teaching materials;
- Graded assignments and quizzes specified in the syllabus;
- Midterm examination questions and answers keys, together with scanned copies of one highest, one middle, and one lowest scoring midterm examination script;
- Final examination questions and answers, together with scanned copies of one highest, one middle, and one lowest scoring final examination script;
- A signed grade report (including rubrics and grade analysis);
- An individually completed Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) form for each instructor.

A hard copy of the CQI form must be submitted to Academic Affairs, and a scanned signed copy must be uploaded to the Course Portfolio folder.

The Department is responsible for verifying completeness of the Course Portfolio. Once all required materials are submitted and verified, the course is considered officially closed and the Course Portfolio is deemed complete for quality assurance and enhancement purposes.

4. STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGEMENT

Schools shall ensure systematic and inclusive stakeholder engagement in quality assurance, programme development, delivery, monitoring, and review processes. Engagement activities must be planned, documented, and periodically evaluated for effectiveness.

Schools shall engage internal and external stakeholders — including academic staff, governing bodies, students, employers, administrative staff, external agencies, and community representatives — through structured communication and consultation mechanisms. These may include discussion forums, consultation meetings, presentations, seminars, surveys, and advisory sessions. Departments are responsible for maintaining records of stakeholder engagement activities and outcomes.

4.1 Student representation

Schools shall maintain formal student representation structures at programme and department levels. Student representatives shall be:

- officially designated through approved mechanisms;
- provided with orientation and training on their QA role;
- invited to participate in relevant committees and review discussions;
- supported through regular briefings and feedback channels.

Student input must be considered in programme monitoring, course evaluation, and quality improvement planning.

4.2 Employer Engagement

Departments shall involve employers and professional stakeholders in programme and course development, review, and enhancement activities. Employer engagement may include participation in:

- curriculum design and revision;
- assessment and competency alignment discussions;
- programme and course reviews and monitoring;
- policy and guideline consultations where relevant;
- internship and practice-based learning arrangements.

Evidence of employer engagement must be documented and reflected in programme files and annual monitoring reports.

5. TEACHING AND LEARNING

The University is committed to maintaining high standards in teaching and learning by implementing learner-cantered, inclusive, and outcome-based educational (OBE) strategies. Our teaching processes are designed to cultivate critical thinking, problem-solving skills, creativity, and promote lifelong learning among students.

5.1 Key teaching and learning standards

Faculty Qualifications: The HR department ensures that highly qualified teachers with international experience are hired for teaching positions.

Pedagogical Approaches: Departments ensure clear alignment between Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and assessment rubrics. Faculty members receive training and are encouraged to engage students through active learning methodologies. The use of digital tools is promoted, including providing video-recorded lectures via the Learning Management System (LMS), to supplement course materials and support student learning.

Course Files Documentation: The Teaching Quality Assurance and Accreditation Department (TQAAD) ensures the systematic maintenance and regular updating of course files, lesson plans, and syllabuses for all courses offered during regular semesters.

Classroom Observations and Evaluation: Departments, in collaboration with TQAAD conduct regular evaluations of teaching effectiveness. This process includes gathering student feedback through surveys, peer reviews via random classroom observations, and annual self-assessments by faculty members.

5.2 Assessment and Evaluation

Assessment at the University is designed to be transparent, fair, reliable, and aligned with defined learning outcomes.

Formative assessments: Formative assessments, such as quizzes, assignments, presentations, practical work, group discussions, and mid-semester evaluations, are designed to provide ongoing learning opportunities and constructive feedback to students throughout the course.

Summative Assessment: Summative assessments evaluate cumulative learning and include midterm and final examinations, capstone projects, thesis work, and comprehensive viva voce examinations where applicable, reflecting students' mastery of course content.

Grading and Evaluation: The University employs pre-defined grading rubrics and marking schemes, which are communicated to students at the beginning of each course to ensure transparency. Examination papers and evaluated scripts undergo moderation to guarantee fairness and consistency in grading.

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Control: Strict adherence to academic integrity is maintained through mandatory plagiarism checks, alongside enforcement of strict examination conduct regulations.

Feedback Mechanisms: Timely and meaningful feedback is provided to students, supporting their academic growth. The University incorporates feedback loops aimed at continuous improvement of courses and assessment methods.

5.3 Assessment Formats

Schools use a variety of established assessment formats, listed below but not limited to:

(a) Coursework
(b) In-person invigilated handwritten examination
(c) In-person invigilated digital examination
(d) Presentation

Other assessment formats such as dissertations and vivas/oral examinations will remain listed in individual programme regulations.

Coursework
For the purposes of the Quality Assurance Framework, coursework is defined as a set assignment of work that is undertaken over a period of time. Parameters for coursework include a fixed date for submission and sometimes a fixed word limit. Coursework may be undertaken by an individual student or a group of students. Where undertaken by a group, clear advice about marking practices should be shared with students in advance. Coursework may encompass a range of disciple-specific, innovative and inclusive assessment modes and methods. Coursework could take the form of a single piece of work, or a portfolio of essays or assignments. Clear marking criteria, instructions on formatting and citation guidelines should be provided in advance.

In-person invigilated handwritten examination
In-person handwritten examinations require students to hand-write their responses to the examination questions. The examination will be for a limited time. In-person handwritten examinations assume the examination will take place synchronously in an invigilated University examination hall or within examination conditions administered locally. In-person handwritten examinations are either closed-book or students may be permitted to bring written notes and texts into the examination hall with the express permission of the relevant Examinations Board and advance notification to the Examinations Team. Clear instructions should be provided to students prior to the examination.

In-person invigilated digital examinations
In-person digital examinations require students to type their responses to the examination. The examination will be for a limited time. In-person digital examinations

assume the examination will take place synchronously in an invigilated University exam hall. In-person digital examinations are either closed-book or students may be permitted to bring written notes and texts into the examination hall with the express permission of the relevant Examination Board and advance notification to the Examinations Team. Clear instructions should be provided to students prior to the examination.

Presentations

A presentation may be prepared and given by an individual or by a group. Where a presentation is prepared and given by a group, clear advice about marking practices / criteria should be shared with students in advance. A presentation includes a delivery of content with a possible opportunity for questions and/or discussion following the presentation. A presentation may be given online or in-person. The content itself may be recorded in advance, but must be presented live; in contrast, a recorded video submitted for assessment without being 'presented' by the student would be considered coursework. A presentation can be delivered solely to the assessors / examiners or to the assessors / examiners alongside a wider audience, such as peers on the course. Clear marking criteria, instructions on formatting, and citation guidelines should be provided in advance. A presentation is considered distinct from a '*viva*', which would have to be approved as part of the course regulations. A presentation is didactic in nature, even if delivered solely to the assessors / examiners and/or involving opportunity for questions or discussion, whereas the focus of a *viva* is dialogic.

6. TEACHING PRACTICE DEVELOPMENT

As part of Schools' quality assurance and enhancement framework, academic staff engagement in teaching practice development is a structured and mandatory process aimed at strengthening learning and teaching effectiveness. Teaching observation is implemented as a quality enhancement mechanism rather than a performance control tool, fostering reflective practice and pedagogical improvement.

All new academic staff are subject to formal induction, training, and probation processes in accordance with applicable Human Resources policies. Ongoing performance development review processes further support professional growth, accountability, and alignment with institutional academic standards.

Peer observation of teaching is compulsory on an annual basis for all academic staff. Its primary purpose is developmental: to provide constructive feedback, promote collegial learning, encourage reflective practice, and facilitate the exchange of effective pedagogical approaches. The process is guided by principles of transparency, mutual

respect, and continuous improvement, embedding observation and reflection as routine elements of academic practice. Through systematic peer engagement, good practice is identified, disseminated, and scaled across Schools, thereby enhancing the overall student learning experience.

Each teaching staff member is required to nominate one of their sessions for peer observation once per academic year. An online nomination list will be made available to all faculty members to register their nominated sessions. Any faculty member wishing to volunteer as an observer must inform the observee in advance. Following the observation, the observer is required to complete and submit a Peer Observation of Teaching Form to the Head of Department within one working day of the observed session. The Head of Department is responsible for maintaining and storing all submitted forms at School level, which are subsequently forwarded to the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Department for review and records.

In addition, academic staff are expected to engage in continuous professional development (CPD) activities to maintain disciplinary expertise, pedagogical competence, and alignment with evolving academic, professional, and regulatory standards. CPD participation is monitored as part of Schools' quality assurance procedures to ensure sustained academic excellence and ongoing quality enhancement.

5. DATA-BASED DECISION MAKING

The University is committed to ensuring that all decisions are informed by robust and reliable data. Data may be collected through a variety of methods, including surveys, interviews, existing databases, and feedback mechanisms. The University emphasizes the importance of **data triangulation**, using multiple sources of information to make well-founded decisions. All data analysis processes adhere to strict standards of **confidentiality** to protect the privacy of students and staff.

5.1 Student voice and Feedback Systems

Students play a central role in enhancing both the quality of educational provision and the broader student experience. Their participation is captured through course-level feedback and through the active involvement of student representatives at institutional review boards, including Course Panels. Students' views inform judgments on the quality of teaching, learning, and institutional provision, and are treated as essential input for continuous quality improvement.

Students' views are seen as being important for informing judgements on the quality of the education experience they obtain through studying at NPUU. At the course level, it is considered equally important to obtain information on the quality of students' learning. The University believes that students should be supported in expressing views and raising issues at the wider subject area and programme level, as well as, on aspects of institutional provision.

The effective involvement of students in quality systems depends upon processes which:

a) facilitate students' confidence in providing open and frank feedback;

b) ensure that the feedback is actively considered and acted upon where appropriate;

c) ensure that information is provided for students on how their views have been considered; action taken and, where appropriate, reasons why action is not taken.

The process is two-way, and students have a responsibility to:

a) act responsibly and constructively in providing views,

b) recognise that student views are one part of a wider integrated quality enhancement systems,

c) participate in the formal structures provided to elicit student comment,

d) disseminate information to each other, initially, through the vehicle of student representatives.

Course Level Feedback

At minimum, the University requires that student feedback be collected through both a Mid-Term Course Evaluation (MCE) and a Final Course Evaluation (FCE) conducted each semester. These evaluations form the baseline mechanisms for systematically capturing student's views on their learning experience and course delivery. In addition to these mandatory evaluations, other types of surveys may also be conducted as needed, and their use is encouraged when additional insights are required to support continuous improvement.

The course evaluation process should be designed to systematically gather and analyse students' feedback on course content, workload, teaching and delivery methods, learning experience, and assessment processes.

All course evaluation analyses must be conducted anonymously to ensure students can provide honest and uninhibited feedback. The identity of respondents must **not** be disclosed to faculty or staff under any circumstances, except:

- in strictly limited cases where disclosure is legally required,

- where a student has provided explicit written consent, or
- where there are serious safeguarding or misconduct concerns that necessitate review by authorized institutional officials.

Any disclosure in these exceptional circumstances must be strictly controlled, limited to those who need to know, and carried out in accordance with institutional policies and data protection regulations. Under no circumstances should anonymity be compromised for informal inquiries, personal curiosity, or performance management purposes.

The results of the course evaluation analysis must be communicated to faculty members through individual reports. Each individual report should contain an analysis of the feedback specifically related to that faculty member, ensuring clarity and relevance for personal reflection and professional development.

General evaluation reports are reviewed by the Head of Department, Dean of the School and Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs as part of the annual monitoring report. Course-specific issues are addressed collaboratively by the Course Leader and the Head of Department.

Course Leaders are responsible for developing and implementing an action plan based on the survey results. The action plan must:

- Be reviewed and approved by the Head of Department before implementation
- Be communicated to students within 3 days of approval

The student feedback responses will enable the Dean of School and Head of Department to make informed judgements about academic staff development. Matters or areas will be referred to the relevant staff members.

Informal feedback can be sought at different times within a course and it is assumed that course leaders undertake this more frequently.

Students will only recognise the value of providing feedback if they receive some response on how the feedback has been received and considered and whether any changes have been made as a result. The Departments and Head of Departments or their equivalent, are an important part of the process and will be responsible for providing information to students on issues raised through the channel of:

a. Student representatives;
b. Official student feedback systems.

Following the course evaluation, action plans will be prepared in response to the most frequently raised and urgent concerns identified by students. The Dean of the School holds overall responsibility for ensuring that the action plans are developed and implemented in a timely and effective manner.

6. INTERNAL QUALITY REVIEW

The University conducts periodic internal quality reviews to evaluate the effectiveness of its academic programmes and quality assurance processes. These reviews serve as a mechanism for identifying areas of strength and areas requiring improvement, ensuring that the University's educational provision consistently meets its own standards as well as national and international benchmarks.

Internal quality reviews are comprehensive in nature, comparable in scope and depth to an accreditation process, and are conducted once every four years. The review is carried out by a panel of internal reviewers, which may include senior academic staff, quality assurance officers, and other relevant stakeholders. The review process involves a thorough examination of programme documentation, student performance data, feedback from students and staff, and the outcomes of previous quality assurance activities.

Following each internal review, a formal report is produced outlining the panel's findings, commendations, and recommendations for improvement. Schools and Departments are required to prepare and submit an action plan in response to the review recommendations, outlining the steps to be taken, responsible parties, and expected timelines for implementation. The Quality Assurance and Accreditation Department is responsible for monitoring the progress of these action plans and ensuring that agreed improvements are carried out accordingly.

7. EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

The University is firmly committed to engaging with external quality assurance processes as a means of ensuring transparency, accountability, and continuous improvement in its academic provision. External review provides an independent and objective assessment of the University's quality assurance practices, academic standards, and educational outcomes, offering valuable insights that complement internal quality assurance efforts.

The University actively participates in external reviews conducted by national and international quality assurance and accreditation bodies. These reviews assess the extent

to which the University meets established regulatory and professional standards, and provide an external perspective on the effectiveness of its quality assurance framework.

All findings, recommendations, and conditions arising from external reviews are formally acknowledged and acted upon. Schools and Departments are required to develop and implement action plans in response to external review recommendations, and the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Department is responsible for coordinating and monitoring the University's response to ensure that all required improvements are addressed within the agreed timelines.

8. GOVERNANCE AND REVIEW

Item	Detail
Approving Authority	University Academic Council
Policy owner	Vice-Rector for Transformation
Operational lead	Quality Assurance and Accreditation Unit under Transformation Department
Implementing unit	Deans of Schools and Department Heads
Review cycle	Annual for the first three years; biennial thereafter
Student input	Semesterly language experience survey; Student Representative Council consultation
Faculty input	Programme leader reports; annual faculty meetings

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Type	Policy			
Number				
Title	Quality Assurance Policy			
Scope	All Schools and Departments			
Contact	ses.admin@npuu.uz			
Dates	**Version Approved:**	**Effective Date:**	**Last reviewed:**	**Next review:**
	Version 1	1.09.2026	1.08.2026	1.08.2027
Approving authority	Academic Council			
Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations	NPUU Code of Ethics NPUU Academic Staff NPUU Academic Affairs Manual NPUU Internship Regulations NPUU Exam Guide NPUU Undergraduate Moderation Guidance NPUU Procedure for the Investigation of Allegations of Misconduct in Research			